

Lt. Richard G. Simms, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Gary L. Parten, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Brush, James D., II Reed, Robert F.
Ise, William H. Walker, John A.
Rapp, Michael D.

The following-named officers of the Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Judge Advocate General's

Corps of the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Granahan, Thomas F.
Neutzet, Dennis R.

David F. Leake, U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Robert E. Every, U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bauman, John C.
Gustafson, Duane O.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bosley, James E. Marini, Ronald M.
Flisk, Bruce D. Tidwell, Eddy
Maddox, James A.

The following-named chief warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service in the classification indicated and as permanent warrants and/or permanent and temporary warrants subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

ELECTRONICS

Sears, James A.

COMMUNICATIONS

Flanders, Mack H.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

YOUTH

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in September 5 edition of Time magazine sets forth some very interesting and thought provoking theories expressed by a prominent psychoanalyst, Prof. Bruno Bettelheim, of the University of Chicago, regarding some of the underlying causes of the unrest which has featured college campus life all over the country in recent months.

The professor rather effectively debunks the arguments of the apologists for this type of behavior by our young people on the campuses and I believe his analysis of the situation makes a good deal more sense than most of the "gobbledy-gook" we have heard and read on the subject.

I include the article from Time magazine in the RECORD at this point:

YOUTH

CONFUSED PARENTS, CONFUSED KIDS

Psychoanalyst Bruno Bettelheim, 66, who is best known for his innovative studies of children's emotional development, has turned his protean mind to student radicals. He sees some in his private therapeutic practice, and observes others on the campus of the University of Chicago, where he teaches and directs the Sonia Shankman School for psychotic children. His considered conclusion is that American parents and American society have not given today's youth the emotional equipment for engaging in rational and constructive protest. In the September issue of the British magazine *Encounter*, Bettelheim spells out his ideas, which have been raising controversy at academic conferences and press conferences for the past six months. Among them:

"When I see some of these students—'unwashed' and 'unkempt'—I cannot help thinking: 'There goes another youngster who, as an infant, was practically scrubbed out of existence by his parents in the name of good hygiene and loving care.'"

"In most of the small group of leaders of the radical left, intellect was developed at much too early an age, and at the expense of their emotional development. Although exceedingly bright, some remained emotionally fixated at the age of the temper tantrum."

"The political content of student revolt is

most of all a desperate wish that the parent should have been strong in the convictions that motivate his actions. This is why so many of our radical students embrace Maoism, why they chant 'Ho Ho Ho Chi Minh' in their demonstrations. They chant of strong fathers with strong convictions."

"We should not overlook the symbolic meaning of the student invasions of the office of the president or dean. Big in size and age, those who sit in feel like little boys with a need to 'play big' by sitting in Papa's big chair."

SELF-HATE

Bettelheim devotes his most careful scrutiny to the activities of the most radical student leaders, and blames their shrillness on parents who raised them with half-baked psychoanalytic theories. "Psychoanalysis has certainly suggested that we should not suppress our inner rages but should face them," Bettelheim writes. "But we were only expected to face them in thought, and only in the safely structured treatment situation. This has been misapplied by large numbers of the educated middle classes to mean that aggression should always be expressed, and not just in thought. Accordingly, many children today do not learn to repress aggression enough."

Yet the same overpermissive parents more often than not make irrational demands for high marks in school and insist on superhygienic cleanliness so that their children reflect well on them in public. Such families, says Bettelheim, exploit their children to fulfill their own "narcissistic needs"; they choose to follow Freud where it suits their convenience, and are as demanding of conformity as "the worst Victorian parent" where it does not. For the children, Bettelheim says, the result has been a "senseless" uncertainty about their own identities that turns to self-hate and later to resentment of the world at large.

The claim by radicals that they act out of high motives, Bettelheim believes, and "their occasional on-target attack on real evils have misled many well-meaning people into overlooking their true motif: this is hate, not desire for a better world."

Bettelheim blames the malaise of the majority of student rebels on another oversimplified idea: the national insistence on putting high school graduates indiscriminately into the isolated academic atmosphere of traditional colleges and universities. Students feel "obsolete," he says, because "society keeps the next generation too long in a state of dependence, too long in terms of a sense of place that one has personally striven for and won. To be adolescent means that one has reached (and even passed) the age of puberty, but must nevertheless postpone full adulthood till long beyond what any other

period in history has ever considered reasonable. Students want, essentially, those group therapeutic experiences that will help them feel they have at long last come of age." Because providing those experiences is not the chief function of most educational institutions, "colleges must inevitably disappoint the students where their greatest need lies. Campus rebellion seems to offer youth a chance to short-cut the time of empty waiting and prove themselves real adults."

Bettelheim does not deny the existence of injustices within U.S. life. But he insists that the underlying causes of campus unrest lie as much in the way American children are raised and educated as in the Vietnamese war or widespread poverty. His advice is for universities to act like firm but understanding parents. While gladly adopting worthy suggestions, administrators should stop being so "anxious to look progressive" that they shrink from upholding the reasoned guidelines that students need to cope with their inner conflicts. For adolescents who lack a commitment to study and research, Bettelheim proposes a new educational system that will cater to the emotional needs of growing up. It would offer a variety of educational apprenticeships combining work and study, and would be ideal, Bettelheim feels, for the majority of American teen-agers.

1969 IS THE YEAR ONE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the August 1969 edition of *Industrial Research* magazine examines the present and future of our national space effort. Although I do not agree entirely with the comments in this editorial, there is much to be learned from the succinct statement of the benefits and values of our national space effort and what they portend for the future. The editorial follows:

1969 IS THE YEAR ONE

Now that man has landed on another world, scientists, journalists, and historians all will comment on the meaning, significance—and in some quarters—the waste and denial of humanity of the space effort.

It is true that the race to the moon began as a mere prestige gambit and that the Russians and Americans hurried their programs more for this reason than for any other. Yet,

the fact that the earth now possesses two spacefaring nations need not mean duplication of effort, but different space efforts as has been shown many times in the accomplishments of the two programs. Our accomplishment also means that the door now is open to cooperative programs to eliminate whatever duplication does exist.

As for waste, we suspect there has been far less waste in developing the all-new technologies required to get to the moon than is evident in other areas of large-scale government programs such as those often funded to decrease poverty, improve race relations, or achieve defense.

Had there been television and a global press during the time of Queen Isabella's decision to finance Columbus, surely an uproar would have been heard from the poor, the religiously persecuted, and the military for diverting gold toward such an admittedly speculative venture. A water route to the Indies might be useful, but is it worth the cost? What on earth are we going to do with another 15-million-square-mile continent? The problems at home require our utmost . . .

A maxim bears repeating here: those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it. The history of mankind has shown repeatedly that dramatic improvements in the lot of man are made not by incessant demonstrations, riots, or by diverting funds from other worthwhile efforts, but by implementing new ideas that can engender a renaissance.

July 20, 1969 will go down in history as the day that man matured, the beginning of a new era on more than one planet, the Year One B.E. (Beyond Earth) as Robert Heinlein suggested, the day that other worlds became attainable. What many of the well-meaning fighters against poverty, race hatred, and international tension don't realize is that the space age now truly before us can provide the stimulus and the goal to benefit their own programs in a much more positive manner than a mere divergence of government funds could achieve.

Rather than state all of these benefits here, we refer you to editor & publisher Neil Ruzic's book serialized in these pages five years ago, "The Case for Going to the Moon," which explained many of the technical and other benefits of space travel. He now has written another book to be published shortly. A "future history," it traces the first 75 years on the moon as though they already have occurred. Called "Where the Winds Are All Asleep," we quote from the last paragraph of the book. It is the year 2045:

"We arrive at the top of the story, of what it meant to colonize the moon. Here in the present day, we now have the perspective to accept ourselves as what we can become. Yes, evolution occurs only when necessary. Yes, man, monster of earth, king of the solar system, aspirant to heaven, has evolved as far as he ever will on earth. Yes, further progress, further extension into sentient intelligence will occur—they will in answer to man's need to survive. As for biological or social evolution beyond that, man retains a large part of his brain unused, unidentified for specific function, awaiting something. With that eternal capacity, he has other planets of other stars to explore: 135-billion of them in this galaxy alone."

As historians will view the development of human potentialities, the date July 20, 1969 will go down into history as the Year One.

DR. JOHN BARCLAY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a dear and wonderful friend marked his retirement

from the ministry this month and I would ask unanimous permission to pay him tribute by reprinting an article that appeared in the September 11, 1969, edition of the Austin American.

Dr. John Barclay's colorful career spanned 28 years in one church, the Central Christian Church in Austin. During that time, he was a comfort and a challenge for the people of Austin. His story is an inspiration for all. He is a tremendously warm leader and friend and minister who has the dedication and the courage to measure up to the requirements of a man of God. His story is as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Sept. 11, 1969]

DR. JOHN BARCLAY RETIRES SUNDAY WITH
FINAL SERMON
(By Phil Skoda)

Dr. John Barclay will mark his 28th year as pastor of the Central Christian Church in Austin Sunday, when he preaches his final sermon before retiring.

His first sermon at the church was given Sunday, Sept. 14, 1941, just one week after he married the former Mattie Belle Stewart of Battleboro, N.C., and moved to Austin.

A dinner will be held in Dr. Barclay's honor at the Terrace Convention Center Friday evening, and a reception has been planned at the church for Sunday from 4 to 7 p.m.

Dr. Barclay reminisced about his 55 years in the ministry, which began when he was a sophomore at Transylvania College in Millville, Ky., in Sept. 1914.

It was common in those days, he related, for young theological students to support themselves in school by pastoring small country churches in the area surrounding their school.

John Barclay went to France in 1917 as an officer in the U.S. Army. He attained the rank of captain in an infantry division. The experience, he says, sharpened his sense of humor and deepened his appreciation of his fellow man.

Returning to his education in 1919, Barclay received his bachelor of arts degree in 1920 from Transylvania College, his bachelor of divinity degree in 1922 from College of the Bible in Lexington, and his master of arts degree from Columbia University in 1924.

The same year, he began a 17-year ministry at the First Christian Church in Wilson, N.C. That pastorate ended in 1941 when he came to the Central Christian Church in Austin.

During the years he has been in Austin, John Barclay has been singled out for honor on many occasions. He has received honorary doctorate degrees from Transylvania College and from Texas Christian University in Fort Worth.

He has served as president of the Austin Council of Churches, was chairman of the board of trustees of Brackenridge Hospital for 10 years, and in 1960 was selected to represent all Protestant churches in the United States when he gave an inaugural prayer at the swearing-in ceremony of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson as President and Vice-President.

Dr. Barclay's interest in both world and church affairs is reflected in his upstairs office at the Central Christian Church. Complete bound editions of Foreign Affairs Magazine line one wall, dating back to 1945, and another wall contains all the bound editions of the World Council of Churches Quarterly since 1948.

Also crowded into his small, wood-paneled office are numerous mementos of his interest in sports. A newspaper clipping from 1922 attests that John Barclay coached the Lexington High School basketball team to the National High School Basketball Championship.

He says that in 28 seasons of University of

Texas football, he has missed only one home game.

Dr. Barclay and his wife "B" plan a month-long trip to Europe in October, but Dr. Barclay says he plans to remain active in church activities.

"I'm feeling good and there's no reason for me to stop," he said, explaining his plans to accept interim pastorate assignments following his return from Europe.

Dr. Barclay will be replaced at Central Christian by Dr. Mark Randle, who comes to Austin from Springfield, Mo. Dr. Randle is a native Texan, born in Lockhart.

Summing up his feelings on 55 years as a minister, Dr. Barclay said, "the rewarding thing is that you deal with people during their great moments and also during their tragic moments."

TO PUSH HOUSING

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the cutbacks in Federal construction ordered by the President have drawn shortsighted criticism from some of those whose own narrow spheres conceivably will be affected.

However, there is little doubt that the President's actions will provide another much-needed brake on inflation and at the same time will spur construction of private housing which increasingly is in short supply.

An editorial from the Baltimore Sun of September 6, 1969, clearly defines the areas to be most affected by these cutbacks, and the distinct advantages to be gained. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

TO PUSH HOUSING

The Nixon construction cutback keys into the earlier administration plan to ease private credit by paying down on the national debt. Both aim at stimulating private housing for which the national goal is 26 million new houses in the next 10 years. High credit and construction costs are slowing the program.

A major reason for credit stringency is that the biggest debtor of all—the government—can outbid private credit-seekers. Right now public building (federal, state and local) accounts for one-third of all construction expenditure—again in direct competition with home builders. Reduce federal borrowing and cut 75 per cent of federal construction demand and you obviously ease credit and prices for householders.

Now add the 75 per cent cut in federal grants-in-aid to state and local construction which Mr. Nixon apparently will order if the states and local governments don't. Add the cuts among all-state financed and all-local projects which a decent respect for presidential precept may stimulate. The effect could approach a three-quarter reduction in a third of construction demand. Add, finally, the business cutbacks which Mr. Nixon did not forget to urge, and the net effect would be counter-inflationary.

One of the things the President and his advisers have in mind is, of course, contract construction wages. These have been rising at the rate of some 6 per cent a year—average hourly earnings were \$2.93 in 1959 and \$4.73 in July, 1969. Construction union leaders warn that the cutbacks Mr. Nixon proposes would narrow job opportunities for the black workingmen whom federal policymakers want to see employed. But adminis-

tration figures suggest there will be jobs for all available workers at reasonable wages and surely the 25 per cent of federal projects to be continued will reflect concern for blacks.

The withdrawal of 75 per cent of federal demand on short building materials and labor coincides with a new private-industry program led by Roger Blough for firmer management response to construction wage proposals. Here, too, the federal suspensions may well alter the bargaining terrain. All in all, one gets the impression of cool economic strategy deployed through familiar market processes in behalf of housing and against inflation—all without jawbone or other kinds of drama.

CAPITULATE—OR CONTINUE THE QUEST

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, since the triumph of Apollo 11 last summer, culminating this Nation's 10-year effort to land men on the moon, a great national debate has begun to emerge.

One can now begin to see the lines being drawn between those who favor continuing an active role in the exploration of space and those who propose to lower space exploration among our national priorities.

The New Orleans Times Picayune recently published an editorial providing a timely and informative analysis of this issue and making what I consider to be some very persuasive points.

I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD and commending it to the attention of my colleagues:

CAPITULATE—OR CONTINUE THE QUEST

Dean Rusk's publicized letter to a one time member of the Aeronautics and Space Council suggesting that the country drop plans for any early manned space ship visit to Mars, leaving them to another generation, has posed a proposition that will provoke hot argument and, finally a hard decision by the Nixon administration.

His view is that the Mars program would be more burdensome than the nation can well stand at this time and that for a generation most of the money that would be devoted to outer space, he thinks, should be handed to NASA and other agencies for the betterment of air travel, the fight on pollution, and the improvement of man's lot on our own planet. He wants space activities held largely to an instrumental basis with international collaboration.

The former secretary of state has a strong case.

If, however, we increased the NASA appropriation to \$6 billion a year for, say, 10 years, we might be ready for the Mars voyage in 1981 for a total of about \$52 billion. And there would be other space investigation costs of several billion dollars during the interval.

Tentatively, that seems to be the rough estimate of the head of the space administration. Some less conservative expert opinion argues the cost would be greater. The country faces financial strain without the Mars program. Military expenses, the prospective ABM defense, welfare and city modernization requirements are clues.

But whether all this outweighs the uplift of national spirit, the buoying effect of great exploration and discovery, and the sense of reward for achievement, cannot be lightly

resolved. Maybe we should realize that the country is always going to have its "problems;" that modernization, renewal and reform, will continually press; that the demands of welfare and assistance for the poor will persist; that political expediency or popular neglect will not fail to create one mess or another to be cleaned up at great expense.

But shall we allow these ills of more or less chronic character, and a part of the routine of national existence, to bar the nation from discovery, from pushing into the unknown, from expanding the knowledge of and refining the concept of space geography? Shouldn't it be our policy to take our chronic problems in a stride—by more work, the application of intelligence and foresight—leaving enough surplus of resources to accomplish the exceptional which history seems to note as a mark of a great nation?

President Nixon and Congress will say how fast and far the United States will go with the Mars exploration over a given period. They should not overstrain the economy—"bite off more than we can chew." But we should be surprised if they capitulate to the notion that the program must be wholly shelved for a generation. That would be taken as a sign that the richest nation on earth is losing its vigor and its vision; that it has become so embroiled and hog-tied by contemporary problems of living and government that it cannot continue to assert its leadership in the quest of significant knowledge of the planetary system and answers to secrets of outer space.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS SABOTAGING CALIFORNIA'S ECONOMIC FUTURE

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's announced 75-percent cutback in federally subsidized construction has shocked many Californians because such a cutback will undermine the economic health and welfare of the Nation's most populous State.

The Sacramento Bee sums up the impact of the announced cutback in an editorial dated September 10. I am inserting the editorial at this point in the RECORD to share this information with my colleagues:

NIXON CUTBACK WOULD HIT BASIS OF PROSPERITY, SAFETY OF CALIFORNIA

The magazine, US News and World Report of Washington, D.C., hardly had hit the newsstand with rosy predictions for the economy of the West when President Richard Nixon acted to undermine the economy.

His sabotage of this area's economic future took the form of an announced 75 per cent cutback in federally subsidized construction. Only last June Ward C. Krebs, Wells Fargo Bank official, said gains in California's economy exceeded the most optimistic forecasts.

Much of this state's boisterous economic health is based upon federally subsidized water projects—such as the great Central Valleys Project and the others built in more recent years.

Now Nixon, in his misguided, ill-informed program to check inflation, kicks at the props of the economies of all the states of the West and Southwest as well as those of the Southeast.

Even United States Sen. George Murphy,

senior senator from California and a conservative Republican, said immediately after the Nixon announcement California has vitally needed water reclamation and flood control projects which may fall victim to the Nixon policy.

These federally subsidized water projects, which are self amortizing, make California the single greatest breadbasket in the United States; their construction gives employment; they save huge amounts of wealth. In one year the Army Corps of Engineers estimated flood control works prevented \$1.5 billion of loss; this state's future prosperity is predicated upon completing the water systems.

Almost all the California's congressional delegation is opposed to holding up these water projects.

Nixon's whole approach to the inflation problem is cockeyed. Year after year the leaders and people say: "If only the nation could get full production. If only the unemployment problem would disappear." Then when the nation gets close to both objectives comes the piercing cry: "The economy must be cooled, it must be slowed down."

Prosperity does not come from nonproduction or unemployment. If Nixon is serious about wanting a constructive solution to inflation, let him attack monopoly, the administered price area, and restore true competition which would so enlarge the store of goods that prices would have to fall to clear the shelves.

Only disaster can result from stemming inflation with the disaster of a crippled economy.

PROTEST AGAINST THE TREATMENT BY NORTH VIETNAM OF POW'S

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with the Honorable WILLIAM L. DICKINSON and other Members of the House of Representatives in cosponsoring a concurrent resolution to protest North Vietnam's disregard for the provisions of the Geneva Convention and their refusal to release the names of prisoners of war, to permit the regular flow of mail to or from those prisoners, to accord humane treatment to those prisoners, and to permit inspection of the facilities in which those prisoners are held.

There are approximately 1,400 missing or captured servicemen in the Vietnam war. Their wives and families are living in constant worry. Lieutenant Alvarez will be a prisoner 5 years in August. The only child of Mr. and Mrs. William F. Mullen, of Brockton, Mass., Maj. William F. Mullen, Jr., USMC, has been missing in action since April 1966. Major Mullen's parents have written me:

We the families of these men are deeply concerned for all of them. We are hopeful that North Vietnam will respond to world opinion protesting the inhumane treatment of these Americans, and that most cherished hope of all, that they will be released.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish at this time to register my strong protest against the Mao Chinese Government's failure to release information on all American prisoners of war. Mrs. Maureen Dunn, of

Randolph, Mass., has been conducting a nationwide campaign focusing on the plight of her husband, Navy Lt. Joseph P. Dunn, who was shot down over the South China Sea in February 1968. That the families of these missing men in action should live in uncertainty is cruel and inhuman.

America will not forget these courageous men. The Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird, has promised that the bulk of American forces in Vietnam will not be withdrawn until the prisoner-of-war question is resolved. Our representatives at the Paris peace talks have demanded satisfactory answers to the POW question. I am hopeful that this resolution will mobilize public opinion against the uncivilized and inhuman treatment of American prisoners of war in Communist prison camps.

DDT: THE UBIQUITOUS POISON

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there are many examples of how our good intentions of the past have been turned into urgent dangers of the present. No example is more poignant than that of DDT. As time goes on, we find increasing evidence of how our attempts to eliminate one environmental hazard have simply created another—perhaps more serious—threat to our environment. A recent article in the Chicago Sun-Times pointed out the problem as it relates to one particular species, the coho salmon.

The high and rising level of DDT in coho salmon should underline for us in Congress the need for action to limit the sale and use of this deadly pesticide. Recently my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I introduced a bill to do precisely that. The bill is H.R. 13340. I commend the following article to my colleagues' attention. I believe it demonstrates indisputably the need for H.R. 13340.

The article referred to follows:

NOW IS THE SEASON TO CATCH COHO—AND LOTS OF DDT

(By Jerry DeMuth)

As fishermen travel to Michigan in the following weeks to catch coho salmon in the streams bordering Lake Michigan, they will be catching the fish as the salmon approach the period when the DDT level in their flesh is at it highest.

"Unfortunately the fishing season coincides with the high pesticide residue level for these fish," said Dr. Norman Leeling, of the department of entomology at Michigan State University in East Lansing.

September and October bring the highest DDT levels, he said.

"When the fish spawn they come up these selected streams and that's when fishermen come out to catch them," explained Leeling, who has been studying DDT residues in coho.

As the fish swim up these streams they eat little. Instead of metabolizing the fat which contains high DDT residues, the residues are absorbed in the fish's flesh, he said.

Although coho flesh normally contains 3 to 7 parts per million of DDT except prior to spawning, coho fat contains 40 to 90 parts

per million of DDT, according to Dr. Robert Reinert of the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in Ann Arbor.

Leeling said that last year coho averaged 15 parts per million of DDT in their flesh during the spawning period.

"We think it will be the same this year," he said.

Last April the Federal Food and Drug Administration recommended that fish containing 5 parts or more per million of DDT be impounded if shipped between states. The recommendation was made after the FDA seized 22,555 pounds of coho which contained 9 to 22 parts per million of DDT.

To remove the fat which contains the highest concentrations of DDT, coho fishermen must cut off the belly fat well above where the dull, yellowish fat begin to merge with the pinkish flesh. Then similar fatty areas that run along the sides of the fish and across the back must also be cut away.

"These fatty areas (dorsal and lateral) would not normally be removed when cleaning the fish," Leeling said. "The strips of fat along the sides and the dorsal portion have to be specially cut out."

But Reinert warned that there are thin lines of fat running through coho which cannot be removed.

"In perch there is no fat and the only oil which contains the DDT residues is in the viscera, which you clean out of the fish," he explained. "But in coho and other fatty fish and the oil is in the flesh and so you can't get rid of all the DDT."

"The amount of pesticides in Lake Michigan is high, higher than it is in any of the other Great Lakes, and it is likely to remain high for many years," said Dr. Howard Tanner, director of the department of natural resources at Michigan State University who originally conceived the idea of planting coho in Lake Michigan.

Reinert said his studies have shown difference in pesticide levels in different parts of Lake Michigan.

"Fish from the southern part of the lake have more pesticide residues than those from the northern part of the lake," he commented.

"We're concerned about what effect DDT can have on reproduction," Reinert added. "The DDT levels in coho eggs we've found is close to the levels which in laboratory experiments have affected reproduction."

Dr. Howard Johnson of Michigan State University's department of fisheries and wild life, said that "DDT is the most probable cause of mortality among young salmon. There is a relation between excessive mortality in Michigan hatcheries and DDT levels."

However, none of the scientists was involved in research to determine what effect DDT has on man. No one knows for sure.

"It looks like the half-life of DDT is around 14 or 15 years in the Lake Michigan environment," Tanner said. "So we're talking about a long period of time before present pesticide levels go down."

"I see no real reason then to be optimistic about a rapid decline in this amount, even if we were to stop using DDT today. Of course, this is what we must do—stop using it."

AIRLINE STANDBY DISCOUNTS FARES

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, all around the Nation there has been considerable comment on the subject of airline discount fares. This has been especially noticeable since the January recommen-

dation of Civil Aeronautics Board examiner, Arthur S. Present, that they be discontinued. I, myself, have introduced two bills on the subject—one last session and one this.

Much to my satisfaction, I recently learned of the August 25 decision of the CAB which disagreed with the examiner's recommendation and ruled that these airline discount fares do not discriminate unjustly against adults. However, we can only pause briefly in our struggle to assure retention of these fares; for, as the CAB said themselves, they expect further hearings to develop "a thorough consideration" of promotional fares.

Today I introduce a bill whose passage will solve the problem once and for all; and end the speculation over the legality of these valuable discounts. The bill serves a twofold purpose. It provides an authorization, through law, for reduced-rate transportation. This has been a part of previous suggested legislation; and I feel that it is just as important as ever before to establish that it was not the intent of Congress in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to prohibit the existing practices of authorizing standby discount fares in periods of off-peak travel.

The benefits to young people in general, and students in particular, have been tremendous. New vistas, through the experiences of travel, have been opened to the young. Most importantly, reduced rates have been significant in overcoming the often insurmountable obstacle of distance; and have therefore been a deciding factor in making it possible for many students to attend the colleges of their choice.

This increase in student air travel has not been at anyone else's expense. The airlines, too, have benefited. They are one of youth fare's greatest advocates. The standby passengers fill seats that otherwise would go empty; and with the onset of the new, jumbo jet service, there will be even more seats to fill. As the Wall Street Journal reported, youth fares:

"Have introduced air transportation to a large segment of the public that wouldn't otherwise have been able to afford to travel by air," according to leading proponent American Airlines.

By extending these discount benefits to senior citizens, as my bill would do, we are able to serve older Americans in a similar way. The situation with our senior citizens is much the same as with the young.

Elderly people, too, are at a period of reduced earning capacity. Most are probably retired and they have much more leisure time. Yet, living on a fixed income they can seldom afford air travel. Reduced rates for citizens in their later years would enable them to travel the great distances by which our modern and mobile society may have separated them from their children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I stated that my bill has a twofold purpose; and now I wish to speak to that second purpose, the new thrust of the legislation I introduce today.

There is a significant segment of this society which suffers from a very grave problem about which we seldom hear

very much. It is exemplified by a case recently brought to my attention. It concerns a little 3-year-old girl named Lora Mae. In the darkness before dawn each Tuesday morning Lora Mae's mother awakens her for a weekly 800-mile round trip by bus for treatment at the famous St. Jude Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, Tenn. Until a cure is found for her presently incurable disease, this will be Lora Mae's life. Think how much easier it would be if she could spend 2 hours flying, versus 20 hours in a bus.

I see no reason why such people, along with the young, the military, and the elderly, cannot be served in their air travel needs. My bill provides that:

Any air carrier or foreign air carrier, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, may grant reduced-rate transportation on a space-available basis to any person certified by a qualified physician to be suffering from a catastrophic disease requiring such person to perform regular and frequent travel to receive treatment not available at his place of residence. Transportation also may be furnished under this paragraph to an attendant accompanying any person referred to in the preceding sentence when the physician concerned certifies that such a person should be accompanied by an attendant. Transportation furnished under this paragraph shall be on a first-priority basis and shall be furnished only for the purpose of permitting travel to the place of treatment or return therefrom.

The problems of these citizens are particularly acute and passage of this bill could go a long way toward solving them. I urge my colleagues to give this bill their full attention.

NIXON GAINS IN PUBLIC FAVOR

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's leadership is making itself felt throughout the Nation, as people realize the significant achievements which have come about, without fanfare, in recent weeks. In both domestic and foreign fields, the President has moved forward with bold, innovative programs.

As an editorial in the San Diego Union of September 8 points out, these strides have purposely been taken in an atmosphere of "gradualism," to avoid unfulfilled promises and consequent frustrations. I insert this editorial in the RECORD.

NIXON GAINS IN PUBLIC FAVOR

President Nixon returns to his desk in Washington today in an unmistakably strong position for a season of major decisions in Congress on key national issues.

Both the President and Congress were absent from Washington during most of August. The lull in activity in the capital has given both friend and foe a chance to assess Mr. Nixon's position on domestic and international issues and his role as a leader.

Despite the handicap of Republican minorities in both the House and Senate, the President has shown that he can seize and exercise leadership on issues that weigh heavily on this fall's legislative calendar—and on the 1970 congressional elections, too.

Republicans and Democrats alike credit Mr. Nixon's personal arguments as being

decisive in obtaining a 51-49 Senate victory for the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile system. It was a prodigious accomplishment, considering that the original line-up of senators was reported as 46-24 against the ABM, with 30 votes undecided.

The President's bold proposals to restructure welfare programs as a human improvement plan has caught the imagination of the nation.

Gallup polls have shown support running at more than 60 per cent in favor of the new approach to welfare—an equal margin of support for Mr. Nixon's policies toward the vexing problem of Vietnam. The new foreign policy guidelines for Asia, and the hope for better relations with eastern Europe, also have struck popular chords.

With the appointment of Chief Justice Burger and the nomination of Clement F. Haynsworth to the Supreme Court, the President has responded to widespread concern over the direction taken by the court in recent decisions affecting the maintenance of law and order.

He has moved decisively and with deliberation to use the hand of government in efforts to stem inflation, and economists are cautiously optimistic that inflation can be stopped without severe dislocation in the economy.

Washington columnists are beginning to apply the term "gradualism" to the Nixon approach.

Call it what they will, it is in marked contrast to the crisis atmosphere that emanated from the White House in recent years. Mr. Nixon has steered clear of over-advertised federal programs that inflate hopes and lead to inevitable frustration.

Gradualism, if that is a correct description, may well be what the people of the United States of America have wanted all along. The Republicans may be in a minority on Capitol Hill, but there is ample evidence that a majority of Americans are behind the Republican in the White House.

TETONS

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, every weekend finds Americans jamming our Nation's highways and transportation facilities in an attempt to get away from it all. The fact is that they seldom really get away. No matter where they go, they find themselves jammed together whether it be a traffic pileup on some freeway or 400,000 youths at a rock festival.

Yet there is an increasing urge and need for solitude—for a period when a person or family can be alone to reflect—to escape the pressures of our urbanized existence.

Fortunately, my district, the great State of Wyoming, is an area that has escaped many of the pressures that plague our citizens in more urbanized areas.

There is no area more beautiful or conducive to inspiration in Wyoming than the Grand Teton area.

I include an article by Ellen Siegelman, which appeared in a recent issue of *Contrails*, in the RECORD. I would also issue the invitation to everyone who would flee the crush of our cities, to come visit Wyoming and the Tetons.

The article follows:

TETONS

(By Ellen Siegelman)

(The Grand Tetons are filled with a wide range of activities. Skiers can enjoy the longest single vertical drop of any ski area on the continent. Horseback riding opportunities are among the finest in the world. Wherever you turn you'll find a great picture-taking vista.)

Among the most spellbinding of all U.S. mountains is Wyoming's Teton range. Thrusting upward above smaller, pine-covered hills for a total length of forty miles, the Tetons are a range of ruggedly gorgeous block-fault peaks, product of a gigantic upthrust millions of years in the making. Unlike most U.S. mountains, the Tetons are a special alpine type: isolated craggy peaks with sharply dropping, often concave, sides.

In Grand Teton National Park—which includes most of the Teton Range and the valley called Jackson Hole, mountain and valley form a uniquely majestic landscape. There are first, the gigantic peaks themselves. Eleven of them are considered major peaks, and the tallest—the Grand Teton—rises more than 13,000 feet above sea level. The Park also has 8 large lakes, 12 glaciers, a number of small glacial cirques or hollows, and a wide variety of canyons ranging from small gulches to huge bowls.

Not only are the mountains spectacularly different from most peaks in this country, but the atmosphere they engender is also quite special. For in this national park you get a sense of solitude that is often hard to come by in other public forests. The thousands of visitors who come every year appear to be absorbed effortlessly in the vast scene. So even in August, when visitors are lined up bumper-to-bumper in Yellowstone, waiting to catch a glimpse of Old Faithful's thermodynamic highjinks, if you travel a scant 80 miles southwest from Yellowstone, you can find utter tranquility in the Tetons. Take a small boat across Jenny Lake, take the short, secluded trail to Hidden Falls, and breathe deeply. You are light-years away from civilization.

The park seems to be dedicated to the proposition that everyone has his own special way of appreciating mountains. The activist can seek to conquer them by climbing. Climbers must go in groups, never alone. The great thrill is in scaling the major peaks of the range—the Grand Teton, or Mount Owen or Mount Moran. The party sets out with a guide and full alpine equipment—ice axes, ropes and climbing shoes—starting in the afternoon; bivouacs overnight in the saddle of the mountain; and completes the ascent around dawn.

The less determined exercise seeker may want to meander somewhat less strenuously along mountain trails—either on foot or on packhorse. A particularly appealing trip is the three and a half hour breakfast ride originating from Colter Bay and Jackson Lake Lodge during the summer. The trip follows foothill trails in the Tetons to a clearing where bacon and eggs are prepared and eaten in the tangy mountain air. The cost of this bit of equestrian delight is six dollars.

You can also wander briskly or lingeringly through more than 200 miles on marked Teton trails. All wide and smooth, some beckon toward the high passes while others wind gently through the valley.

The pure contemplative (or lazy) type can have his mountaineering made even easier. He can take the absolutely unforgettable float trip on a large raft down the Snake River. Picture yourself for a bit on such a raft: you drift and dream as the mountains slide by. If you are observant you will perhaps see a marmot on the barren rocks, or beavers building their dams along the river, making deep pools for the rainbow trout. If you're here at dawn you may be rewarded by the sight of the rare trumpeter swan or the courtship dance of the sage grouse. Birds

abound—more than 200 species. Because the Park is a wildlife sanctuary, you may catch glimpses of elk, deer, bison, and moose. The six-hour float trip costs twelve dollars, including lunch, and will be recollected happily.

These are all rural pleasures; but the Tetons also has something for the urbanite who gets nervous on a steady diet of huge vistas and open spaces. The town of Jackson, accordingly, has all sorts of citified pleasures to offer: a big main street with western stores open late at night; rodeos; a children's zoo a museum and four art galleries; the Jackson Hole Fine Arts Festival; two movie theaters and such local color items as old-time melodramas at the Pink Garter theater, and a public pageant every evening featuring the "hanging" of a local desperado. Thus the town recalls its old days, back in the era when fur trapper Davey Jackson named the Valley and when, until the demand for beaver hats declined in the mid-fifties, it was a bustling trapping and trading post.

Again the infinite variety of the Teton area can be seen in the seasonal pursuits possible here. The summer sports—climbing, hiking, riding, bird-watching, fishing are best known. But fall brings the big game hunters out in force. Some 80 outfitters set up camps in the valley each fall and offer tents, meals, horses, guides, and equipment.

And in the winter, the air is alive with the sound of skiers. The Teton Village Corporation has set up a group of richly rustic resort hotels (first rate food, bar, gift shop, heated pool) that cluster in an alp-like community at the foot of an aerial tramway. At the end of its 2½ mile ascent, the longest and highest in America, the view and the skiing are breathtaking. Boasting the largest expanse of skiable terrain on one mountain anywhere in the country, it is comparable to the finest European resorts in excitement of runs and luxuriousness of accommodations.

So whether you like to contemplate mountains or to conquer them, from above or from below, in summer or in winter, in solitude or in company—whatever your pleasure, you'll find it in the Tetons.

HOLIDAY MOBS RUIN BEAUTY OF YOSEMITE, OTHER PARKS

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during the August congressional recess I had an opportunity to visit—with my wife, Lindy, and my grandson, Thomas Hale Boggs III—several of this Nation's great national parks.

The three of us visited Yellowstone National Park, Yosemite National Park, and the Redwood National Forest in California, and it can be said, without exaggeration, that each visit was an almost spiritual experience. There are few words to describe the grandeur and majestic beauty of this great Nation of ours.

I might add, however, that the Boggs' were not always alone in these wonderful parks. We were joined by thousands and thousands of our fellow Americans who, like ourselves, enjoy nature.

In the past, Congress has shown great foresight and wisdom in preserving large tracts of wilderness for enjoyment of our people.

I submit to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that to show less wisdom, less vision, than our predecessors in this vital area would be a major failure in our responsibility to the present and future generations of Americans.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Arizona Republic of September 1, 1969, and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

HOLIDAY MOBS RUIN BEAUTY OF YOSEMITE, OTHER PARKS

YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.—They came in cars and trucks, in buses and campers and trailers, lumbering through the foothills of the Sierra Nevadas, toward a Labor Day weekend away from the agonies of city life.

But by Thursday evening they read this sign at the park entrance: "All campsites are full."

That warning has been sounded with increasing frequency this year, not only at the national parks and forests but at thousands of other recreation areas across the country.

Facilities are staggering under a crush of humanity. Attendance at national parks has been rising at least 7 per cent a year.

One study indicates that even if population growth were discounted, four times as many people are visiting the parks today than 20 years ago.

Park officials agree the figures add up to a major crisis. As Ernst W. Swanson, a professor emeritus of economics at North Carolina State, said in a recent study:

"While we may grant that all Americans should have an opportunity to enjoy the many wonders our natural, historical and cultural assets hold for us, the most pertinent question ensues—can we afford a burden of visits so immense as to threaten the existence of our parks?"

The outlook for the future is bleak.

"Yosemite will still be the same size 50 years from now," said Bryan Harry, the park's chief naturalist. "We can't make it any bigger or build another one."

"The population is not only growing, it is becoming more affluent and more mobile, and this land will become even more precious as other wild places continue to shrink."

"We have to find a way to cope with this problem, and we are open to suggestions."

The roots of the problem are fairly obvious. Affluence has spawned a whole new industry—the camping unit mounted on the back of a pickup truck—and the wilderness is now accessible to people who still like running water and soft beds.

In lodges and cabins run by concessionaires, accommodations with baths and stoves are far more popular than rudimentary units.

Vacations are longer, and new superhighways enable travelers to reach almost any park in the country within a few days.

The growing congestion and lack of green space in urban areas is driving more people out in search of nature. But they wind up creating what they are trying to escape.

Yosemite, only a day's drive from San Francisco and Los Angeles, is generally considered the most overcrowded park.

Congestion reaches its peak on major holidays, and this Labor Day weekend was no exception.

The constant roar in the background was not a waterfall, but traffic. Transistor radios blared forth the latest rock tunes. Parking was at a premium. Dozens of children clamored over the rocks at the base of Yosemite Falls.

Campsites, pounded into dust by incessant use, were more crowded than Watts. Even in remote areas, campers were seldom out of sight of one another.

The whole experience was something like visiting Disneyland on a Sunday.

"People who used to come to Yosemite for the beauty and the serenity stay away," com-

plained Harry. "Those who come now don't mind the crowds. In fact, they like them."

"They are sightseers, and they come for the action. They don't come for what Yosemite really has to offer."

If Yosemite no longer appeals to the pursuit, it has become a "people's park," an enjoyable place for the average family to spend a few days.

"It's so quiet," said one young couple from Oakland as they stood in a crowd at Yosemite Falls. "At least it's quieter than the city."

Gary Yaeck of Bakersfield added: "It sure beats concrete and asphalt. My son caught three fish this morning. That's a pretty big thrill."

MANPOWER TRAINING PROPOSALS EXPLAINED

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a number of groups concerned about employment and education problems have commented on the technical complexity of comprehensive manpower proposals. Even with a scorecard, it is sometimes difficult to tell the players.

Last week the chamber of commerce performed a valuable public service for all of us when their legislative department published a balanced and straightforward account of the three comprehensive manpower bills which have been proposed during this session. With unusual objectivity and remarkable clarity, the chamber has pinpointed the fundamental questions which must be resolved if we are to develop a successful national manpower policy, and has outlined the legislative alternatives currently proposed to come to grips with those questions.

I would therefore like to include as a part of my remarks the article entitled "Federal Manpower Training Programs" which appeared in the September 12, 1969, chamber of commerce publication, Here's the Issue:

FEDERAL MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

(NOTE.—Few people are satisfied with the results being obtained from a multitude of manpower training programs. Congress is considering proposals for a major overhaul.)

The need for achieving increased efficiency and effectiveness in Federal job training programs is generally recognized, both by members of Congress and by the public.

Three major proposals to make substantial changes in the manpower training field are now pending in Congress.

Some of the drive behind all of these measures, of course, is traceable to the fact that large—and increasing—sums are involved.

In his Special Manpower Message, President Nixon said the Federal Government is now spending about \$3 billion a year in a wide variety of manpower programs, with about half of that amount directly devoted to job training. Private enterprise, he noted, is spending much more.

The attention now being paid to the whole manpower training effort, however, would seem to be motivated by more than concern over dollar costs—as large as they presently are. It is to be found, rather, in a belief that a lack of job skills which results in unemployment or underemployment is a root cause of many other disturbing social problems.

Effective manpower training can play a

key role in our attempts to alleviate these problems.

President Nixon put it this way:

Manpower training is central to our commitment to aid the disadvantaged and to help people off welfare rolls and onto payrolls. Intelligently organized, it will save tax dollars now spent on welfare, increase revenues by widening the base of the taxpaying public—and most important—lift human beings into lives of greater dignity. . . .

But the Government's investment has failed to achieve its potential for many reasons, including duplication of effort, inflexible funding arrangements and an endless ribbon of red tape.

He cited some specific examples of failures:

A big-city Mayor takes the lead in trying to put together a cohesive manpower program for the entire labor market area—tying together jobless workers in the inner city with job openings outside the "beltway". He finds it difficult to assemble a coherent picture of what's going on. Manpower programs, funded by different agencies, follow different reporting rules, so that the statistics cannot be added up. Moreover, there is no single agency which maintains an inventory of all currently operating manpower programs. He knows that help is available—but where does he turn?

A jobless man goes to the local skill training center to seek help. He has the aptitude for training in blue collar mechanical work, but no suitable training opportunities are available. At the same time, vacancies exist in a white collar New Careers project and in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. But the resources of these programs cannot be turned over to the training program that has the most local demand.

A 17-year-old boy wants to take job training. The only manpower program available to him is the Job Corps, but its nearest camp is hundreds of miles away. With no other choice, he leaves home; within 30 days he had become homesick or feels his family needs him; he drops out of the Corps and has suffered "failure" which reinforces his self-image of defeat.

An unemployed high school drop-out in a small town wants to learn a trade in the electronics field. His local employment office tells him that there is not enough demand in his town for qualified technicians to warrant setting up a special training class in a local public school. He is also told that "administrative procedures" do not lend themselves to the use of a local private technical institute which offers the very course he wants. This youngster walks the streets and wonders what happened to all those promises of "equal opportunity."

Analysis of these failures in terms of individual application reveals a common denominator—lack of flexibility. There are apparently too many programs operating under too many different authorities within too rigidly defined boundaries.

HOW THE PROBLEM DEVELOPED

A quick review helps explain how this problem developed—and helps one evaluate the proposals for dealing with it.

The Federal Government entered the field of vocational training for the civilian population in 1917. Basically, this program provided grants to the States for vocational education in public schools and other institutions below the college level. Grants were available to all States and were designed to help the States offer vocational education courses in the high schools to adolescents and in night or special schools for adults. The State programs were open to the entire school population.

A new direction was introduced in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA). The announced purpose of

this Act was to provide programs that would retrain workers whose skills had been made obsolete by technological and structural changes in the economy and to prepare the vast numbers of young people about to enter the work force—products of the post-World War II baby boom—for jobs.

The Act directed the Secretary to provide for the testing, counseling, and training of unemployed or underemployed workers, including youth 16-21, and workers from farm families with less than \$1,200 annual family income.

For the first time, too, the Secretary of Labor was directed to assess the labor needs of the economy and to train workers in types of jobs that were—and would be—most needed.

MDTA programs are still a major part of the manpower training activity, but they have been augmented by one program after another aimed at specific groups.

There are, for example, a number of Federal programs designed to provide jobs and training for youths and adults in the public sector. The New Careers program opens sub-professional jobs through on-the-job training in the fields of health, recreation, and community services. The Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school and summer programs provide part-time work opportunities for disadvantaged youths, thereby enabling them to continue their education.

The Concentrated Employment program is designed to serve pockets of high unemployment in rural and urban areas. The Work Incentive Program is designed to provide job training to potential workers now dependent upon public assistance.

In the past few years, increased emphasis has been placed on the role of private business.

Private businesses contribute through:

(1), the National Alliance of Business, which was created in 1963 to develop 500,000 jobs for the hard-core unemployed in the 50 largest U.S. cities by June 30, 1971, through the Job Opportunity in the Business Sector (JOBS) program which reimburses the employer for expenses incurred in hiring and training the disadvantaged;

(2), the Special Impact program which provides monetary incentives to industry for locating new facilities in economically depressed areas and for hiring and training the disadvantaged; and

(3), the on-the-job training program under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

One difficulty, of course, in any evaluation or discussion of "manpower training" is that, as the President pointed out, it is "one of those phrases with a fine ring and an imprecise meaning." Where does "manpower training" stop and "education" start, for example? How is it related to such things as the Federal-State Employment Service, assistance to public and college libraries, adult basic education, educational research and development and many other Federal programs?

Differences of definition help explain the difficulty in reaching any kind of an agreement on the number of Federal manpower programs now existing. One authority, Rep. William Roth (R-Del.), following an eight months study of Federal assistance programs, reported to the House that he had discovered "at least 69 manpower training and vocational education programs."

In his Special Message, the President said that manpower training should be applied to programs that:

make it possible for those who are unemployed or on the fringes of the labor force to become permanent, full-time workers;

give those who are now employed at low income the training and opportunity they need to become more productive and more successful;

are designed to discover the potential in those people who are now considered unem-

ployable and to remove many of the barriers now blocking their way.

The President declared:

The various services people need are afforded in laws already on the books. The need today is to knit together all the appropriate services in one readily available system.

In reading this sentence it is easy to place the emphasis on the need for "knitting together all the appropriate services in one."

In fact, the achievement of a "readily available system" is probably the more challenging part of the task. Certainly, it seems to be the most difficult.

THREE MAJOR PROPOSALS

Some start toward the "knitting together" was achieved in the March reorganization of the Manpower Administration in the U.S. Department of Labor, which was designed "to consolidate the agencies that had fragmented responsibility for carrying out most of the Nation's manpower training program."

All three of the pending proposals would carry this consolidation further.

They are:

The Manpower Training Act of 1969 (S. 2838), which was introduced by Senator Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and is generally referred to as the Administration bill. A companion bill (H.R. 13472) was introduced in the House by Representative Ayres (R-Ohio).

The Comprehensive Manpower Act (H.R. 10908), introduced by Representative William Steiger (R-Wis.), commonly referred to as the Steiger bill; and

The Manpower Act (H.R. 11620), introduced by Rep. James G. O'Hara (D-Mich.), generally called the O'Hara bill.

All three have essentially the same objective—the achievement of a more unified comprehensive national manpower system.

All three are directed essentially at the same groups. Under the Administration bill, program participants must be unemployed, underemployed, low income, or otherwise disadvantaged persons, 16 years of age or older, not prepared for employment, or others designated by the Secretary of Labor. The Steiger bill would concentrate on the unemployed and underemployed, with special emphasis on persons from low-income families. The O'Hara bill would concentrate on the unemployed, eligibility applying to anyone between the ages of 18 and 65 who was able and willing to work, but who has been out of work five weeks or more or working less than 35 hours a week for 10 weeks.

All three also would authorize the whole gamut of aids and programs, including basic education, literacy, communication skills, counseling, testing, work evaluation and adjustment, health services, child day care, part-time work for students, relocation assistance, incentives to public and private employers to train eligible persons, and related areas.

BASIC QUESTION

A real difference lies in the approaches of the three bills to the question of Federal-State-local responsibility and authority.

President Nixon pointed out that "the idea of creating a set of 'programs' and then expecting people to fit themselves into those programs is contrary to the American spirit." Rather, he said, "we must redirect our efforts to tailor government aid to individual need."

The fact that individuals live in different communities with possibly different problems lies at the heart of much of the controversy over where responsibility for manpower training should be vested and how Federal funds should be channeled to these communities.

On May 13, Representative Steiger told the House:

If services are to be available to clients in accord with their need, then (Garth) Mangum in *The Emergence of Manpower Policy* is fully justified in concluding:

"National decisions cannot be made which

arbitrarily fix the combinations of services to be available in States and communities."

Small industrial States may have little use for the on-the-job training but might benefit from an expanded institutional training program. Cities with considerable heavy industry and high demand for semi-skilled workers have different needs from those urban areas which are predominantly white collar. In adapting manpower programs to the needs of the particular State, city, and individual there is no substitute for a State and local manpower planning and implementation mechanism.

Most Federal funds are presently disbursed on a project-by-project basis in the belief that unless the Federal Government does act in this way it has "little means of controlling the quality of services and assuring that the target population is served."

At the same time, the project-by-project approach has created many problems, not the least of which are time-consuming red tape and delay.

In his penetrating analysis, Rep. Steiger said:

Much of the impetus for this proliferation of programs and models stems from the dilemmas which confront a Federal agency, as it attempts to deal with State and local jurisdictions.

On the one hand, disbursement of funds through state governments reduces the number of required Federal contact points and the need to become directly involved in local problems; on the other hand a number of States have proved disappointing in their lack of responsiveness to community, particularly large urban, problems.

On the one hand, funding on a project basis often excludes communities with the greatest need but the least energetic leadership; on the other hand formula allocation may tie up limited funds in the hands of the apathetic while the more capable and aggressive States are neglected.

On the one hand, project-by-project funding provides a Federal agency with leverage to force appropriate action and in some cases to bypass various layers of State and/or local bureaucracy; on the other hand, the vast number of cities, counties, and other jurisdictions far exceeds the limited capacity of Federal agencies to negotiate, monitor, and evaluate contracts.

These dilemmas will not even begin to be resolved until we begin asking the questions: "What can Federal, State, and local governments and related private agencies each do best?" and "How can we strengthen the capacity of each level of government to perform its role more effectively?"

It is in the way that they answer these questions that the principal differences in the bills can be found.

COORDINATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Administration bill consolidates the manpower funding sources at the National level by providing what amounts to a block grant to States in the place of the many separate grants-in-aid now available. This would mean the elimination of many current programs, such as MDTA.

For a State to be eligible to receive funds under the Administration bill, the Governor must begin plans to establish a State "umbrella" manpower agency. When fully operational, the agency will determine the utilization resources within the State and will monitor manpower program performance.

Each community will designate a local "Prime Sponsor" responsible for regional coordination and the establishment of a community manpower plan. The "Prime Sponsor" funnels its program ideas to the

*Under the Administration bill, businessmen could serve on the State's manpower agency and local Chambers could be "prime sponsors."

State manpower agency, which develops its plans for Federal funding based on the "Prime Sponsor" proposals in the various communities of the State.

If the Secretary of Labor approves the State plan, the Federal Government grants the State a single "block" of funds which, in turn, the State disburses to its communities.

The Administration bill provides for a phasing-in of Federal funds. That is to say, the amount of the "block" grant will depend on the progress being made by the State in setting up its umbrella manpower agency and local "prime sponsors," in developing approved plans, and on other criteria.

Under this proposal, in short, funds would flow as follows: From the Secretary of Labor to the State Agency to the local Prime Sponsor to the specific program.

The Steiger bill is based on the same principle of an upward flow of ideas, and local responsibility, but not as many phased stages are required before the money is released to the local levels.

Funds would flow from the Secretary of Labor to the State Agency to the specific program.

In the Steiger version, the State umbrella manpower agency would be required to be broadly representative, with membership required from several agencies which have an influence on manpower programs—although not directly responsible for them—such as education agencies, model cities agencies, and similar organization.

There is no locally designated manpower unit like the Administration's Prime Sponsor. All programs would be run directly by the State.

The O'Hara bill retains full authority with the Secretary of Labor. There is no provision for community or State manpower planning agencies. Funds flow directly from the Secretary to the local program sponsor, be this a public or private agency or a private employer.

INDIVIDUAL FEATURES

Economic Stabilizer. The Administration bill contains a triggering mechanism to increase the program authorizations when there is a substantial rise in unemployment. If the unemployment rate reaches 4.5 percent for three consecutive months, the Secretary can spend an additional 10 percent of the appropriated funds.

Neither the O'Hara nor Steiger bills contain such a feature.

Computerized Job Bank. The Administration bill proposes a National Computerized Job Bank to be established in each State and to be run by the State Employment Service. The Bank would catalogue job openings in a given geographical area to expedite job placement. This is patterned on a pilot program being tested in Baltimore.

Neither the Steiger or O'Hara bills contain such a feature; although the O'Hara bill provides for a comprehensive system of labor market information, National, State and local, and for the collection of job vacancy data and for man-job matching system.

"Employer of Last Resort." The most unique feature of the O'Hara bill is that it would authorize the Secretary of Labor to "contract with any Federal, State or local governmental agency, or with any nonprofit organization, to provide useful public service to unemployed persons."

This setting up of the Federal Government as the "employer of last resort" for the unemployed—long sought by labor unions—is regarded by many as the real purpose of the O'Hara bill. It would, in effect, guarantee any eligible unemployed person a job.

COSTS

The Administration bill would authorize "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions" of the bill. If the same funds were to be authorized for the bill as the

presently authorized for operating programs to be replaced by the bill, the sum would be \$1.6 billion.

The Steiger bill requests \$2.0 billion for 1971, \$2.3 billion for 1972, \$2.5 billion for 1973 and \$3 billion for 1974.

The O'Hara bill would also authorize "sums as may be necessary." Obviously, the cost would depend a great deal on the extent of unemployment and utilization of the guaranteed public service employment feature.

THE OUTLOOK

Most observers expect that this Congress—probably in the Second Session—will enact some form of Manpower legislation, following extensive hearings. They expect, too, that the bill that finally emerges will be some form of "compromise" measure.

Its eventual form will depend, among other things, on the interest shown in the legislation by businessmen and others who are concerned with developing manpower at the local level.

HO GOES TO HEAVEN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, before the campaign to cannonize Ho Chi Minh gets out of hand, I would call the attention of my colleagues to an article from the Peoria Journal Star of September 5, which gives a clear picture of just what kind of a man he was. Rather than all of these comparisons with George Washington, I think it more appropriate to class him with Adolph Hitler and Joe Stalin.

I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

HO GOES TO HEAVEN

(By C. L. Dancy)

The world is building some strange kinds of "heroes" and legends these days—as reflected in the "tributes" being paid to the deceased "Uncle Ho," many of them by our own American "humanitarian" and "broad-minded" commentators and reporters.

He is supposed to be a great "nationalist" and "patriot" who has done great things for his country.

This has been an era when the French and British Empires melted away, some with violence and some by negotiation—but All Are Gone. It is inconceivable that if there had been no Ho Chi Minh and no war in Vietnam that that country would remain part of the French Empire today. It wouldn't be, of course. Nothing else is.

No, had it not been for Ho and his passion for terror and violence and totalitarian control, Vietnam would be a free land today without the French, without the Chinese, without the Russians, without the Americans, and probably united.

He was the worst plague that ever hit Southeast Asia.

Uncle Ho brought upon his people a new despotism, 25 years of death and destruction, and the present division—when in less than 25 years by less bloody means they could have been free, united, and peaceful... like half a dozen African nations from Tunisia south.

(The exception to this in the whole French Empire would have to be Algeria, alone, where the struggle was probably inescapable because of its large French population and close economic and geographic and political integration with France.)

In terms of results, Ho Chi Minh was not a success for his country but a disaster that deprived them of real success.

In terms of the man, what kind of a hero is this?

What kind of a "hero" would George Washington have been, for example, if he had launched the revolt against the British with a widely-organized, secret massacre and mutilation of civilians, mostly women and children—setting up the surprise by engaging in "negotiations" up to the "Night of the Long Knives" itself? What if Washington then proceeded to "organize" the countryside by lopping off the right hands of children of families that refused to join the army and provide it with provisions?

What kind of hero would Washington have been if he had left the "popular front" of all democratic factions until the British abandoned their effort, and then assassinated Thomas Jefferson, Ben Franklin, Sam Adams, John Adams, John Hancock, James Madison, and others in order to establish a non-democratic, totalitarian despotism over the total life of the populace?

What kind of a hero would Washington have been if he had then sent thousands of men across the Canadian border to murder Canadian officials in every village and town, force farmers by terror and torture to cooperate in guerrilla war against the Canadian authorities, and carry on such endless war to unify the "American colonies" for 25 years?

Have we gone blind, neurotic, or nutty?

If a person's activities are unspeakable—we don't speak. It isn't dignified. It doesn't suit the commentator image to tell the truth when telling it is so unsavory. So . . . we eulogize him, say that such barbarism is only spoken of by propagandists dealing in extreme statements, and paint over the fact that some folks in our world, like Uncle Ho, engage in such extreme acts and such savage barbarism in living, breathing, flesh and bloody reality!

Crimes exist in America. They sure do! Thirteen thousand murders a year—isolated acts of individual criminals or psychopaths, not state policy.

And crimes exist in war zones, also, as isolated acts of confusion, panic, psychological breakdown—not state policy.

But "good old Uncle Ho," planned, preached, trained, organized, and directed mass assassination and murder for the calculated purpose of terrorizing and ultimately tyrannizing his fellow Vietnamese.

And the kind of "war" he preferred is a war against civilians, as he has repeatedly demonstrated.

He started his "war" with attacks on civilians—and climaxed it by using his Russian rocket banks against city residential areas, not military targets.

Some hero!

Some patriot!

Some human animal!

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT FAVORS ROTC

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have inserted remarks in the RECORD concerning the importance and necessity of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. Today I would like to share with my colleagues the feelings of Dr. William D. McCain, president of the University of Southern Mississippi, on the subject. Dr. McCain made the following remarks concerning ROTC during the orientation session for freshmen and transfer students:

CVX—1606—Part 19

USM PRESIDENT TAKES EXCEPTION TO ROTC OPTION

HATTIESBURG, Miss., September 8—(AP).—Dr. William D. McCain told new arrivals at the University of Southern Mississippi he thought the move to make ROTC voluntary was wrong.

The USM president, in addressing the freshmen and transfer students Sunday, said the college changed to a voluntary Reserve Officers Training Corps program because "we are following a national trend that it's not good to support your country and to be a patriotic citizen . . . if we do not support it, there won't be any country."

McCain said he had "taken on my hands the blood of some of you in this coliseum."

"There will be wars as long as you live and someone is going to have to fight. There's no way to avoid that. The fact that some of you won't take military training means that you won't be prepared and some of you are going to die and your blood will be on my hands."

Southern joined the state's two other universities in dropping mandatory ROTC this year after opinion polls among students and faculty.

INDIANA HOMEBUILDERS ON HOUSING CRISIS

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the homebuilding industry in northern Indiana is in a crisis.

During our congressional recess I met with homebuilding groups and they all predicted the situation will continue to deepen unless the President and Congress act on the money panic for housing.

I submit for the Members a report, with suggestions, which the northern Indiana builders forwarded to my office today:

NATION'S HOME BUILDERS NEED HELP

As representative of the Home Builders Association of Northern Indiana, Inc., I should like to express my thanks for your kind reception of our committee at our meeting with you on September 2, 1969.

In response to your request for particulars of the Home Builders problems and our suggestions for remedy I submit the following:

FACTS

The housing industry is in, perhaps its most critical period of the postwar era.

The nation desperately needs millions of new and rehabilitated housing units. The industry desperately needs its fair share of capital at reasonable rates to provide these units.

Housing is the first and worst victim of credit tightening.

That's close to 90%, and it is likely that the industry's share of the burden in fighting inflation is almost 90% under present conditions.

Today, housing starts are on a downward slide and could drop to an all time low rate of about 1 million units by the end of the year. This at a time when the nation's housing goals call for production of 26 million new and rehabilitated units in 10 years.

The fact is that only 4 million new housing units were begun in the past three years. That's a million fewer than needed just to serve normal new household formation needs.

HIGH INTEREST RATES

Prices skyrocket and interest rates reach historic highs. Money deserts the four types of savings institutions which provide the bulk of mortgage lending.

THE 1969 HOME BUILDING CRISIS

Commercial banks, for instance, had a new outflow of \$5.4 billion in the first seven months of this year compared to an inflow of \$9.9 billion in the same period of 1968. Savings and loan institutions had an inflow of only \$2.5 billion in the same period as compared to \$3.1 billion last year. The story's the same for mutual—down 27% in the savings flow.

TODAY'S HOUSING NEEDS

Some \$26 billion is needed annually in new funds to finance new housing construction. To finance annual production of 2.6 million units for 10 years to meet established housing goals will require an average annual addition of \$13 billion in new funds.

Can it be supplied? Obviously not under the current structure of the mortgage market. NAHB studies indicate we'll be about \$13 billion short of an adequate supply of mortgage funds in 1975.

NEEDS OF LOW INCOME PEOPLE

Of course, there may be enough money for a select group of buyers and renters. But there won't be enough to go around for low and moderate income groups. Once again the nation will have failed on a social and moral commitment, and a dangerous blow will have been struck at a most important element of the national economy—the housing industry.

Corrective action is necessary immediately—corrective action such as contained in the 14 point program embarked upon by NAHB.

Beyond that, if our national resources are to be employed to the most benefit we must work for development of priorities in our nation's housing requirements and in the use of those resources.

The home building industry, itself, is a major national resource—socially and economically—and should so be regarded in policy decisions.

Our nation's financial structure now is not geared to cope with today's problems.

CONGRESS MUST ACT

A complete reexamination of the nation's financial machinery and regulatory system must be begun immediately to overhaul it into the last third of the century in a manner responsive to the nation's requirements.

On Congress devolves the responsibility to fund fully the programs which it has approved to provide low and moderate income housing.

TO REMEDY THE SITUATION

The nation is heading for a housing crisis of epic proportions. Good housing, available for purchase or rent, is scarce and becoming scarcer.

The mortgage money market is excruciatingly tight. Inflation continues its perilous pace. Restrictive monetary policy throttles only housing.

Interest rates are at record levels. Production of low and moderate income housing is reaching the vanishing point.

THE 14 POINT PROGRAM

The housing industry is in a fight for survival. In this situation, NAHB's Executive Committee approved a 14 point program to ease the current crisis. In the main, the program's points can be accomplished by Executive or Administrative action. Some require Congressional action. This is the program:

CREDIT CONTROLS

Credit controls should be authorized by Congress to assure a more balanced distribution of scarce credit throughout the economy.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ACT NOW

The Federal Reserve Board be directed to purchase the obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in order to support, at a reasonable rate, these components of housing financing. The Treasury also

should be empowered and directed to support Bank Board obligations.

In 1966, Congress gave the FED permission to make such purchases. Thus far, the FED has not exercised that permission. Congress should direct it to do so.

U.S. TREASURY ACT NOW

GNMA

The Treasury and the Housing and Urban Development Department should move to make fully operational the authority for the Government National Mortgage Association to guarantee mortgage-backed securities issued by FNMA and private mortgage holders. They have done this only partially.

Special assistance

The President and Congress should authorize full use of all available GNMA special assistance funds to assist the mortgage market. Congress has authorized \$2.6 billion of such funds.

USE GI INSURANCE FUNDS

GI funds

Congress should enact immediately the Teague bill (H.R. 9476) which would make use of GI insurance trust funds to aid the VA mortgage market. This would be a more profitable investment of such funds. Congress should also examine other trust funds with similar purpose.

USE PENSION AND RETIREMENT FUNDS

Pension funds

Congress should direct pension and retirement trust funds to invest a substantial portion of their funds into the mortgage market to retain their eligibility for tax exemption. Insurance companies also should be required to live up to public responsibilities by supporting the mortgage market. A tax reward could accomplish this.

FNMA

Urged to continue to expand its current level of support for Federally-backed mortgages.

Business loans

The FED should call on its member banks to sell their loans to business.

CONGRESS ALLOW CREDIT RATIONING

Credit rationing

Financial institutions, including commercial banks, should be urged to ration scarce credit supplies. Such voluntary rationing should be authorized by Congress. The purpose is to assure that funds will be available for home buyers and builders for construction loans and long term mortgages.

Taxes

Interest and dividends on savings deposited in institutions using such fund for mortgage financing should be made tax-free.

ROLLBACK PRIME RATE

Governmental action and public opinion should be used to force a rollback in the banks' prime rate increase.

Regulation Q

The FED should maintain its current rate on time deposits under Regulation Q to forestall any further outflow of savings from S & Ls and mutuals.

Commercial paper

Congress should enact legislation to control commercial paper and other non-bank operations not now subject to governmental regulations, including use of Eurodollars.

GOVERNMENT AS MORTGAGEE

Last resort

The government, if necessary, should become mortgagee of last resort in order to assist in fulfilling housing needs. Congress could enact such legislation.

Rental housing and depreciation

The housing industry, depressed already under the weight of credit and financing problems, faces another dangerous blow—removal of much of the incentive for building rental housing.

This threat is posed in the "tax-reform" bill approved by the House of Representatives. It changes and waters down the depreciation incentives for building apartments.

The depreciation proposal, initiated by the Treasury Department, reflects little understanding of the nature of the housing industry and how it works.

A major solution to the pressing housing shortages rests in the multifamily field, yet the House action would—if let stand—remove any drive to build such housing.

Investment in rental housing depends upon tax incentives which include such features as accelerated depreciation and favorable capital gains treatment on resale.

HOUSE TAX REFORM

The House, in approving the tax bill, voted to continue the 200% "double declining" basis of depreciation for new housing, but to cut it to 150% for all other new real estate.

It cut to the straight-line depreciation method all used real estate property now eligible under current law for a 150% depreciation basis.

It also eliminated the 10 year sliding scale recapture of excess depreciation (as provided in Section 1250) to provide for complete recapture of all excess depreciation, regardless of how long the property is held.

The benefit of retention of the 200% accelerated depreciation rate for residential property retained by the first owner is rendered seriously ineffective by the drastic reduction of the resale market resulting from the straight line depreciation on all used properties.

Equally devastating, is the change in Section 1250 which provides that, if depreciation is taken in excess of straight line depreciation, all excess depreciation over straight line is to be recaptured as ordinary income to the extent of the capital gain occurring upon sale of the property.

Thus, the temporary benefit of excess depreciation write-offs against other income of the owner builder would be more than offset by the fact that upon sale depreciation previously taken would, in one lump sum, be subject to what would be a higher ordinary income tax rate than the applicable rate in the years in which portions of the excess depreciation had been taken. The scale, therefore, is weighted prohibitively against excess depreciation.

HOUSING TAX

While NAHB is opposed to change in current law it has suggested—if Congress is determined to amend the law—these constructive alternatives which would be least likely to damage the industry:

"Adoption of a limited tax preference plan under which every taxpayer would pay taxes on at least some stated portion of income, regardless of depreciation deductions (and other items). This, NAHB feels, would best accomplish the purpose to prevent undue tax shelter while still preserving a substantial, though diminished, source of needed investment capital for rental housing; or

"Amendment of Section 1250 to lengthen the recapture period on accelerated depreciation in case of sale. The industry could live with a five-year ordinary treatment of excess depreciation with ordinary income treatment on a diminishing scale thereafter. This suggestion would simply lengthen the ordinary income period of Section 1250."

The Northern Indiana Home Builders hopes the President and Congress acts immediately on these recommendations and revive Housing for Millions in America.

MASSIVE WITHDRAWAL BY UNITED STATES WOULD SPARK VIET MASSACRE

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, an article in this morning's Washington Post by Columnist Joseph Alsop is most relevant to the present discussions regarding further American troop withdrawals from South Vietnam.

Mr. Alsop in his article clearly reminds us all of the events of the last year and a half in the northern provinces of South Vietnam. His short lesson in recent history is accompanied by a grim warning of what our indiscriminate reduction in forces might mean to this particular area of South Vietnam.

I might also add that I visited South Vietnam last month and spent some time in the city of Hue and the surrounding countryside. Mr. Alsop's assessment of the situation is right in line with my own findings and, therefore, I am commending his article to my colleagues and others for their serious consideration:

MASSIVE WITHDRAWAL BY UNITED STATES WOULD SPARK VIET MASSACRE

HUE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—At this juncture, President Nixon had better reflect on what the Communists did in Hue at Tet a year and a half ago.

The President might start by pondering the Communists' method of avoiding needless waste of ammunition. For this purpose, parties of 15 or 20 of their victims in Hue were forced to dig their own burial trenches. Their ankles were tied. Their elbows were also tied behind their backs, and a rope was passed through all their elbows. They were then ordered to squat in line on the brink of the trench.

That way, a sharp tug at each end of the rope was enough to tip the whole line of squatting men, women and children (for there were also children!) into the trench. No doubt they writhed in their ropes; but it was still very easy to bury them alive.

Such was the fate of many, when the Communists briefly seized this lovely little city in the Tet offensive. In Hue itself, about 2,000 civilians were buried alive or sprayed at the trench-side with automatic weapons, or had their heads broken with mattocks. About another thousand civilians were killed in the same manner along the line of march of the retreating North Vietnamese regiments.

When the horrible mass graves were found, the "Liberation Radio" finally reported the massacre but claimed that only "imperialist lackeys" had been executed. Of the bodies that could be identified, however, only 30 per cent had the remotest connection with the American or South Vietnamese government. The rest were mere accidental victims, punished at random for Hue's failure to join the "popular uprising" that Hanoi's strategists had forecast.

Ironically, it is now needful to remember this savage episode because this city, so recently a shambles, is once again the prettiest in South Vietnam. A brilliant province chief, Col. Li Van Than, has not merely rebuilt Hue; he has also led all the people of his provinces far down the road to peace and prosperity.

It is indescribably moving, in truth, to drive by jeep, unescorted and unarmed, through the little villages of this province and its neighbor to the north, Quangtri. The situation here is altogether different from

that in Binhtrung and Haugthia provinces, where there are almost no remaining Vietcong but plenty of enemy troops from North Vietnam. In the populated areas of these two provinces around Hue, there are, to all intents, no enemy troops whatever. So there is peace.

Everywhere, the hard crusts of fields three or four years fallow are being broken to put in crops. In Hue's province, the dikes are everywhere beginning to be rebuilt, to keep the salty seawater from the land.

Almost every village and hamlet has its own elected government. Everywhere you run into the men of the Regional and Popular Forces. For these people are ready and eager to defend their peace. And in hardly any hamlet or village of this province do you see American or South Vietnamese soldiers.

In the province, the soldiers are either in the mountains or along the Demilitarized Zone. And that is the crux of the matter, which now makes it needful to recall the Hue massacre at every step and with every decision in Washington.

For the people live in peace, along the fertile coastal strip of these two provinces, because the soldiers of the 1st ARVN Division and the U.S. 101st Airborne and 3d Marine Divisions are in the mountains, or in the Ashau valley, or along the DMZ still fighting the war. The soldiers are in fact the screen for the people's newly found peace.

Over and over again, in heavy force all during the imaginary "lull," North Vietnamese regiments have tried to move south to drive through the screen and reach the populated areas. Let the President ruin this screen by too many troop withdrawals, and one or two or three regiments of North Vietnamese will manage to get through. There is not an American commander here who does not fear it.

Let those regiments get through the screen, moreover, and the Hue massacre will look like a Sunday school picnic. While other enemy units pin down our men and the 1st ARVN, the screen-penetrating regiments of North Vietnamese will surge up and down the coastal strip, killing the Regional and Popular Forces to the last man, murdering the village and hamlet chiefs, staining the whole land with blood. And that blood will be on our hands!

So what about it, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Laird and Mr. Rogers and Gov. Harriman and my dear friends in your editorial ivory towers? Here are a million people, to whom at long last we have managed to bring peace, who have also put their trust in us. At least a hundred thousand of them will be doomed out of hand, if that screen is even seriously broken through. Do you want the responsibility for a hundred thousand deaths, or shall we wait until Hanoi has been finally forced to end the war?

TWO CHAMPIONS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, within the space of just a few short days, death took the lives of two great Americans—both were champions; and yet, while these men typified the American spirit and the dream of all Americans to succeed in their chosen fields, they were as different as day and night.

The people of our Nation admired them not only as men but also for their achievements. One fought his way to the top as a politician, gifted in word and astute in the art of politics; the other

fought his way up in his profession by the use of his fists, his brain, and his brawn.

Both were truly outstanding citizens. Both exemplified the opportunity we have in this Nation, if we wish, to move ahead, and to fulfill the hopes we might have to succeed—if success is what is wanted. Success, however, did not come easy to either, for both had to work hard to move out of the poor circumstances to which they were born. They tramped up the hard road to success by hard work, and by the sweat of their brows, while at the same time brushing away the cloud of self-pity, until they reached the pinnacle of their dream.

One was Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen; and the other was Rocky Marciano. On the surface, it would appear that there is little to compare the two. Dirksen was a sophisticated and eloquent Member of the U.S. Senate; Marciano was a "bull-like," strong, heavyweight boxing champion of the world. Yet both started life in almost the same circumstances.

Everett Dirksen was born in a small town in central Illinois. His father died when he was 5 years of age. As a boy he worked hard at many menial tasks—he peddled vegetables from door to door, he drove a truck, and later realizing the need for further education, he worked his way through college and ultimately became a lawyer.

Rocky Marciano's boyhood was quite similar. He was one of six children born of immigrant parents. His father was a shoemaker and money to his parents came hard. Like Dirksen, Marciano worked hard, as a laborer, as a ditchdigger, and at other odd jobs. Although he never attended college or acquired the educational knowledge that Senator Dirksen did, he too, was a proud American. He, like Dirksen, believed that self-improvement came about by self-initiative and by hard work.

Thus, it appears that these two great Americans, as diverse as they might have been in their interests did, nevertheless, have the same desire and drive necessary to bring about the reality of their dreams of success.

From humble beginnings, they pulled themselves up the ladder of success rung by rung but by their own bootstraps.

Senator Dirksen became a national and international figure as a U.S. Congressman, then as a U.S. Senator. Finally he became one of the outstanding leaders of the Republican Party and was named minority leader of the Senate.

He was a straight-talking personable man but not averse to letting his thoughts and feelings be known by direct statements regardless of what the personal consequences might be. On some of his stands he was criticized, while on others he was praised, but in all cases he let his position be known to the American people. He was a fighter for the preservation of our Constitution, and of our free enterprise system. Although he received great publicity by reason of his own "humorous" political style, yet there are few who can deny his achievements or work on behalf of the people.

At times he was accused of representing big business, but then there were

those who also accused him of representing minority groups against the interests of big business.

Rocky Marciano chose the fight ring as his road to the top. He was not a big man, but he was rough, tough, and ready. As a prizefighter, he fought the greatest and finally retired undefeated. He was subsequently acknowledged by many to have been the greatest heavyweight champion of all time. This proclamation came during his lifetime and hence Rocky Marciano became a legend in his own time. He became also, a national and international figure.

In his quiet almost humble manner, Rocky was always in the forefront when it came to promoting a worthy cause. In fact, on the day he was killed, he was en route to making a speech before a civic club for a friend who had requested him to be there to help raise money for a charitable cause.

Thus, it is obvious that the thousands of people from all walks of life, who filed past the bier of Rocky Marciano in Brockton, Mass., and in Fort Lauderdale, and to those who walked past the flower-decked casket bearing Senator Dirksen in the Capitol rotunda and at his burial in Illinois, proclaimed in silence their respect and admiration for what these two great Americans had accomplished.

I am sure that they and the rest of us feel pride that we lived during their time on earth, and that each exemplified the spirit of being an American. We who remain should look at their lives and be proud that we have our own right to our American dream, and that the right and hope for improving our lot in life is fact and not fantasy.

These men left as their heritage, living proof of America's offer under our Constitution, to those of poor and humble beginnings, to achieve success if the desire is present.

This right of achievement is the right of all free Americans, but requires an acceptance of the challenge to look it squarely in the face, not with self-pity but the wish and desire to become a champion. They did it by hard work, initiative, pride, and with the gift that God has granted to each of us; namely, the blessing of being born in a free country.

HUGH DUNCAN COMMENTS OVER KTWO-TV ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, international development in the recent past have led to much talk of a detente between the Soviet Union and the United States. Indeed there are some who say the points of common interest outweigh the points of conflict.

As a result of their faith in these propositions these individuals have advocated measures up to and including unilateral disarmament by the United States.

I believe we should actively seek peace. But I do not believe these measures

should be taken without a consideration of the very real forces at work in the world.

Hugh M. Duncan, my field representative in Casper, Wyo., has assessed well the continuing dangers on the international scene, in an editorial written for Wyoming television station, KTWO, and I include the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE
(By Hugh M. Duncan)

In the best of all possible worlds, mutual mistrust between the world's great powers would diminish, and meaningful negotiations would signal an end to the arms race. In such a congenial international climate, America would then be able to reduce military expenditures and turn its attentions to solving the problems of its Negroes, its Mexican-Americans, its Indians, the hungry, the ill, and the untrained.

Unfortunately, the grim reality is that we do not live in such a world. The grim reality of our present world is evidenced in the weekly casualties in Vietnam, in the sabre-rattling by Red China, in the Berlin Wall, in the Island prison of Cuba, in the Czechoslovakian invasion.

Because of present conflicts between Red China and the Soviet Union, there is hope that Communism, as a monolithic structure, has come apart at the seams. As a consequence, a feeling of hope pervades the American people that some accord can be reached with the Soviets, leaving only China as a serious military threat. Or so the columnists would have us believe.

One rather apparent fact seems to be ignored, however. And that is that the Communist world is still, at least, monolithic in its goals of worldwide domination. The ideological dispute goes only to the means, and not the end.

It seems reasonably apparent that, for a decade at least, it is the Soviet Union which poses the greatest threat to democracy.

It is, after all, Russian technology which fuels the war in Southeast Asia. At the core of the North Vietnamese resistance is Russian financing.

It was Russia—not China—which savagely smothered the kindled sparks of freedom in Czechoslovakia.

It is Russia, not China, which sustains the Mideast crisis with men, material, and money.

It is Russia, not China, which has established a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

And it is Russia, not China, whose nuclear-tipped rockets are aimed at the heartland of America.

One wonders if the foregoing facts have been forgotten by the Congress in the current debate about deployment of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

Safeguard is a response to the deployment by Russia of multiple-targeted intercontinental missiles, aimed not at American cities but at American missile installations.

The Russian missiles are patently offensive in nature. They are of no value, of course, if the American missiles at which they are aimed have already been launched. They are designed, therefore, as "first strike" rather than retaliatory missiles.

The best defense to a "first strike" by Russia is a good offense. If, however, our offensive missiles are lost in a surprise attack and our ability to retaliate is substantially diminished, we would have no choice but to capitulate.

It was this choice—the choice between fatal war and outright surrender—to which Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon objected.

All indicated a desire for a third alterna-

tive—a "safeguard"—which could destroy an airborne "first strike" and leave our retaliatory force intact.

The Safeguard system is inherently defensive. It is designed to shield our retaliatory missiles by destroying in mid-air attacking missiles. The columnist, Stewart Alsop, observed that the Safeguard ABM "could not hurt a single hair of a single Russian head."

Even Russian Premier Kosygin has acknowledged that such defensive weapons are not the cause of the arms race—and backed up his opinion by deploying ABMs in the air corridors surrounding Moscow.

It has been observed that the protest against Safeguard is, in reality, a protest against a tragic, unwon war in Vietnam.

But, as Stewart Alsop observes, it is not logical to protest the war by attacking the ABM. It is not logical to protest the loss of some 37,000 American lives by denying to a future president the option he may desperately need to save 250 million lives.

**MR. ANDREW P. LYNCH, SBA
HEAD IN NEW JERSEY**

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press recently carried a story on Mr. Andrew P. Lynch, head of the Small Business Administration in New Jersey and a resident of Avon which is in the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, which I have the privilege of representing.

Mr. Lynch has made an outstanding contribution to the Small Business Administration, combining his strong administrative abilities with a sense of dedication and of high concern for small business.

Unfortunately, the Small Business Administration does not always have the money it would need to fund all of the projects which are applied for and are deserving of funding. Nevertheless, the Small Business Administration, with the outstanding work of men such as Mr. Lynch, has played a major role in keeping small businesses in business.

The Associated Press story, as carried in the Daily Register of Red Bank, follows:

[From the Red Bank (N.J.) Daily Register, Aug. 29, 1969]

COUNTY MAN HEADS SBA IN STATE

(By Bob Dubill)

NEWARK.—Hurricanes, floods and occasional controversy keep the Small Business Administration before the public eye.

But the agency's main job is to keep small businesses in business. It is expanding a program of free consultation services for those finding it rough to get started or to turn a profit after several years of trying.

"Ninety per cent of all business failures are due to poor management," said Andrew P. Lynch, of Avon, head of the SBA in New Jersey.

"We have a very active management assistance program that offers courses, counseling and a first hand look by knowledgeable and experienced people at any business in trouble."

A key part of the consulting program is

SCORE—Service Corps of Retired Executives—which has 120 volunteers.

"We always have two or three of these men in the office and others on call who are willing to sit down with anybody who needs help. All have had successful business careers themselves and they offer their time and services free. Perhaps it is a patriotic gesture or just plain goodwill. But the program has been very successful," said Lynch.

MORE VOLUNTEERS

"We hope to multiply these services through a volunteer corps of active executives. We have contacted large businesses, trade associations and others. The response has been excellent."

"If a men's clothing store, for example, is having problems, we might send in an advertising man, a public accountant and a representative from the Men's Wear Association. They'll spend a day or two on the scene analyzing the problems and making written recommendations. We'll keep following up until the manager is out of trouble and turning a profit."

The SBA opened in New Jersey five years ago. Before that, residents from the Garden State had to go to New York or Philadelphia for financial assistance and advice.

"We now rank in the top 12 offices in the country in the number of loans being serviced," said Lynch, who has been at various times an accountant, businessman and banker.

UP TO \$350,000

The SBA guarantees loans up to \$350,000 to small businessmen who qualify. The businessman negotiates the loan with a commercial bank. The SBA guarantees to repay 90 to 100 per cent of any loan in default.

Generally, a Small Business is any retailer doing \$1 million or less in gross business a year, a general contractor doing \$5 million or less for three consecutive years and manufacturers with less than 250 employees.

Lynch said that loans to members of minority groups have accounted for 62 percent of the loans made by the SBA in New Jersey during the past year.

The SBA in Washington has been a center of controversy over whether enough of the program is reaching out sufficiently to the ghettos.

Lynch said that Newark banks gave the program a major boost by agreeing to put up a \$1 million pool and that banks in Union, Passaic, Monmouth and Sussex Counties are climbing aboard. He said that banks in Trenton, Camden and recently in Wildwood are also participating.

"We guarantee or back up 100 percent of a loan up to \$25,000 and 90 percent above that," said Lynch. "We are currently negotiating three very substantial loans with the Prudential Insurance Company under this phase of the program. These loans will range from \$100,000 to \$400,000."

NON-BUSINESS PUBLIC

The non-business public becomes most aware of the SBA during periods of disaster.

When Hurricane Donna spread millions of dollars worth of damage along the Jersey Coast more than a decade ago, the SBA approved 1,500 substantial loans from Monmouth County to Cape May at the southern end of the state. Whole houses and businesses were washed out," said Lynch. "Property insurance does not cover damages caused by waves or storms."

Eight counties in New Jersey were declared disaster areas last month in the wake of prolonged flooding. More than 50 persons approach the SBA for financial help in rehabilitating homes, property and businesses.

The loans carry a 3 percent a year interest rate and may run as long as 30 years if Lynch's office gives a stamp of approval.

LET'S STOP KICKING THE SOUTH AROUND

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that much of the eastern press is so steeped in prejudice against the South that many writers insist on making the South the "whipping boy" for problems that are national in scope.

Certainly the South has its problems, but they cannot compare to some of the difficulties that have developed in many of the great urban and metropolitan areas throughout the Nation.

In this connection, the distinguished columnist James J. Kilpatrick, in a recent article entitled "Let's Stop Kicking the South Around," points out that the South is characterized "by innovation and by solid progress." I am placing this column in the RECORD.

The truth is that the South has made great progress in recent years, providing a better life for millions of our people of all races.

Those who criticize the South cannot truly understand the assets and advantage of a way of life that is based on courtesy and mutual respect. In the South there is a much warmer public relationship between people in the normal interaction of day-to-day life than in many sections of the Nation where people let the rest of the world go by—unheeded and unnoticed.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the South, I place in the RECORD herewith the column by Mr. Kilpatrick:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Sept. 14, 1969]

LET'S STOP KICKING THE SOUTH AROUND!
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Reconstruction came to an end in the South, or so the history books tell us, during the reign of Rutherford Hayes some 90 years ago. But there are times, honest to Pete, when Southerners wonder if the South ever is to regain an equal standing in the Union.

There is something about the South, apparently, that draws an unrelenting anathema from the North. Old abolitionists never die; they write on for The New York Times. It has only to be said, or hinted, that a particular program or appointment may be pleasing to the South—the conservative South, that is—for the program or appointments to be damned out of hand. As a Southerner, I protest.

We are witnessing the syndrome just now in the nomination of Clement F. Haynsworth to the Supreme Court. It is entirely proper, of course, that the Senate Judiciary Committee inquire into his qualifications. No one is suggesting that the Senate's duty to advise and consent should be treated in perfunctory fashion. But the noxious clouds of complaint against this appointment have little to do with qualifications. The objection, at bottom, is that Haynsworth is a Southerner—a moderately conservative Southerner. That is enough. Lynch him!

Thus, an entirely phony challenge is raised that Haynsworth acted unethically by not disqualifying himself eight years ago when the great Deering Milliken case first came to his Circuit Court. The charge is baseless. The Fourth Circuit's major opinion in the Deering

Milliken litigation came in November of 1963. Haynsworth did not write the opinion—Judge Albert Bryan wrote it, and Judge Herbert Boreman concurred. Two other judges dissented. Haynsworth's position on the law and the evidence was in no way irrational; it was a position shared not only by Bryan and Boreman, but also by two members of the National Labor Relations Board and by the board's own trial examiner.

Haynsworth's critics know that their charge of a particular conflict of interests is flimsy. Thus they were seeking, last week, to puff it up to a more general charge that Haynsworth is "Mr. Textile Interests." These are the same critics, by and large, who smiled benevolently in other days upon the nominations of Arthur Goldberg and Thurgood Marshall. There are times, in Washington's political rainy season, when we wallow in tides of hypocrisy; and one of those times is upon us now.

It is not only the Haynsworth nomination that suffers the "Southern stigma." Harry Dent is a skilled and dedicated executive, worth his weight in gold at the White House; but he comes from South Carolina—he formerly was with Strom Thurmond—and his appointment as a presidential assistant brought slurs that were simply anti-Southern. No matter what the administration does about school desegregation in the South—no matter what it proposes on voting rights—a hostile reaction arises.

Even Spiro Agnew succumbs. The vice president appeared on Meet the Press the other day, and was asked about the "Southern strategy" that has been urged on his party. He began his response by denying that he was in any sense a traditional Southerner. Then he got even more defensive: "How could someone seeking to court the forces of reaction propose a welfare program of the magnitude and scope the President has just proposed?"

Aarghh! The South, with the largest racial problems, has demonstrated the greatest racial peace. It has suffered less than its neighbors from strikes, riots, and campus disorders. The South continues to raise daughters who are ladies and sons who are gentlemen. It is characterized not by "forces of reaction," but by innovation and by solid progress. The old Confederacy is part of the Union now; it is a great place; I love it; and it would be pleasant indeed if the damned Yankees who dwell in Washington would stop kicking my South around.

CHANGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, with tremors of nostalgia, the University of Texas Tea House must make way for progress. It is to be torn down to make room for—of all things—the automobile. It is being razed to make room for the widening of a street.

The change will be orderly, but it will not be the same, for that tree-shaded lot overlooking Waller Creek.

It was in 1870 that a Missourian named William Garner built a home for his bride there after striking it rich in the gold rush. Sixty years later Miss Mary Gearing, then chairman of the university home economics department, decided this location was perfect for her plan to have a tea house to use as a laboratory for her students, while also serving the university community.

The University of Texas became the first in the Nation to have such a facility. The food was good and the service was quiet and swift, handled by white-jacketed student waiters. Food reflected Texas under-six-flags tastes. French creoles and humboes, Spanish-influenced Mexican foods, and Dixie dishes with plenty of hot breads were the favorites.

Noreen Ross, with the University of Texas news information service writes:

In September, 1940, Helen Corbitt, nationally recognized food expert, took charge and remained until 1942. Her arrival ushered in the era of her famous potluck delicacies, "stickie buns" and the unforgettable brownie crumble balls.

The history of the early World War II years was reflected in the Tea House, one-day-a-week special "Victory" menu, an outgrowth of the Victory Garden project of the Home Economic Department. Then, in 1943, the Tea House was called into "active service" as a mess hall for 300 Navy men stationed on campus.

In September, 1946, having honorably discharged its duty to the nation, the Tea House was reopened to the public, but it was June, 1947, before it again was used as a laboratory for Home Economics Department students.

The immediate postwar years saw the Tea House characteristically reflect the early stages of trends that were eventually to sweep the country. It sponsored (well in advance of the national fixation on all things slimming) a nutritionally sound nine-day diet that helped numbers of faculty and staff shed unwanted poundage, and in 1951 experienced what must have been one of the earliest student protest walkouts. (Faced with a change of policy, some of the student waiters walked out—but the dispute was settled quickly.) As faraway places and strange-sounding names became a part of the public consciousness, the Tea House swung into line with a weekly foreign food night and served, in turn, menus from such countries as Russia, China and Hungary.

A graceful yielding to the demands of changing times has been a hallmark of the Tea House—and in saying goodbye, one is reminded of the voice from the crowd who is said to have called out to Queen Victoria on the occasion of her Diamond Jubilee:

Go it, old girl. You've done it well.

GOD HATES A COWARD

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I insert in the RECORD was published in the Omaha World-Herald of the date of January 26, 1949. I emphasize the date: January 26, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that for some 35 years the Republicans have controlled the executive branch of Government for only 8 full years and they have controlled the Congress for only 4 years, 1947-48 and 1953-54. But there has always been the opportunity, both in and out of Congress, for—as the editorial appeals—"a Republican Party to raise high the flag of loyal opposition."

This it has not done. Instead, in too many instances, it has temporized and all too often compromised the principles that brought the Republican Party to greatness.

Read well and ponder the words of this editorial written 20 years ago:

... speaking broadly, the Republican Party consists of men and women who in firm conviction are opposed to the swift trend toward the omnipotent state that is sweeping over every section of the earth. Whether it be defined as communism, fascism, socialism, totalitarianism, statism, the New Deal, the Insurance State, these men and women regard it as a thing of infinite menace, however cunningly disguised, and however ardently supported by good but misguided people.

Through the years, the ever-expanding socialistic welfare state has piled tax upon tax, deficit upon deficit, and debt upon debt, vesting insidious and powerful control in the huge Washington bureaucracy over the lives and fortunes of all citizens.

Says the editorial in a warning that has been ignored:

Here too, in our America, the State is taking control and ownership of the people. It is using the power to tax to destroy their independence and self-reliance. It is converting free men into vassals and dependents. It is devouring the substance of self-supporting people to render them self-supporting no longer, and to establish a condition of universal reliance upon the biased paternalism of a Great White Father—a "Father" corrupted and corrupting, since great power does corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

And the Republican Party has not dared resist the tide; it has gone along with it. Not out of conviction, but out of cowardice. It has not dared to be a Daniel; to have a purpose and make it known.

What a wonderful thing it would be if the Republican National Committee meeting here (1949) in Omaha, and if other constituted Republican leaders, could realize how desperately these United States need an honest and brave Republican Party—how true Republicans above all others hunger and thirst for it. A Republican Party to raise high the flag of a loyal opposition.

In concluding, the editorial says:

The Republican Party can keep on crawling ignominiously along the dusty trail of an order it abhors but shrinks from challenging. Or it can rise out of the dust of four merited defeats, stand erect and unafraid, proudly to take up the battle for all that free men prize.

If there is not to be a party of loyal opposition—of men and women ready to stand or fall, if necessary, for the great principles enunciated by the Founding Fathers—then this free Government is doomed. The complete editorial of 20 years ago follows:

GOD HATES A COWARD!

That's gospel truth. If any witness were needed to attest it the Republican Party of 1936-1948 would more than suffice.

For 12 years the Republican Party has been a coward; the worst kind of coward—a moral coward. In consequences it begins to take on the appearance of something the cat dragged in.

It is hard to define as an entity the Republican Party or any other large group of people, since however closely banded together all cannot think alike in all respects. But, speaking broadly, the Republican Party consists of men and women who in firm conviction are opposed to the swift trend toward the omnipotent state that is sweeping over every section of the earth. Whether it be defined as communism, fascism, socialism, totalitarianism, statism, the New Deal, the Insurance State, these men and women regard it as a thing of infinite menace, however cunningly

disguised, and however ardently supported by good but misguided people.

But the Republican Party has lacked the courage to say what its rank and file believe. Out of hunger for the flesh pots it has lacked the patriotism, the loyalty, to stand up for the free Republic of the founding fathers and to fight for it. Due to that lack of moral courage, of loyalty to the American creed, the United States, almost the sole remaining bulwark against the advancing tide, finds itself without a spokesman, without a champion to proclaim and battle for its traditional, glorious creed. And it finds, the once-so-firm foundations of its temple crumbling.

The fact is known of all men.

Here too, in our own America, the State is taking control and ownership of the people. It is using the power to tax to destroy their independence and self-reliance. It is converting free men into vassals and dependents. It is devouring the substance of self-supporting people to render them self-supporting no longer, and to establish a condition of universal reliance upon the biased paternalism of a Great White Father—a "Father" corrupted and corrupting, since great power does corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

And the Republican Party has not dared resist the tide; it has gone along with it. Not out of conviction, but out of cowardice. It has not dared to be a Daniel; to have a purpose and to make it known. Its plea for votes has been the shameful one: Give us the offices, the power, and we'll give you as much of what we believe to be wrong as will the Democrats themselves.

Americans do not respond to any such appeal. They, too, hate a coward. They despise hypocrisy. They hunger for a leadership of good faith. They will accept a brave and fighting leadership tainted even with Pendergastism and absolutism rather than a leadership that crawls—and trails its flag.

What a wonderful thing it would be if the Republican National Committee meeting here in Omaha, and if other constituted Republican leaders, could realize how desperately these United States need an honest and brave Republican Party—how true Republicans above all others hunger and thirst for it! A Republican Party to raise high the flag of a loyal opposition! Opposition not alone to a misguided and recreant Democratic Party here at home, but opposition tenacious and resolute, brave and unyielding, to all the monstrous wrong and error that today menaces freedom, self-reliance, the courage to adventure, human dignity, in every land and every clime.

How joyously, with what reborn hope, men and women of the ancient faith of this Republic would rally about such a standard! Proud of it they would be in victory. No less proud in defeat!

Surely, surely, it shall not be recorded by amazed historians of a later day, that when the black flag of Absolutism was raised back in the Twentieth Century, when the fate of all mankind was involved, there was nowhere, in any land, not even our own, an organized body of men and women who had the courage, the devotion, the wisdom, the loyalty to God who made men free, to challenge that foul intruder and to dedicate their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor, to driving him back into the Dark Ages whence he emerged!

Never has there been sounded such a call to service as rings today in the ears of the Republican Party. Never, for men and women of courage, of character, of conviction, has there been afforded such an occasion for rising to the heights of human devotion to imperishable ideals.

The Republican Party can keep on crawling ignominiously along the dusty trail of an order it abhors but shrinks from challenging. Or it can rise out of the dust of four

merited defeats, stand erect and unafraid, proudly to take up the battle for all that free men prize.

Courage or cowardice? Loyalty or recreancy? Conviction or time serving?

It is as simple as that, ladies and gentlemen of the Republican National Committee.

ROMANIAN REDS TRY NEW FACE, BUT CANNOT FORGET OLD WAYS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, has recently returned from one of his periodic factfinding tours of Europe. Mr. Danielopol is especially equipped to diagnose the developments in Romania because of his extensive financial and diplomatic career in the service of the prewar and postwar government of Romania before the Communists took over. I, therefore, direct the attention of the Members to his editorial carried in the *Aurora* (Ill.) *Beacon-News*, Thursday, August 21:

ROMANIAN REDS TRY NEW FACE, BUT CANNOT FORGET OLD WAYS

WASHINGTON.—The Romanian Communists are trying to put on a new face but they can't forget old ways.

They persist in the old Marxist tradition of bending history to suit their purpose.

At a recent press conference at the Romanian Embassy here at the height of the excitement over President Nixon's trip to Bucharest the Reds distributed a little pamphlet which was described as containing "historical" data.

History? Hardly!

It was a collection of distortions, falsifications and outright lies.

Any Romanian who lived through World War II and its aftermath would be shocked at the Reds' effrontery. But those less well-acquainted with Romanian history might swallow it:

The embassy says, for example:

"The Government of broad democratic concentration headed by Dr. Petru Groza promulgated the agrarian reform of March 1945."

What government of "broad democratic concentration"?

The Groza cabinet was a minority puppet regime brought to power by Soviet tanks.

Foreign Commissar Andrei Vishinsky flew into Bucharest in March 1945 and with threats and military pressure forced King Michael to oust the democratic coalition of the National Liberal, the National Peasant and the Socialist parties which represented some 95-98 percent of the country.

It was replaced by a Groza government comprised of a number of hastily organized splinter parties which had no substance, but were formed to give the appearance of a national front.

The government served as a facade for the Communist Party which numbered less than 1,000 in a population of 20 million.

Even Vishinsky admitted to Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, that in free elections the Communists could not get more than 20 per cent of the vote even by "twisting arms very hard."

So much for the embassy's "broad democratic concentration."

Now for the "agrarian reform" of which the Reds boast.

The real Romanian agrarian reform law

was passed by the World War I parliament in Jassy in early summer of 1917. It was introduced by a young liberal member from the district of Olt, George Danielopol, my father.

"It was one of the most drastic and progressive land reforms in the world. Nine-tenths of Romania's arable land was voluntarily distributed to the peasants. Only 10 per cent was left in farms of more than 125 acres.

Soon after the war, the reform was carried out. The peasants who participated represented 80 per cent of the population. They became the most conservative and the toughest anti-Communist class in the country.

When Groza came to power in 1945 without popular support he attempted to win over some of the peasants by telling them to "help themselves" to the 10 per cent that had not yet been distributed. He was also bent on destroying what was left of the landed class in Romania.

The great majority of the peasants refused the grab. They did not trust the Communists even when they carried gifts. They were right, for the so-called land reform was only a ploy.

It wasn't long before the peasants saw their land confiscated by force and swept into collectivization.

Those who resisted were thrown into jails or labor camps. Many were murdered.

The whole mass of the landed peasants was left destitute. Many worked only 150 days a year.

This is one of the major factors why a once-rich Romanian agriculture and economy lags far behind even Communist Yugoslavia and Poland where peasants were allowed to keep their farms.

So much for the embassy's "land reform."

If the Ceausescu regime is serious in its move to rejoin the civilized world, it will have to learn that honesty is still considered the best policy.

You can fool some of the people all of the time; you can fool all the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time.

LT. COL. (RET.) CHESTER E. WHITING, FOUNDER AND FIRST DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. ARMY FIELD BAND

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, with the opening of school again, I believe that my colleagues will be interested in an article which appeared in the Laurel News Leader, entitled "The Parade of K-12," by Col. Chester E. Whiting who is a resident of my district and is currently serving as vice president of the Prince Georges County Board of Education. Colonel Whiting is eminently qualified to give his observations on education. In his long and distinguished military career and as founder and first director of the U.S. Army Field Band, which brought musical pleasure to countless thousands, these observations on our school youth by Colonel Whiting should be read and digested. They are pertinent to our time. Indeed, they are timeless. I, therefore, commend them to my colleagues:

THE PARADE OF K-12

(By Lt. Col. (ret.) Chester E. Whiting)

(NOTE.—Col. Whiting has again consented to write a guest editorial to mark the re-

opening of the elementary and secondary schools. A Laurel resident and parent, and vice president of the Prince Georges' County Board of Education, he was formerly founder and first director of the U.S. Army Field Band.)

The greatest parade of the year will get underway next Tuesday. Starting in early September, it will not end until next June . . . the parade of K through 12. There will be but few sidewalk watchers, yet, it will be viewed by thousands from various vantage points. No bands will escort the marchers, although every sound of the band, from the shrillest piccolo to the deepest bass will be heard. And each tune, harmonious or cacophonous, will interpret the zeal or the indifference of your child and mine, depending upon the kind of orchestration we fashion for him.

The parade marshalls, stationed along the route, will regulate the progress of the procession. The cadence and length of step will be regulated by the enthusiasm and the will of the marchers themselves. At every intersection there will be a reviewing stand, and each will be marked "Reserved for parents." Will you and I be in these stands to applaud those that are keeping up—to encourage those who may be faltering?

My use of hyperbole, obviously, is an attempt to make a vivid impression upon our parents, to nudge them gently into a comprehension of their responsibilities.

We know that three of the five R's will be taught and supervised efficiently by a faculty and staff of superior quality. The teaching of the other two, Respect and Responsibility, is largely up to us. But the spoken word falls when our attitudes and actions are in contradiction to it. In other words, we must respect the recently acquired rights of our children to question, to criticize, to express opinions contrary to ours, and, to enjoy the feeling of being our partners, not our subjects. No longer is the admonition appropriate or proper, "Children should be seen and not heard."

Because life always gets harder toward the summit, responsibility increases as we get older. Children must be taught to practice it in its simplest form at an early age. Responsibility, to my mind, is the most important of the five R's; upon it the other four are basically dependent.

The uppermost thought in the minds of all of us is, "What kind of year is this going to be?" Being deeply concerned with this question, I think we have to face up to some facts, all of which are found within the premise that these are not changing times—these are changed times. And these changes, long overdue, are good for our children, good for us. So, my answer to that question is: This is going to be a good year, a better year. My confidence in and respect for our children, their parents, and our teachers dictates my optimism.

The parade is about to start; let's take our places on the reviewing stand.

LAST CALL FOR PEACE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Henry T. Haller, now 81 years of age, is dedicated to the cause of peace. He and two brothers served in World War I and he says if it were not for his age and his poor health now, "I would manage to get over to Vietnam some way to help out in the hospitals over there."

Mr. Haller has written a poem dedicated to our beloved mother of the Prince of Peace. In his foreword, he says:

All movements for World Peace falter apart, because so much hatred ruleth man's heart! A third World War endeth in atomic warfare! A fiery world consumeth death flare!"

Following is the text of his poem:

LAST CALL FOR PEACE

(By Henry T. Haller)

The Messiah came to this war torn earth
For All Races, All Nations, All Men,
His Rule was to establish World Peace
"On Earth As It Is In Heaven!"
Just think of the wars fought in His Name
Since the Prince of Peace sojourneyed here!
If man persists in ignoring these Rules
The way to Armageddon is clear!

There is no such thing as a civilized war,
War is the Mortal Enemy of all Mankind,
It is inherently vicious to the core,
Defiling the best in the human mind!
War is the chief cause of violent unrest
In this enlightened twentieth century.
A thing all world wide Scholars protest,
A blot on this land of the brave and free!

War is a frightful and immoralized thing
Out of the hoary and gory past ages,
It is that malignant and inhumanized sting
Which bloodied all Histories' Pages!
George Washington warned 'US' to beware
Of foreign entanglements' high cost;
Huge numbers of dead—ruins everywhere,
Through which our Freedom could be lost!

Hate is the leading incitement to war
Used by profiteering war nations;
From remote ages to the near present
This destroyed many Civilizations!
Atlantis' foundering in the Atlantic
Is a lesson for the present—a link:
Hate, fear and greed, wickedness and war
Caused the Continent of Atlantis to sink!

The deeds of the war lords are shameful
All Commandments they twist or discount;
Debased Religions, Reason and Science
Distorted Peace as Taught on the Mount!
Sowed hates and suspicions 'tween Nations
To build up vast war armaments—
Until today their Nuclear Death Weapons
Can lay waste All Earth's Continents!

In place of preparing for a True Peace,
Most Nations prepare for new wars ahead!
Hate, fear and war never cured their likes
But causes their likes to Spread!
They plot more wars while mouthing Peace
Invent more gruesome ways to kill;
The cause of the present war crises—
Their hatreds—spread widely—ill will!

A Peace which depends on armaments
Never did a lasting Peace insure,
Because wars do fear and hate foment
And thereby future wars assure!
Preparing for war to conquer warfare
Brought man two fearful World wars;
If Humanity wants Peace it must prepare
To pursue the Prince of Peaces Course!

This Planet is one of countless billions
In Gods dazzling Infinite Space,
But man makes of it a Charnel House
A Heaven crying immoral disgrace!
Mans vicious slavery foisted on others
In satanic wars of blood and might,
Could lead to world wide havoc again—
For the want of Truth's Foresight:

Real Peace must be based on Moral Law—
Not an eye for an eye Peace by the sword;
The Ten Commandments—not tooth and
claw

But Justice and Mercy—Truth and Accord!
Mans frightful inhumanities to man
Through slavery, war, rapine and greed,
Nullifies the Prince of Peaces Plan—
The only one which will ever succeed!

Fear and hate are the commanding twins
 Making Peace on earth so fragile;
 Not 'til Love rules out these war king pins
 Can True Peace rise out of exile!
 Many are Praying for Peace from Above
 Among all Races all Nations all Creeds;
 Really and Truly men need Divine Love
 In Thoughts—Words—Feelings and Deeds!

The Prince of Peace never approved war,
 Or have His Rules through warfare expand!
 Atom wars threatening all Mankind
 Can be traced to the militarist band!
 The Missions are blamed by the heathens
 For enslavement at the point of the sword!
 'Twas militarism—not the Missionaries
 That also crucified our Lord!

Militarism is a sinister cancerous disease
 Devouring the best blood of all Nations;
 In place of saving it shatters World Peace,
 And destroyed many high Civilizations!
 War profiteers care not whom they corrupt
 In mad gambles for Profits' High Sell;
 Nor the Nations they force to go bankrupt,
 Or the many boys they deliver to hell!

Peace moves not based on Moral Law
 Are like the far confounding echoes,
 Leading Men and Nations to their doom
 Down, down in the fearful shadows!
 So long as the Golden Rule is flouted
 And its Power for Peace is denied,
 In Men's Thoughts, Words, Feelings and
 Actions
 The "Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse"
 ride!

Wars are defiling the conscience of man
 Leading to false notions "God is Dead!"
 The Anti-Christ merchants of War and Death
 Have put Humanity asleep! Widespread!
 Peace thrives on Charity and Compassion
 Truth, Justice, Divine Love, Forgiveness;
 These above all lead to World Peace—
 The Golden Rule's World Wide Success!

If Humanity wants a Heavenly Peace
 It must want it more than its very breath—
 More than all the Gold on this Planet
 Or reap the harvest: War and Death!
 True Peace must rest on the Golden Rule—
 The Rampart of World Wide Brotherhood,
 On the Prince of Peace's "Hallowed Light"
 And the Prayerful Might of World Mother-
 hood!

CONGRATULATIONS TO UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE ON 175TH ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the University of Tennessee—one of the great universities in the Nation—is celebrating its 175th anniversary.

From a small college—Blount College—founded on the banks of the Tennessee River at Knoxville in 1794 the University of Tennessee has become an outstanding institution of higher learning, ranked together with the Oak Ridge scientific community as one of the major brainpower centers of the Nation.

The University of Tennessee was one of the original land-grant colleges and in enrollment has grown from a handful of students to almost 35,000 students. Its campus has grown from 40 acres to 1,000 acres and its physical plant, originally valued at \$600 is now valued at hundreds of millions of dollars.

The University of Tennessee is a mag-

nificent asset to our State, not only in terms of education but in terms of unity and loyalty. "This Is Big Orange Country" is the sign that greets visitors to our State, referring to the Tennessee football team and its colors. Millions of Tennesseans—alumni and friends—are a part of the University of Tennessee family and they take pride in its victories and its progress in all areas.

I want to join in congratulating the University of Tennessee on its 175th anniversary and to wish President Andrew Holt, members of the board of trustees, the faculty, students, and alumni the very best of good luck as this great institution continues to grow and prosper.

Because of the interest of the American people and my colleagues in education, I place herewith in the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean concerning the anniversary observance.

The editorial follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO UT ON 175TH ANNIVERSARY

The University of Tennessee has begun its 175th anniversary celebration—observing the span of the institution's existence from its first few classes of only a handful of students to its present status as one of the nation's great universities.

UT—now the proud occupant of The Hill in Knoxville—was founded in 1794 as Blount College, before Tennessee had become a state. It was named for William Blount, the territorial governor.

The school was set on a 40-acre tract—costing \$600—which its founders said would meet all future space needs. Now the university occupies nearly 1,000 acres on the Knoxville campus alone. In addition, it has large campuses at Martin and Memphis, it has acquired the University of Chattanooga, and owns a large amount of other properties in the state, approximately 35,000 acres in all. Its worth is now figured in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

From its original enrollment of a few local students, UT has steadily grown until it will have almost 35,000 students scattered throughout its many divisions across the state when classes begin later this month. The students now come from many states and several foreign countries.

The name of the school was changed to East Tennessee College in 1807 and to East Tennessee University in 1840. In 1869 it was designated a federal land-grant institution, and in 1879 the name was again changed—for the last time—to the University of Tennessee.

The university has experienced its most phenomenal growth in the last 10 to 15 years—from the standpoints of enrollment, physical facilities and service to the state and region.

A \$150 million construction program carried out over the past 10 years has brought about a spectacular change in the university's appearance, especially on the Knoxville campus.

The Hill has been somewhat overshadowed by a cluster of new classroom buildings, dormitories, libraries, and other structures on the surrounding knolls. New athletic facilities—such as the William B. Stokely Athletic Center, the Tom Black Track, and additions to Neyland Stadium—have also gone up, testifying to UT's outstanding position in almost all phases of competitive sports.

The university's expansion has also kept pace with developments in the fields of medicine, social work, nuclear studies, and space science, with facilities at Oak Ridge, Tullahoma, Nashville and elsewhere. A \$4 million building is to be constructed here to house

UT's Nashville center for expansion of a variety of educational services.

As UT has grown in size and scope, so has it grown in vital services which it provides for the people of the state of all ages and in many fields.

The role of a true university is to involve itself in the everyday affairs of a growing society and to provide leadership in researching modern problems and finding their solutions. UT is performing in this role with increasing skill and effectiveness.

The university and its president, Dr. Andrew Holt—who is primarily responsible for the institution's sudden burst of progress in the last few years—are to be congratulated on UT's 175th anniversary.

POISONS, PROFITS, AND POLITICS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, much of the recent debate over problems related to various pesticides—usually with most emphasis given DDT—has tended to concentrate on the long-term potential ecological damages which result from continued application of these chemicals; not as much has been said about present dangers of pesticides.

Now, Mrs. Ruth Harmer, a resident of the 29th Congressional District of California and a longtime friend and associate of mine, writes in the August 25 issue of *The Nation* that the problem today "is to determine to what extent all human beings—who are unwittingly serving as guinea pigs in the vast uncontrolled field tests—have been damaged, perhaps irreversibly."

I believe Mrs. Harmer's article, "Poisons, Profits, and Politics," is an important contribution in the ongoing colloquy about pesticides and environmental quality, and I now submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

POISONS, PROFITS, AND POLITICS

(By Ruth Harmer)¹

California regulates more closely than any other state the use of pesticides—the vast arsenal of "economic poisons" employed since World War II in an all-out attack on the biosphere. For that reason it is instructive to consider the following account by a state public health official of the recent death of a 16-year-old farm laborer assigned to spray a field of strawberries:

"The permit to purchase and apply the pesticide had expired, so that it was purchased and applied illegally. The highly toxic phosphate ester was applied by hand duster, a primitive and entirely unsafe method of application. The container label was not read by anyone until after the illness was discovered. No advance arrangements were made with a physician for prompt, adequate care for an emergency. The worker was not instructed about hazards and precautions for using the pesticide. He was not provided with protective clothing. When the boy was taken to a physician, no one

¹ Mrs. Harmer teaches at California State Polytechnic College and is the author of *The High Cost of Dying* (Macmillan) and the forthcoming *Unfit for Human Consumption*.

could provide any information about the pesticide the worker had applied. The supplier of the pesticide did not check the number of the permit given by the purchaser to assure that the permit was valid. The product was also misbranded; it contained two-to-four times the phosphate ester pesticide specified on the label."

In addition, noted Dr. Irma West, coordinator of the Injury Control Project with the California Department of Public Health, the medical instructions on the label could be confusing and needed re-evaluation. "I know of three deaths in which these instructions have proved detrimental," she added, "and I know of no benefit from them in an emergency."

Who was held responsible for the boy's death? No one—yet every one of the series of grave errors was also a violation of laws and regulations, and the avoidance of any one of them might "easily" have saved his life.

Dr. West's carefully documented report of that and hundreds of other cases of injuries and deaths occurring each year to workers exposed to toxic chemicals was part of the testimony presented earlier this year by attorneys for the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee at a court hearing in Bakersfield. The union was seeking dissolution of a temporary restraining order—a temporary order that has been in effect since last August—instructing the Kern County agricultural commissioner to keep secret the records of pesticide applications by crop dusters there. The records are public records.

"We will not tolerate the systematic poisoning of our people," Cesar Chavez, UFWOC leader, has warned growers. "We will be damned—and we should be—if we will permit human beings to sustain permanent damage to their health from economic poisons."

Without information about what is being sprayed, by whom, where and when, the union says it cannot provide workers with adequate safeguards—medically and contractually—against the "ever-increasing danger." Growers have been incredibly lax, it argues, in exposing workers to the battery of economic poisons, some of which are so toxic that a single drop on the skin can kill an adult. State agencies charged with administering and enforcing the regulations have been equally lax, it adds; and offers as evidence sworn statements from field workers describing injuries received after having been sprayed while working in the fields and after having been sent into sprayed fields too soon after spraying.

Jerome Cohen, the union's chief counsel, initiated action last summer after appeals by a group of workers who had been forced to seek medical attention for relatively severe cases of conjunctivitis, nausea, dermatitis and other gross symptoms of pesticide poisoning. The place to begin, he decided, was at the office of county agriculture Commissioner C. Seldon Morley, who is required by law to keep for inspection records of the commercial pest control operators: the date of treatment, material and dosage used, the number of units treated and other pertinent items. Individual farmers, even the corporate ones, are not required to file records.

Commissioner Morley said the records had been given to him "in confidence." The visit, not a particularly sociable affair to judge by courtroom recollections, ended with Cohen's promising to return in a day or two to get what he considered "vital public information."

Within two hours after the union attorney had left Morley's office, three applicator corporations, acting on behalf of themselves and all other members of the county Agricultural Chemical Association, had obtained a temporary restraining order. Mr. Morley, who had been named as defendant, was now enjoined

from disclosing the records. Judge J. Kelly Steele, whose anti-union decisions have not endeared him to organized labor, signed the order with remarkable promptness, considering that the trade association's attorney, Stephen E. Wall, had admitted that "in the very limited time available due to the urgency of the situation we have not been able to accomplish much research on the point and we have not found direct authority on the point. . . ." Mr. Cohen petitioned the appellate court in the district for a pre-emptory writ of mandate. That was turned down on the ground that the issue should be resolved at the trial-court level.

Great changes have occurred since the days of the Joads in Kern County, which lies at the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley—probably the world's most fertile region. U.S. 99, twisting down from the Tehachapi Mountains and leveling north past Arvin, Weedpatch and other towns on the migrants' route, is now a broad highway. Nondescript public buildings in Bakersfield have been replaced by glittering steel and glass rectangles of ultramodern design. The "Okies" and the "Arkies" who survived the great hunger have adopted the attitudes and manners of California farm folk, even to snarling "union" just like the Establishmentarians.

But once inside the handsome paneled courtroom, changes seemed less fundamental. The old issues were still the issues, dividing the courtroom and the case right down the center: human values vs. business license, philosophy vs. technology, concept vs. coin. In the spectators' seats to the right of the entrance sat the crop dusters, those technological experts who defy the laws of gravity by their ability to fly "right on the deck" and who challenge the laws of biology at great risk to themselves as they wage chemical war in the fields. Their workday confrontations with nature have given them toughness and arrogance.

In the spectators' seats to the left were the farm workers. They, too, had been stamped by their work. Their faces, more varied in structure and richer in hue, ranging from black to brown, yellow and white, had the settled patience of persons who regard nature as process rather than enemy. With them were a number of young men—well educated, totally engaged—for whom Delano and Cesar Chavez have become the center and symbol of a struggle to redefine justice in our time. From their ranks had come the attorney spokesmen: 25-year-old David Averback, who went to work for UFWOC last summer because the job ". . . jibes with my concept of what it's all about," and Jerry Cohen, who became UFWOC general counsel two years ago for similar reasons. Like a good many other young attorneys today, they have rejected the prevailing professional notion that law is an abstract game for the affluent to be lost or won on points. For them, law is a vehicle for delivering justice to all the people.

Beyond the two factions, on the raised bench under the golden state seal, sat Judge George A. Brown. Courteous, grave, interested in the issues, he indicated himself as a man deeply appreciative of the dignity and the proprieties of the law. His task was formidable and of far-reaching consequence. On his decision depended an answer to one of the overwhelming questions of our time: *To what extent can the law and will the law curb the agricultural and chemical entrepreneurs from jeopardizing the health and lives of other men and contaminating, perhaps forever, man's greatest natural resource—the earth itself?*

The union received strong support from experts in its efforts to prove that farm workers and the general public need protection. A first step, the young lawyers said, is to set up a clinical testing program for agri-

cultural workers, similar to the one now used for pest control company employees. Although scientists are still of divided opinion about the effects on human health of the chlorinated hydrocarbons (the other principal category of insecticides, which includes DDT), they are universally aware of the hazards of the organic phosphates. First developed extensively during the 1930s, some proved so toxic that they were immediately turned over to the military as "perfect" weapons of chemical warfare—deadly enough to wipe out the population of an area without damaging property. One of the more commonly known insecticides of this variety, TEPP, is so poisonous that a single ounce of the stuff is enough to kill about 500 men.

Like other nerve gases, the organic phosphates inhibit the action of a neural enzyme, cholinesterase, which regulates the mechanism by which nerves relax and control muscles. The first symptoms parallel those of relatively harmless irritants: the nose begins to run, vision is blurred. Then the chest is constricted, and breathing becomes more difficult. Finally, the victim's respiratory muscles are fatally impaired. He dies by asphyxiation.

Since death follows so quickly upon the first overt symptoms, the cholinesterase level of persons working commercially with agricultural chemicals—manufacturing, formulating, and applying—is checked frequently. If it is below what is normal for them, they are taken off their jobs until the level has built up again—sometimes they must give up the work, permanently. The need for similar protection for farm workers was underscored by Dr. West's affidavit, which contained the "classic" case of the 16-year-old boy. She described a number of other alarming incidents. In August of 1963, she noted, more than ninety of 6,000 peach pickers in one area became sufficiently ill from parathion (one of the most commonly used organic phosphates) to seek medical aid. Health officials, as a test, checked seventy others in the group who displayed no signs of poisoning. They found that 50 per cent of them showed "significant reduction of red cell and plasma cholinesterase levels, but were either asymptomatic or had not sought medical attention for their symptoms."

Additional evidence of the need to provide safeguards for workers was offered by Edward Lester, director of test laboratories in Fresno and Bakersfield. Contrary to his own financial interests—pest control companies are among his major accounts—he supported the union appeal for tests for farm workers. "Obviously I feel quite strongly about this," he told me later. "I see so many critically ill persons, including children and young people. If proper precautions were taken, people wouldn't die."

The witness who revealed perhaps most clearly the nature and extent of the problem was Dr. Robert Van den Bosch, professor of economic entomology at the University of California. An internationally recognized authority, Dr. Van den Bosch cited economic and biological as well as philosophical and moral reasons for halting the unilateral use of insecticides and substituting an "ecological approach."

"Pest control now," he asserted bluntly, "is largely a matter of merchandising." California farmers are being heavily penalized for the "overkill" program, which has often engendered more serious pest problems than those it set out to control. "Good" insects as well as "bad" ones have been ruthlessly exterminated by broad-spectrum materials, creating an ecological imbalance that has often given many species of parasites "license to explode."

By preserving the complex of predators and parasites that affect the whole chain of life, by promoting intelligent crop management and agricultural hygiene, by using highly selective pesticides and biological con-

trols, farmers could realize enormous savings in money, land and men's health and lives. In addition to taking issue with the merchandisers, Dr. Van den Bosch expressed concern about the inadequacy of the tests made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and with the failure of legislators to declare a moratorium on DDT. "What we are talking about," the scientist said, "is a philosophy."

That was not what some people in the courtroom were talking about. From the standpoint of the pest control operators, the duty of the law was clear and simple: to maintain business as usual. Mr. Wall based his case chiefly on the escape clause in the new California code. Although the code holds access to information about the people's business to be "a fundamental and necessary right of every citizen of this state," it also precludes disclosure of records of law-enforcement agencies and—of obvious interest to big businesses—records possessed by other agencies if they contain trade secrets, geological and geophysical data, plant production, marketing and crop reports "obtained in confidence." The records of pesticide applications contain trade secrets. Wall insisted, that had been given to Commissioner Morley "in confidence."

Arguing forcefully to support Wall on the "trade secrets" clause, as on other points, was county counsel Ralph Jordan, attorney for the defendant, Commissioner Morley. It is novel in a courtroom to find the attorneys for plaintiff and defendant on the same side of the table, sharing the same witnesses, citing the same precedents, making the same appeals. And the alliance between public officials and private operators in this instance was rendered more ironic by another "chemical case" going on. At one point, the hearing was recessed so that a jury could bring in its verdict and Judge Brown could pass sentence. Defendants were two rather frayed young women; one very blonde, one very brunette, both looking sadly in need of vitamin D. While working at a place called the Hillbilly Ranch, they had sold—according to the felony charges for which they were given prison terms—\$6 worth of second hand amphetamine tablets to a police informer. The prosecuting attorneys, like the jurors, wore expressions of outrage at the violations of public health and safety—to say nothing of public morality.

Mr. Jordan expressed even greater outrage about the union's demand to see the records. In his zeal to protect the trade secrets of Wall's clients, he questioned Dr. Van den Bosch so fiercely that Judge Brown was once forced to ask him "to stand back a little, please." He scoffed about the "somewhat ethereal question of whether the public interest of disclosure outweighs the public interest of confidentiality"; he dismissed affidavits of injured workers as "a pile of garbage."

Commissioner Morley was so solicitous about the applicators' trade secrets that he could have been mistaken for Wall's confidential clerk. Animation is not the commissioner's distinguishing characteristic, but one of the occasions when he seemed more person than portrait occurred in the corridor outside the courtroom after Dr. John Swift, another University of California entomologist, had testified. He had been summoned by UFWOC's opponents chiefly, it seemed clear, to counter the testimony of his colleague. The commissioner was delighted with Dr. Swift's performance: "They were trying to put you on the spot," he thwacked the expert on the shoulder heartily, "but you came through fine, fella."

It was thus easy to understand the passion in Cohen's voice when he talked about UFWOC as public defender. "I think it is inefficient to rely on government agencies," he retorted sharply to a comment by Mr. Wall. "We don't trust government agencies. We rely on ourselves and would rather rely on public law."

That even in best regulated California, laws governing pesticides are not firm enough to warrant anyone's reliance became more apparent in the months that followed. Four weeks after the concluding summaries were presented, Judge Brown formally instructed Commissioner Morley to continue to keep the records secret. Disclosure, he said, "would seriously hamper the essential cooperation existing between all segments of the pesticide industry and the farmers on the one hand with the commissioner on the other."

Supporting his decision, Judge Brown referred to the applicators' argument that if their records were disclosed, unlicensed grower-owners would do the spraying themselves. That they could take on the job is an open question, since commercial application has become a big business in California, which now uses about 25 percent of the nation's agricultural pesticides. Furthermore, if and when growers did indicate that they were willing to get the equipment and manpower, the state could insist that as "commercial applicators" they must obtain licenses and keep records.

The important issue, by-passed in the decision, is that pesticides are no longer anyone's private business. Every person in this country and in most others carries within himself appreciable concentrations of economic poisons. There is no hiding place: pesticide residues have been found in creatures at ocean depths and mountain heights from the Arctic to the Antarctic. The milk of some nursing mothers in the United States contains such an intolerable level of residue that if it were cow's milk it could not be sold.

Because of problems of drift and persistence and biological magnification, both Republican and Democratic legislators have been joining Sen. Gaylord Nelson in seeking to ban the ubiquitous DDT. Arizona declared a year-long moratorium last January after its dairy and honey industries were threatened; Michigan acted this spring when the condemnation of coho salmon from its principal lake jeopardized a commercial and tourist boom; California's legislature is considering a bill submitted by state Sen. John A. Nejedly to impose a gradual ban on its use—in his original measure even the possession of DDT would have been outlawed. A formidable case was made in Wisconsin by conservationists working with the Environmental Defense Fund. And early in July, the U.S. Department of Agriculture emerged from its lethargy long enough to order a thirty-day suspension for DDT—time out for "review."

The rising voice of protest occasioned by the speed with which Rachel Carson's "fable for the future" is being translated into current scientific reports is not without danger, however. A ban on DDT—and it should be banned—may lull the country into the comforting delusion that the problem has been solved. Although other chlorinated hydrocarbons are less likely to drift and are less persistent, neither they nor the highly toxic organic phosphates are being employed selectively enough so that people, both workers and nonworkers, can be protected.

Scientists are no longer asking if pesticides pose a health hazard. Their problem now is to determine to what extent all human beings—who are unwittingly serving as guinea pigs in the vast uncontrolled field tests—have been damaged, perhaps irreversibly. Responsible investigators associate the chemicals with a terrifying list of afflictions: toxic hepatitis, many varieties of cancer, disfunctions of the enzyme systems, embryonic malformation, kidney disorders, and other chronic and degenerative diseases. And the toll will continue to mount, according to recent reports about their mutagenicity.

Several weeks ago Charles A. O'Brien, chief deputy in the California attorney general's office, took significant action to support the

UFWOC appeal from Judge Brown's decision upholding the sanctity of "trade secrets." Explaining his intervention in a suit filed by a farm worker in Riverside against the county agricultural commissioner, O'Brien said: "We believe there's a constitutional right to know on behalf of the public which transcends the cloak of privilege." At least 1,000 Californians were injured by pesticides last year, he noted, the agriculture files cannot remain closed since "they may involve life and death for future Californians."

He, like others, expressed concern that the regulatory agencies "too often" are oriented toward the regulated rather than the public. It is no secret that they, along with educational institutions, have been too intimately involved with the merchandisers. The thalidomide trial now going on in Germany and other episodes involving the drug industry offer terrible warnings about the risks incurred when chemist-businessmen dictate public policy. With pesticides the risk is even greater. It may well be, as some experts say, that the contamination of the biosphere has passed the point of no return—that the dose already administered has been fatal.

THE JEWISH HIGH HOLIDAYS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the 13th of September 1969, begins a very important religious period for the Jewish people of the world. On this date falls the holiday of Rosh Hashana, which in 10 days is followed by the holiest of the Jewish holidays Yom Kippur. Recognizing not only the great religious significance of this time, but, the ideals that it symbolizes, I should like to help commemorate these holidays.

Rosh Hashana signifying the beginning of the Jewish religious year, falls on the first day of Tishri, which is the seventh month in the Jewish calendar. According to legend and custom, Rosh Hashana is a time when all the records of one's past actions are opened before God for his careful judgment. No deed nor secret passes by the close scrutiny of the Eternal Being. In carefully weighing the actions of man, God makes no distinctions between religious groups nor between nations. As Supreme Ruler and Ultimate Judge, He deals with all men equally.

The Jewish people believe that by resolving to live better lives, and by praying for forgiveness for past sins they can find favor in the eyes of God. Obtaining the Lord's favor, however, necessitates not only personal repentance, but, forgiveness from those whom one has wronged. In accordance with this ideal, during this holiday a highly commemorative hollowed-out ram's horn called a shofar is blown to symbolically remind the congregation to live a good and virtuous life.

Rosh Hashana is the first of the Jewish high holidays. It signifies the beginning of a period which is devoted to deep meditation concerning one's own life and its relation to the rest of mankind. During this time one prays and is charitable, ultimately preparing for the most sacred day of Yom Kippur.

The "Day of Atonement" or Yom Kippur, occurring on September 22, 1969, is the last day of the period known as the "Ten Days of Penitence." It is the culmination of the individual's thoughts, prayers, and acts of penitence. It is on Yom Kippur that one, after already having proclaimed his faith in God, asks repentance for all the evil that he has done. The entire day is devoted to obtaining forgiveness through prayer and fasting. According to the beliefs of the religion, the fast and offerings of repentance are accepted by God only if all the wrongs committed are righted, and if these acts lead to future good deeds toward one's fellow man. With nightfall comes a single sounding of the shofar indicating that the fast is ended and that the worshippers may return to their homes. The congregations leave the synagogues in anticipation of a year of peace and happiness for both themselves and the rest of the world.

I look forward to the time when all men fulfill many of the ideals symbolized during these Jewish high holidays. The world would be a much happier place if all men would take the time to not only critically look at themselves, but make a sincere effort to treat others with kindness. I, thus, join the Jewish people in their longing for the day when wickedness is driven from the earth, and peace and harmony truly prevails over all of mankind.

CAPTIVE NATIONS ALL-STARS

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, Russia co-opts her captive nations' human and institutional resources.

A captive nations athlete wins an international tournament medal and sees it engraved "U.S.S.R."

At the United States-Soviet track and field meet in Los Angeles earlier this year, "Soviets" Janis Luis and Janis Donins placed first and fourth, respectively in the javelin. These "Soviet" ambassadors of sport are actually citizens of captive Latvia.

A captive Estonian, Tonu Lepik, took third place in long jump, but Russia took the credit.

A Soviet draft choice from Lithuania, Vytautas Jaras, captured fourth place in discus and, of course, Russia paraded him as her countryman.

Juhan Simonson of Lakewood, N.J., vice-president of the Estonian National Committee in the United States and secretary of the New Jersey Council of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Americans, graciously provided me these facts about the Los Angeles track meet.

Mr. Simonson's report indicates a "Russian" team does not necessarily consist of "voluntary" Russians. A more appropriate name for a "Russian" athletic team would be "Captive Nations All-Stars."

Regardless of which country gets nominal credit for a captive national's athletic

pro prowess, the fact remains of course that Russia's colonies are not free. But sports can be a metaphor for international politics, changing people's perception of their government. For this reason the Olympics might well invite each national unit to enter a team independent of the U.S.S.R. delegation.

Re-Stalinization co-opts captive nations' prestigious literary institutions too. The Information Service of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania reports Vytautas Radaitis, "a party hack," replaced liberal poet Vacys Reimeris as editor of *Literatura ir Menas—Literature and Art*.

The Information Service ridiculed Reimeris' editorial judgment in printing a conservative article that, in the Information Service's opinion, was neither true nor beautiful. The Information Service commented on the article in question:

Even his style, studded with official clichés, is dull and impersonal (the medium here is also the message).

While Russia parastatically crams dull dogma through captive nations' cultural media, she also chills free speech of those who would criticize her. To fool the censor into letting his message get through to an American, a citizen of a Russian satellite felt it necessary to write:

What rascals these astronauts of yours. Imagine, they dared overtake ours!

In this age of electronic communication, leadership by example may be more effective than leadership by force, Mr. Speaker. No country can block news completely; therefore, to the extent Iron Curtain citizens can observe international news, I hope they see America doing right.

Accordingly, while calling for national liberation and free speech within the Soviet sphere, let us assure human rights for our own people too.

Freedom from racial discrimination, freedom from speech-chilling harassment, and freedom from crime are vital to every American, in the same way that these liberties are vital to the captive national who we wish could enjoy the same freedoms America professes.

In 1776 the Yankees did not try to patent the fruits of their political ingenuity. They sought no royalties. Rather they hoped their declaration of human rights would flourish in the public domain, ready to inspire freedom campaigns pending in the future.

Lincoln said a half-slave, half-free America was not viable. Nor will the world be stable until all people—on both sides of the Iron Curtain—enjoy the freedoms proclaimed by America's Declaration of Independence.

THE DIME DOLLAR

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, I attended the Kentucky Chamber of

Commerce luncheon at the Kentucky State Fair in Louisville, Ky.

During the luncheon, it was my pleasure to listen to an address by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and editor-publisher of the *Tulsa Tribune*.

I think it would be beneficial if each of you, my colleagues, would take time out to read this enlightening and forceful speech.

The text, entitled "The Dime Dollar," follows:

THE DIME DOLLAR

(An address by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States and Editor and Publisher, *Tulsa Tribune*)

Five score and six years ago a Kentucky boy from what is now Larue County whom his admirers called "Honest Abe" stood upon a battlefield in Pennsylvania and raised an honest question.

Abraham Lincoln wondered whether this government or any government "of the people, by the people and for the people" could long endure. His immediate concern, of course, was a civil war, brought about by the slavery issue and deep convictions over the sovereign rights of states. That issue was decided in blood.

But today we may still ask his question, and the new issue is whether a free people enjoying unprecedented prosperity will not witness the termination of both their freedoms and their prosperity through their own greed and the demagogic dishonesty of some of their elected representatives.

In short, is America going to get a dime dollar, and if it does what will it do to the American people?

A few days ago, in anticipation of this speech, I called upon the economic section of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to glean from the most reliable government sources a few statistics. I would rather bore you with some figures than leave you with a comfortable impression that perhaps I have overdrawn the problem.

In purchasing power, today's dollar is worth approximately 27 cents compared to the 1913 dollar. If we hold to the present five per cent rate of inflation the dollar 25 years from now will be worth a 1913 dime.

In the past 20 years the Consumer Price Index has gone up 52 percent, despite the fact that business profits have declined from 4.3 per cent of sales to 3.3 per cent. It is true that the average weekly earnings of a factory worker have increased far faster—135 per cent to be exact. But even this most fortunate sector of the American economy has seen its real purchasing power rise only 35 per cent after federal withholding taxes. And swelling state and local taxes have cut this net increase even more.

Productivity has gone up 69 per cent, or about half the increase of factory wages, but the average consumer is spending more and more of his income on services, and services deliver not much more per man-hour than they did in 1949. In other words, the 1969 pants presser is not much more efficient than his counterpart of 20 years ago.

Now let's look at federal spending. From fiscal 1960 through the budget estimate for the fiscal year 1970 total federal spending goes from \$92 billion to \$195 billion—an increase of 112 per cent.

Non-defense spending is up 163 per cent—from \$37 billion to \$98 billion.

The government has, naturally, been driven to borrow heavily from the citizens in order to bridge the difference between its income and its outgo. In order to command this money it has had to pay ever-increasing interest. These interest costs are locked in. They cannot be reduced, for they are promised on every government certificate. And

in the past 10 years they are up 85 per cent—from \$9 billion to \$17 billion.

In the past 10 years federal payroll costs have gone up 100 per cent. Outlays for community development and housing are up 180 per cent, health and welfare up 200 per cent, and education and manpower spending up 500 per cent.

Congressman Otto Passman of Louisiana has recently pointed out that our national debt exceeds by \$43 billion the total national debt of all other nations of the free world. Many have used our foreign aid to keep their debts low. They have, in effect, conned the American taxpayers into providing services normally chargeable to their own taxpayers.

In the past 10 years Uncle Sam has gone in the hole another \$55 billion. We roll billions off our tongues easily. But that \$55 billion amounted to chucking one \$1,000 bill out the window every six seconds, day and night, for the past 10 years. It would be a good way to draw a crowd.

Worse yet, Washington has developed a system of promising a lot more than it actually spends. Thus, future spending allocations are put beyond the reach of even the most economy-minded incoming administration.

There has been gross underestimation of the costs of many of our foot-in-the-door projects, but the theory is that no one will leave a dam half-finished or a bridge half-built.

Aside from a certain amount of guile on the part of those federal empire builders who gain both in salary and prestige from the burgeoning of their departments, it is now a fact that government is so big that it tends to get away from even the most sincere administrators.

Louis Cassels of UPI recently made a month-long study of federal budget and spending practices. He obtained estimates, from within government itself, that a minimum of \$10 billion and perhaps as high as \$30 billion of the \$200 billion federal budget is utterly wasted.

The Senate Government Operations Committee recently found 10 agencies dealing in manpower programs; 18 in improving the natural environment and 20 in health. Congressman William Roth of Delaware interviewed agencies for eight months and found 1,050 separate programs providing money to states, cities, institutions or individuals. For higher education, alone, funds are spent through 21 separate agencies.

Obviously, if we're ever going to get government expenditures under control again we are going to have to cool down this onupmanship between rival and competing agencies trying to do the same thing. We are going to have to appropriate for functions, to make an estimate of what the nation can afford to spend in such broad areas as defense, housing, medicare, conservation, education, highways, etc., and then divide these outlays among the agencies best equipped to handle them. At the present time we are trying to meet agency requests without sufficient regard for the nation's resources and the performance record of the agencies.

All of us who put a charge on our products or our services cut ourselves in on the incomes of those who buy what we make or hire us for what we can do. Most of us have competition. We are limited in what we can charge by what the competition charges. If our prices or fees get out of line we run up against diminishing returns.

This is as it should be. The antitrust laws were passed, for example, to keep combinations of manufacturers from monopolizing manufacture and setting unreasonable prices. Government regulatory agencies were set up to prevent utilities and transportation companies from overpricing essential services where there is no competition.

But under the Wagner Act labor unions were exempted from antitrust action. And

the National Labor Relations Board, which is supposed to be an impartial body, has behaved more and more like an agency of the unions.

As a result, one part of the checks and balances theoretically inherent in free enterprise isn't working. The tight monopoly of the building trades unions in many areas has kited the price of construction out of sight. We are seeking \$9-an-hour plumbers and \$10-an-hour brick masons. We see the national economy wracked as the parts of the nation are periodically tied up by dockers and maritime union members. Some of these strikes are designed not to improve wages and working conditions, but to levy penalties against new technologies which would cheapen the cost of shipping for every consumer.

A pistol to the head is not collective bargaining.

The union leadership is not acting irrationally. It is hard for a business agent to counsel moderation if he knows that some member will arise at the back of the hall and say, "Elect me—I can get you more." It is natural that union leadership would press for monopoly, for the right to discipline the membership by levying heavy and capricious fines, for the elimination of state right-to-work laws and the reimposition of the privilege of the secondary boycott.

It does no good to point fingers of scorn at this behavior because a lot of business would behave just about the same way if there were no restraints on cartels, price-fixing and collusion.

But the fact remains that as long as rigged market can be maintained in labor due to special privilege granted for political advantage it will be possible for certain wages to far exceed productivity. This forces up prices and feeds inflation.

Occasionally you hear a cry of anguish that the only solution is to reimpose wartime wage and price controls. These have certainly proven necessary when a nation bends all its effort toward all-out war production. But every nation that has maintained these controls in peacetime has tasted the bitter tea of corruption, black-marketing, idiotic shortages and poor quality goods.

A free market is the only market that is in perpetual adjustment to consumer demands. Free markets are simply weakened by monopoly. And a union labor monopoly is no holier than any other.

While we are looking for parties guilty of hastening the erosion of the dollar let us look at ourselves—we chamber of commerce types—for, alas, we are human, too.

We want good things for our cities and, many of these good things cannot be built without heavy federal subsidies. Over the past 30 years the decision-making process governing major city improvements has gradually gravitated to Washington.

Tick them over. Who gets an interstate highway without federal funds? Who gets an expressway? Who gets urban renewal and slum clearance? See how dependent our local universities and colleges have become on federal grants. And our hospitals. We all want bigger and better airports, and who provides subsidies for longer runways and better navigation aids?

Federal taxes have removed much of any city's wealth to Washington, and chambers of commerce struggle to get some of it back. We are acutely conscious that, if Louisville doesn't rattle the tin cup, Long Beach, Las Vegas or Little Rock will get the dough.

We are inclined to judge the quality of our senators and congressmen, not on how well they have thought out solutions to the nation's problems, but on how much chicken and gravy they've brought home.

We in chambers of commerce are going to have to exercise a little self-discipline ourselves. We are in a poor position to yawp about the destruction of the currency as long as we reward best those public servants who have been most willing to loot the treasury.

If we want to save the dollar we're going to have to stretch out our gimmies. We are going to have to be willing to wait another six months for the new bridge and maybe a year for the new hospital wing. And we're going to have to get the word to Washington.

For we in the business community are supposed to be more sophisticated about economic realities than any other general class of citizens. And if we don't demonstrate some prudent regard for America's future, who will?

I speak of America's future. I mean it. There is no such thing as a bankrupt great nation. There is no such thing as a flowering civilization, in industry, in the arts, in the sciences and humanities, if it has swept away the savings of its people.

One of the cruel ironies of our present crisis is that much of the damage has been done in the name of the "welfare state." They called it the "Great Society"—remember?

What welfare is there in old-age pensions paid off in potato chips? What social security is there in a carefully accumulated life insurance program that matures in dust? What honesty is there in government bonds that you eventually might light your cigar with, if you could find a cigar?

This is no uncharted road. The trail of history is lined with the bleached bones of social systems that imagined that prosperity and a money supply are synonymous. This is Pancho Villa economics. But long before poor Pancho worked the Mexican printing presses day and night in an honest effort to make all peons rich, the fallacies were plain.

And the ruination of workers is the surest result. People with cash reserves can find some hedges while the currency still has value. They can rush to buy lands or diamonds or foreign currencies. It is the man who depends upon his weekly paycheck who goes over the falls first and drops the farthest.

Out of the ruination usually comes a loss of liberties. During the great French inflation of the 1790s the desperate Paris mobs, finding their wages would buy no bread, hurled the original authors of the French Revolution to their own guillotines and welcomed the man on horseback, the dictator from Corsica.

The German inflation of the 1920s destroyed what faith and hope the Germans had in democratic processes. When the gentlemen bearing the swastika blamed it all on the Jews and said that Germans must submit to harsh disciplines in order to gain the glory that was rightly theirs, we all know what happened.

This is a very great country with very great economic strength. It is also a country blessed by rich resources and a skilled and energetic citizenry. America can have a high degree of general prosperity, a generous uplift program for the ignorant poor, and adequate charity for the unendowed. We can have all this and a sound dollar, too. But we must start listening to the Geiger counters.

Our economy is like an atomic pile. The heat is rising. The Geiger counters are growing noisier. But we are still some distance from the runaway, uncontrollable reaction that will produce utter disaster. We still have time to drive in the graphite rods and will control the fission and deliver, not explosion, but useful energy.

The gentleman from what was Hardin County, who made the great speech at Gettysburg, said that government conceived in liberty was being tested.

That government survived the particular test he had in mind. It has survived many great tests since then. But, beginning with Lord Thomas Macaulay, many political philosophies have wondered whether democracy doesn't carry with it the seeds of its own destruction, whether the people will be able to resist indefinitely the temptation to debauch the currency.

This is the great test of 1969. The integrity of Americans is now on trial.

Let no one tell you that the cure for our recent follies will be painless. Let no one tell you that we can turn away from our money jag without withdrawal symptoms, without some squeeze and crunch.

But we must choose between some pain now or agony later.

If we are not honest with ourselves—if we remain carried away by greed—then this great pile could blow.

HEROISM IN CLOSE COMBAT EARNS AWARD FOR MARYLAND GI

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, S. Sgt. Gene Moses, a fine young man from Maryland was recently awarded the Bronze Star with "V" Device for his heroism in Vietnam. I wish to honor his courage by including the following article in the RECORD:

HEROISM IN CLOSE COMBAT EARNS AWARD FOR LOCAL GI

The bravery and devotion to duty of a Bel Air soldier have earned for him the the Bronze Star Medal for Heroism, with "V" device.

Staff Sergeant Gene W. Moses, the son of Emma Johnson of Bel Air, was cited recently for his actions of May 16 in the vicinity of Bong Son, Vietnam.

His actions in leading a reconnaissance patrol were credited with leading to the deaths of 47 enemy personnel, and a number of wounded. In addition, he shot and killed one enemy soldier himself, and, when his gun suddenly jammed, used his survival knife to kill two other enemy soldiers whom he faced.

In a note to his mother, Sgt. Moses commented, "I got lucky, that's all. I sure hope I keep on having 'luck' on my side."

The official reason for the citation was explained in a Department of Army announcement:

"For heroism in connection with military operations against a hostile force near Landing Zone English, in the vicinity of Bong Son, Republic of Vietnam. On May 16, 1969 SSG Moses was leading Team 3, a six man reconnaissance patrol, when they suddenly spotted nine enemy soldiers all heavily armed approaching their position.

"A closer observation revealed that the nine enemy soldiers were the point element of a NVA reinforced company. SSG Moses instructed the assistant team leader Sgt. Husman to move the other team members further down the trail and to set up a hasty ambush while he stayed in position to call and adjust artillery fire on the advancing NVA company.

"With the artillery fire and the aid of Huey Cobras and gunships the NVA company was surprised and completely disorganized with a devastating and suppressive barrage of fire. Upon seeing that the enemy company was withdrawing with heavy casualties SSG Moses moved back to help his team who had already engaged the point element of the NVA company. Rounding a bend in the trail SSG Moses ran into three fleeing enemy soldiers who had managed to break out of the ambush set up by his team members. SSG Moses shot and killed one enemy soldier right off and then took cover.

"At this time his weapon became jammed and would not fire, he then took out his survival knife, charged and killed the two re-

maining enemy soldiers. A sweep of the area later on in the day confirmed 47 enemy killed in action to include the nine killed by the small reconnaissance patrol lead by SSG Moses, and numerous blood trails gave evidence of a large number were wounded.

"SSG Moses' complete devotion to duty and personal bravery were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army."

ARE THE CITIES TRAPPED IN THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FUNDING GAP?

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an excellent publication of the National League of Cities, which describes the difficulties faced by our cities in fighting pollution—not only air and water pollution, but also the "audible pollutant"—noise. I refer to the current issue of Nation's Cities, the official monthly magazine of the National League of Cities. I highly recommend the entire issue. Even a glance at the titles of the articles or a quick skim through the magazine makes it clear that our cities are already working hard to combat pollution and are constantly developing new techniques for pollution control.

You may remember that back in 1965 when we passed the Water Quality Act, the National League of Cities was among its strong supporters. Even though this act set water quality standards to be met within a prescribed time limit and thus required local commitment and investment, still the cities were strongly behind it. They recognized the problem, acknowledged their responsibility, and have invested millions of local dollars in water pollution control. But now many of our cities face fiscal crises. Up against their debt limits, paying more in interest than in principal on municipal bonds for pollution control facilities, our cities need our help. They are not demanding new Federal authorizations; they merely ask that we honor the promise we made

in 1966 when we passed the Clean Water Restoration Act.

The lead article in September's Nation's Cities, entitled "Art the Cities Trapped in the Water Pollution Control Funding Gap?" points out the dilemma faced by our cities as a result of Congress' unwillingness to appropriate the funds authorized in the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. The cities have made—and continue to make large contributions to the effort, but they cannot do it alone. Congress must act. I urge my colleagues to read this article and to support full funding of \$1 billion for Federal grants for construction of waste treatment facilities.

The text of the article follows:

ARE THE CITIES TRAPPED IN THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FUNDING GAP?

(By Raymond L. Bancroft)

Hopes were high back in 1966 when the Congress approved the Clean Waters Restoration Act. NATION'S CITIES called it "one of the 89th Congress' most sweeping accomplishments."

And indeed it was. The act called for a steady and steep rise in federal assistance for sewage treatment facility construction—from \$150 million in fiscal 1967 to \$450 million in 1968, \$700 million in 1969, \$1 billion in 1970, and \$1.25 billion in 1971. Financially hard-pressed cities and counties were enthusiastic about the prospects of really being able—with increased federal help—to meet the water quality standards then being drafted by state water agencies under the Water Quality Act of 1965.

While the lofty money authorization levels set in the 1966 act remain intact, however, the appropriations to match them have not been made by Congress. In fact, as the table on page 8 shows, the appropriations from fiscal year 1967 through 1970 (including \$214 million asked for '70) total \$781 million, only a third of the \$2.3 billion authorized. Construction grant officials in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration said in July that applications for non-existent funds continue to pile up. A total of 4,648 applications for construction grants are now languishing in FWPCA regional offices or in state water pollution bureaus.

The result of the lag in federal funds for wastewater construction projects naturally has "put the burden back on the localities" to pay for needed projects, says Robert Canham, acting executive secretary of the Water Pollution Control Federation, a national association representing both industry and government.

1968 MUNICIPAL WASTE TERRITORY¹

Size of place, 1960 census	Primary treatment			Secondary treatment			No treatment	
	Total plants	Communities identifiable	Population served	Total plants	Communities identifiable	Population served	Communities	Population served
Unknown.....	112	65	6,284,805	643	302	8,049,603	15	271,725
Under 500.....	261	239	587,361	1,231	1,117	1,820,942	252	79,640
500 to 1,000.....	355	338	249,101	1,422	1,344	1,322,214	333	228,444
1,000 to 2,500.....	623	550	980,302	2,160	1,945	3,422,129	491	685,556
2,500 to 5,000.....	368	318	1,110,813	1,329	1,103	4,325,341	215	704,898
5,000 to 10,000.....	279	239	2,532,269	961	781	5,763,512	143	1,649,878
10,000 to 25,000.....	242	211	3,453,900	771	519	8,875,655	82	1,354,855
25,000 to 50,000.....	106	83	3,063,100	258	166	6,588,635	25	839,075
50,000 to 100,000.....	48	41	3,374,220	158	74	6,192,422	14	1,071,710
100,000 to 250,000.....	35	18	3,419,215	97	39	6,604,168	8	1,224,070
250,000 to 500,000.....	17	9	3,307,525	76	10	4,200,285	2	858,905
Over 500,000.....	22	6	15,372,410	77	9	18,620,880	2	2,305,900
Total.....	2,468	2,117	43,735,021	9,183	7,399	75,785,786	1,582	11,274,656

¹Includes 1962 rather than 1968 conditions for the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Iowa, and Arkansas.

Source: "The Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact," vol. 1, 1969 (preliminary data). Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

"This whole situation has tended to lead to a lack of confidence by local and state officials in what federal aid levels will be," Canham adds. "The states are recognizing the problem where it counts . . . through their taxpayers with the expectation of federal assistance later."

The fact that municipalities and states are taking up the slack in waste treatment facility building left by inadequate federal assistance is borne out in a new WPCF publication, *Water Pollution Control Facts*.

"The influence of the federal grants program for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities, even at its \$214-million per year level, assures the proper encouragement of construction by municipalities," the report states. "Witness the 1968 increase over 1967; it showed a 20 per cent increase for a total of \$1.35 billion, despite the fact that the level of federal grants funds did not increase. Fiscal 1970 continues at the \$214 million level, the same as fiscal 1969. At least this will keep up the momentum."

Canham, however, wonders what will happen to the fight against water pollution when the 1966 act's current authorization expires in fiscal 1971, particularly if increased federal appropriations aren't forthcoming.

"The whole effort is bound to suffer," he says.

In advocating that Congress appropriate the full \$1 billion authorized for fiscal 1970 construction grants, the National League of Cities has pointed out the bind in which many cities will find themselves if they cannot get federal assistance.

"Local improvements must be made since the act provides for enforcement through the Courts," said NLC President C. Beverly Briley, Mayor of Nashville, in a letter to President Nixon urging his support of the full appropriation.

"Local units will be compelled to proceed with major improvements and expenditures whether or not the federal government meets its obligations. The sad product will be that cities will be forced to clean up the waterways but will do so at the expense of improving housing, education, and other critical local needs which draw upon the same resource base."

Already communities in Pennsylvania, Missouri, Florida, California, and New Jersey have faced state-imposed restrictions on future residential and commercial construction because of water pollution problems.

But many observers, including the NLC, feel it is unfair for cities to be forced to comply with water quality standards while many are not able to financially meet them because Congress has failed to appropriate funds already authorized.

Mayor Briley urged the Administration to either support efforts to get full appropriations or, if this is not possible, to modify the schedule of compliance to permit cities a longer period of time in which to meet water quality standards.

The primary reason for lack of adequate federal financing of the 1966 Clean Waters Restoration Act is the same given for other domestic program appropriation lags: the Vietnam War. Under prodding from the budget cutters, the Administration has sent Congress an alternative plan for financing waste treatment plant construction. Under the plan, the Secretary of the Interior could enter into contracts up to 30 years in length with a local or state government to pay the federal share of the costs of treatment plants. This means larger bond issues would have to be floated and the locality or state would have to pick up the interest on the federal share. Federal payments to the state or local government would be made up to 30 years to cover that U.S. share. The National Leagues of Cities and other groups representing local governments are opposed to the plan. "We think it stinks," said one NLC staffer.

As Joe G. Moore, Jr., the former commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control

Administration, expressed it at a conference earlier this year:

"Congress . . . will again this year wrestle with the problem of how to provide additional funds for the construction of waste treatment facilities without appropriating money."

David D. Dominick, Moore's successor, expresses disappointment at the length of time it took to get the alternate financing proposal to Congress. But, he adds, "we must make the best of a tight budget situation because right now we are lagging in the fight for clean water."

Dominick's FWPCA is caught in the middle of the financing dilemma. It pushed hard for an appropriation of \$600 million for construction grants in the proposed 1970 budget but the Bureau of the Budget chopped that request to \$214 million, the same as that appropriated in 1969.

"It is most important that we keep every effort in Washington to keep faith with the states that have already begun construction on their own," Dominick says. "We must keep faith with the municipalities which need additional financial assistance in order to meet the water quality standards to which they have agreed."

FWPCA officials in the field also feel the pinch of congressional promises in the light of funding realities. Richard A. Vanderhoof, director of FWPCA's Ohio Basin Region, notes the "clearly incompatible" nature of water quality standards and the funds available to meet them.

"We're making progress in water pollution control if everyone would stand still," Vanderhoof says. "But we must run faster. The combination of industrial growth and municipal growth almost puts us in a position of status quo, particularly with the level of funds we have available."

Although it is generally agreed that there is a whopping backlog of unmet sewage treatment needs in the U.S. (a 1967 FWPCA estimate put the total at \$8 billion to provide secondary treatment for most of the urban population), the 1969 edition of FWPCA's *The Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact* comes up with a much smaller backlog estimate of less than \$2 billion.

"Only a fault in basic assumptions or a significant change in circumstances can account for the variation found to exist between various estimates of the cost of water pollution and control," the agency report says.

"It may be argued," the report continues, "that the concept underlying almost every cost estimate that has been made—that is, the idea of a fixed backlog—is no longer a valid assumption in light of the current status of waste treatment as reflected in the 1968 Municipal Waste Inventory."

"Water pollution is a process as well as a condition. It is dynamic in its occurrence; fluctuating in its circumstances. So water pollution control must be flexible in its approaches; and time forms an essential element in estimates of its cost."

"This document [the report], then, views the municipal costs of water pollution control within a context of dynamism. It gropes with the question of determining an appropriate rate of investment rather than establishing a final cost of water pollution control. In substituting the dynamic view of the static one, it recognizes the disagreeable fact that pollution control will continue to require expenditures, that pollution cannot be ended by spending any single sum. It loses something in apparent precision. It is felt, however, that the view compensates for any lack of definition by bringing us closer to a manageable statement of real conditions."

"The changed way of looking at things imposes a broader view and forces recognition of problems in relating federal programs to events in such a way that the

programs will not be out of date or mis-scaled by the time they are initiated. While all the ramifications of the approach are not understood, analyses now being undertaken can be expected to yield some insights over the coming year. These may be useful in recasting legislation after the expiration of current authorization in fiscal year 1971."

The FWPCA report also points out that new treatment plant investments are fairly close to the estimated need for construction and that rates of investment for interceptors and outfalls are very close to the level of indicated requirement. "But sewer, replacement, and expansion shortcomings seem to be developing," it adds. "Since 1963 the construction of new waste treatment plants has been declining relative to the other major categories of investment that qualify for FWPCA construction grants—replacements, additions, and installation of interceptor sewers."

But the FWPCA notes that the decline in new treatment projects should not be a surprise. An "enormous number" of new plants—more than 7,500—have been built between 1952 and 1967 and the great majority of the population with sewers now receives some sort of waste treatment.

Since only four cities over 250,000 population (Honolulu, New Orleans, Memphis, and parts of New York City) remain available for initial waste treatment investments, the coming investment in new plants is concentrated in small towns. The FWPCA report says communities under 10,000 population now account for almost half of the dollar value of investment for new waste treatment plants, up from slightly more than a third during the 1952-55 period.

Estimates from the states in their program plans indicate that municipal waste handling investments over the 1969 through 1973 period will amount to about \$6 billion, roughly equal to that spent over the past five years, the FWPCA report says. It is very likely that spending for upgrading, expansion, and replacement needs in 1969 will exceed the outlays for new plant investments. "There seem to be great expansion and replacement needs in cities of all sizes," the report notes.

Adding to this trend will be the need for advanced waste treatment to meet the stricter state water quality control standards. Tertiary or advanced waste treatment is a state goal for many Indiana communities by 1977, is contemplated for some Ohio towns, is being phased into the Chicago system, and is planned for part of Long Island. Construction costs zoom upward for advanced treatment facilities.

The need for advanced treatment, the increased emphasis on upgrading operational efficiency, and the need to raise operator wages will increase operating and maintenance costs of municipal waste treatment plants "very sharply in the immediate future," the FWPCA report notes. Already these operating and maintenance costs total \$150 million to \$200 million a year, a doubling in the last decade.

In summarizing its findings, the FWPCA concludes:

"It would appear, then, that there may be a substantial gap opening between the amount the nation expects to spend—as measured by state program plans and by the level of federal construction grant appropriations—and the amount that will be required to complete the connection of all sewer places to waste treatment plants and to expand, replace, and upgrade treatment where it now exists."

"The fact that the states as a group anticipate programs that will involve a level of spending very close to that of the last six years is a cause for major concern, despite the major accomplishments of the last six years."

"The findings of this report show that investment requirements imposed by new

plant construction, expansion, replacement and upgrading of plants, accelerating acceptance of industrial wastes in the municipal plant, increasing levels of waste reduction being required, and the fact that a very significant portion of needed new investment occurs in precisely those places where cost experience in the past has been highest, will all result in pressing capital requirements upward significantly for many years."

INFLATION FIGHT DRAWS BLOOD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that a great adverse effect of inflation is felt by the situation affecting our domestic scene as well as our international trade relations.

An editorial in the Saturday, September 6 Chicago Daily News very succinctly comments on the fight of the Nixon administration to control inflation:

INFLATION FIGHT DRAWS BLOOD

President Nixon's 75-percent cutback on new federal government construction suggests that the inflation problem remains his foremost concern. The sooner it becomes so to the majority of congressmen, the better will be the chances of building an effective defense.

The explosion of protest in Chicago over an order that will, for example, hold the 45-story federal office building project on dead center illustrates how painful even this small dose of medicine can be. Chicago congressmen promptly—and rightly—wail that the cutback will cost the city money and jobs, including jobs of minority groups who need them badly. They also argue—again rightly—that construction costs next year will probably be substantially higher than they are now.

But that comes around to Mr. Nixon's point: How is it possible, without a painful economic wrench, ever to put a halt to the rising inflationary spiral that threatens to end in a devastating national economy collapse? There is no painless way.

The House of Representatives, of course, should have borne this in mind when it wrote its new bill providing tax relief for millions of citizens. That is precisely the wrong tactic in a situation where a key problem is public buying pressure driving up prices.

Yet the President was bound to invoke opposition jeers and catcalls when (as he has now done) he offered a new proposal to rescind those cuts while giving a bit of relief to corporations to offset the jolt repeal of the 7-percent investment credit will bring.

We hope the returning Congress will leave off grandstanding and turn its serious attention to braking a rampant economy that has so far resisted every effort to slack its pace. Unless this is done, there is disaster ahead for everyone.

A LEAF FROM THE MILITARY BOOK

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1948 President Truman took a significant step toward assuring this Nation's goal of

racial equity by issuing an Executive order that henceforth, any and all discriminatory practices in the military would cease. Since that time, our Military Establishment has proceeded to prove quietly and without fanfare that all Americans, whatever their origin, can live and work together in harmony and friendship. As a former marine, I am particularly proud of the record of progress in the Marine Corps.

But the military, some 3,000,000 strong, are drawn from all segments of our society, and inevitably, some of the racial turmoil which has beset us in the past few years has surfaced in the ranks of recent recruits. Young, black Americans entering service are clearly aware of minority rights, and are less patient and more assertive. As a result, some instances of conflict have been occurring at military installations, marring the record of 20 years of peaceful coexistence. In one instance, a life was lost.

Any life foreshortened by needless and misplaced passions is tragic. But by giving disproportionate prominence to the problems that our society as a whole has bequeathed the military, we are doing a disservice to the efforts of enlightened and intelligent military leaders who are dedicated, as few others can claim to be, to the proposition that all men are created equal.

They have been proving for more than a generation what the rest of us have been trying to prove since America was founded, that equality for all really works. We could all take a leaf from the military book.

With this in mind, I call my colleagues' attention to a message recently directed to all marines by their Commandant, Gen. Leonard F. Chapman. Evenhandedly, he notes recent conflicts; evenhandedly, actions are directed to bring about a solution. Above all, evenhandedly, justice is dispensed in the finest traditions of our country and our military.

Marine Gen. Leonard F. Chapman's message follows:

NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

(Released by L. F. Chapman, Jr.)

During the past several months there have been instances among marines of violence and other unacceptable actions which apparently stem from racial differences. Such problems are almost unheard of among marines in combat. It is when marines move to other areas or return to the United States that these differences arise. And it is there where acts of violence between marines are occurring, acts which cannot be tolerated, and must stop.

I do not believe that the recent events are typical. In fact, literally thousands of marines have quietly made the adjustment from combat, and capably served stern and demanding tours of duty, in a national atmosphere where expressions of appreciation for their services are hard to find. It is evident, however, that despite our substantial progress toward racial parity, difficulties of a significant nature do exist in our corps.

It is now and has long been our policy in the Marine Corps that discrimination in any form is not tolerated. It has similarly been our policy that a fighting organization such as ours must have a solid foundation of firm, impartial discipline. It is in the context of these two basic policies that we must take measures to dispel the racial problems that currently exist.

We may argue that the underlying causes of our racial difficulties parallel those of the Nation at large, but the fact remains that they are real, and they can adversely affect the military effectiveness of our corps. We must seek in every manner possible to improve understanding among all marines, stressing the concept that we are a band of comrades in arms, a loyal fraternity with a traditional esprit that spans an era of nearly two hundred years. The truly integrated spirit that pervades on the battlefield, must pervade in the barracks and on liberty as well. The causes of friction, rather than the symptoms, must be identified by all commanders, frankly and openly discussed, and eliminated where possible. Positive and overt efforts to eradicate every trace of discrimination, whether intentional or not, must be continued. Actions or influences that tend to arouse antagonism between fellow marines must be combated. Every marine must understand that the Marine Corps does guarantee equal rights, equal opportunity, and equal protection, without regard to race, and will continue to do so. We take care of our own, continuing to recognize, as the foundation of our corps, the importance, integrity, and dignity of the individual marine.

Equally vital, each Marine must understand why the Marine Corps has always demanded the highest standards in military appearance, military courtesy, and proficiency, and why we will continue to do so. These high standards breed pride, and pride, in turn, builds the kind of discipline that is essential to battlefield success with minimum casualties. These qualities have always been the hallmark of Marines and no relaxation in our proven high standards will be condoned. For example, uniforms will be worn correctly with no non-regulation items in evidence; haircuts will conform to regulations, no more, no less; proper military salutes will be rendered on appropriate occasions; the highest quality of professionalism must be exhibited in every assignment; breaches of good order and discipline will be dealt with fairly, expeditiously, and firmly. This is especially true for those Marines who instigate or execute violence against their fellow Marines.

It is the responsibility of the officers and staff NCOs to provide the leadership and set the example for those junior to them, particularly for the combat veterans who have had little experience in other duties. We must demonstrate that leadership responsibilities demand after-hours availability and supervision. I cannot improve upon the expression of principles of leadership and the relations between officers, staff NCOs and men as they are written in the Marine Corps manual. If these were conscientiously carried out, many of our problems would disappear.

Some complaints about discrimination I have heard appear to be valid, but many are based on rumor or misapprehension. Nevertheless, some Marines believe them to be true. Most are concerned with promotions, military justice, duty assignments, and request mast. It is essential that all commanders learn of these erroneous beliefs and systematically and continuously inform their men of the facts. Commanders and staff NCOs must communicate with their men, and see that they get the straight word, so that trust in the corps can be restored to those who doubt.

To come to grips with the problem of racial friction, the following actions will be immediately undertaken:

A. The contents of this message will at once be read and explained to all Marines, except to those in combat, by immediate commanding officers personally.

B. All officers and NCOs will review the complete contents of the Department of the Navy's manual on equal opportunity and treatment of military personnel.

C. All officers and staff NCOs will read, carefully absorb, and practice the contents of

that section of the Marine Corps manual dealing with military leadership.

D. Every commanding officer will review his request mast procedures to ensure that all Marines understand clearly their right to air their grievances without hindrance or prejudice. I emphasize that no harassment, either real or implied, will be permitted to occur at any level between the individual requesting mast and the commander with whom he is requesting mast. Individuals may request mast with any commanding officer/commanding general in their chain of command at their base or location. I want to insure that channels of communications between every marine and his commanding officer are open, that every marine understands that they are open, and that legitimate grievances will receive sympathetic consideration and rapid response.

E. Commanders will permit the Afro/natural haircut providing it conforms with current Marine Corps regulations.

F. No actions, signs, symbols, gestures, and words which are contrary to tradition will be permitted during formations or when rendering military courtesies to colors, the national anthem, or individuals. Individual signs between groups or individuals will be accepted for what they are—gestures of recognition and unity; in this connection, it is Marine Corps policy that, while such actions are to be discouraged, they are nevertheless expressions of individual belief and are not, in themselves, prohibited. However, they are grounds for disciplinary action if executed during official ceremonies or in a manner suggesting direct defiance of duly constituted authority.

G. Each commander will review his promotion procedures to verify their fairness and emphasis on merit and potential, and will correct any errors that may have been made in the past, in accordance with current regulations.

H. Commanding generals and commanding officers will immediately, conscientiously, and persistently execute the general and specific provisions of this message, and report progress to me from time to time through the chain of command. This message is applicable to the Marine Corps Reserve.

BETTER APPROACH NEEDED TO END WAR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week's fizzling "peace offensive" by the Nixon administration does not appear to make much sense. Whatever its intent—and that may be something we do not learn about for some time—the slipshod bombing halt-start figures to be a setback rather than a move toward eventual settlement in Vietnam.

Once again, the quick shift on bombing indicates the polarities separating the persons who are interested in achieving peace through mutual compromises and the militarists—both American and Asian—who seek peace only through battlefield victory.

Hopefully, last week's abortive grasp for peace can be shunted aside as just a bad show, and the administration can still attempt some meaningful methods of stopping the needless slaughter in Vietnam. Recent reports do present some evidence that Hanoi might be willing to push on toward settlement if we took

some new stances regarding the degree of troop withdrawal and support of the Thieu-Ky regime.

Mr. Speaker, my file continues to thicken with reports detailing the current turmoil over peace maneuvers by both Washington and Hanoi, and I now submit four of those articles for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1969]
B-52 HALT WAS "SIGNAL" THAT BACKFIRED AT HOME

(By Murray Marder)

President Nixon's puzzling on-off halt to B-52 bombing in South Vietnam was intended as a signal of "flexibility" for Hanoi in shaping its post-Ho Chi Minh strategy.

The halt, which the White House officially denies was a signal to achieve a direct response, already appears to have misfired domestically, by arousing bafflement about the President's purposes in ordering the 36-hour suspension. The White House top command, concentrated for weeks on the West Coast and looking at the United States from that perspective, acted stunned by the immediate reaction, in the American press and in Saigon.

Whether the intended signal similarly will misfire or pay off in North Vietnam is still open to question.

The United States has handed North Vietnam at least a short-range propaganda argument to attack U.S. policy. Experts expect that Hanoi and the Vietcong, in any event, are likely to assail the 36-hour bombing pause as another example of American "trickery," which they say was repeatedly practiced by President Johnson.

Administration strategists also may find that they have whipped up just the kind of ferment of domestic attacks on U.S. Vietnam policy that they privately have credited themselves with avoiding throughout the summer.

There were some surface indications yesterday that because of the public bafflement created by the B-52 sequence President Nixon now may feel obliged to speak out quickly on his Vietnam policy, probably with a new decision on additional U.S. troop withdrawals.

Speculation, but no firm evidence, increased that the President may make a Vietnam statement before his scheduled address on Thursday to the United Nations General Assembly.

But the official response yesterday was "no comment" to all further inquiries about the B-52 affair or about the President's extensive policy review Friday with his Vietnam advisers.

There are strong reasons to believe that by the B-52 pause the administration wanted to accomplish something more than simply measure North Vietnam's combat "intentions" following the Communist-called cease-fire to mourn the death of North Vietnam's President Ho. Diplomatic sources generally took that official explanation with a massive dose of skepticism.

UNSTATED GOAL

The unstated U.S. objective is understood to be that President Nixon especially wanted to signal North Vietnam, at this particular time, that all subjects in the war, including the B-52 raids, are negotiable with the sole exception, as he has said before, of the South Vietnamese people's "right to self-determination."

On July 30, the President proclaimed, during his visit to Saigon:

"We have gone as far now as we can or should go in opening the door to peace, and now it is time for the other side to respond."

That statement created an impression of rigidity. There is no sign that the administration wants to retract or amend it. But the administration, it is understood, does want

to remove the aura of immobility attached to it, both for domestic and diplomatic purposes.

As far as North Vietnam is concerned, the President evidently wanted to signal Hanoi's leaders that what it repeatedly denounces as "mass massacres" and "terror raids" by the B-52s can be ended—for a so far unstated bargaining price. To have said so directly to North Vietnam, however, could expose the United States to the charge of "ultimatum" or "blackmail."

To have said so aloud also could have exposed the President to intense opposition from South Vietnam's government and the U.S. military establishment, which still privately criticize President Johnson's decision to halt the bombing of North Vietnam last Nov. 1 as an unfortunate giveaway. The four-delegation Paris talks which that action produced are trapped in stalemate.

In addition, there is already some South Vietnamese suspicion that in ordering the B-52 halt, the United States may have received some secret overture from North Vietnam that it withheld from Saigon. U.S. sources deny there was any "signal" from Hanoi to which the President was responding.

Cumulatively, therefore, the risks arising from the brief B-52 halt are large and the returns so far are indistinguishable. The administration, however, is operating on the premise that the returns cannot yet be measured.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1969]
VIETNAM REVIEW OPPORTUNE BECAUSE OF EUPHORIC POLICY

(By Joseph Kraft)

The top-level Vietnam review now getting under way at the White House could hardly have come at a more opportune time. For over the past few months, the administration's central lines of policy have sunk from sight in a miasmic atmosphere compounded by unavowed euphoria and the illusion that all things are possible.

In the absence of clear policy lines there has been muddling galore. Far from being in position to react to the death of Ho Chi Minh the administration is in fact back at square one. It needs to block out fundamental policy on Vietnam—especially on the key issue of troop withdrawal.

Part of the euphoria arises from field reports. From Gen. Creighton Abrams on down, the U.S. command in Saigon asserts that the enemy is on the run and is scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, back for consultation, has been telling everybody that success in the pacification program is causing the other side's political infrastructure to wither away.

On top of these reports come highly favorable assessments of domestic opinion. The administration does not think the anti-Vietnam students are going to give it a hard time this fall. As one official puts it:

"The kids could call Johnson and Humphrey 'phony liberals' and there would be a reaction. But they can't call Nixon a 'phony liberal.' They don't relate to him at all. So there won't be much of a fuss."

What results from these assessments is a mood of unarticulated confidence easier to feel than to describe. Nobody says flat out that the war is won or even that a little persistence will see it through. The word-eating forced by events upon the Johnson administration has caused officials to hold their tongues.

But actions betray what words do not. And the Nixon administration, in case after case, has been acting as though it did not have to have a firm policy, as though it was enough to let events take their course, as though all options were open, all things possible.

Take the matter of troop withdrawal. There were internal differences when it came time to announce a second cut last month. The

command in Saigon did not want to ease pressure. So rather than enforce the issue, the President postponed a decision.

Then there was the matter of the battle-field truce called by the other side after the death of Ho Chi Minh. If only for propaganda purposes, it would have been useful for Washington to accept the truce, and call for extension to a general cease-fire. But since nobody in the administration cared enough to push the issue, President Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam seized the moment to reject the truce. The best the administration could then retrieve was a lame offer to scale down combat activities contingent on reduction by the other side.

Lastly, there has been the matter of the New South Vietnamese Cabinet of Premier Tran Thien Kham. Instead of reflecting a broadening of political base, it expresses a concentration power in the hands of a tiny, unrepresentative clique. But nobody in the administration was concerned enough even to emit a squeak. On the contrary, Ambassador Bunker blandly promised that the new team would be particularly "effective"—as if effectiveness was interchangeable with broad political support.

In fact, the unspoken optimism behind these inactions is not well-founded. North Vietnam, far from being at the bottom of the manpower barrel, has its regular army virtually intact. Any time the other side wants to take big casualties, it can, in one or two nights of attacks wipe out virtually all the recent progress made in pacification.

As to public opinion, it may well be that the students will not kick up an important fuss this fall. But Mr. Nixon's right-wing supporters are soon going to be pushing him hard on their favorite theme of win or get out. As the President put it in his eulogy of Senator Dirksen: "Friends are not always... allies."

Thus there is an urgent requirement—a requirement that goes far beyond the death of Ho Chi Minh—for the President to take the Vietnam issue in hand. There is a need to assert, far more explicitly than ever before, that the United States is not going to fight the Vietnamese war indefinitely.

There are many ways to make that point. But the best way to deliver the message—the way that will be heard in Hanoi, Saigon, Paris and across this country—is to order a troop withdrawal that goes well beyond the trifling figures of 30,000 or 40,000 talked about in the past.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1969]
PRESIDENT FACES A WIDENING SPLIT BETWEEN
GENERALS, AIDES ON WAR

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The quiet but rising pressure by the generals for a military instead of political solution to the Vietnam war was dramatically evident in a recent private luncheon on Capitol Hill.

Guest of honor was Gen. William Westmoreland, formerly top U.S. commander in Vietnam and now chief of staff of the Army. His hosts were several congressmen—headed by Rep. Olin (Texas) Teague of Texas, Democratic chairman of the House Veterans Committee and a hawk.

Westmoreland was careful to say nothing critical of President Nixon and the Nixon plan to withdraw U.S. combat troops as fast as they can be replaced by South Vietnamese. That plan was the brainchild of Westmoreland's boss, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

But when the dishes were cleared and the coffee poured, the general's hosts asked hard questions, specifically whether the war could be won if all restraints were removed from the U.S. military. Westmoreland said that in his opinion the war would be over now if U.S. forces had been unleashed.

More important, Westmoreland—again an-

swering specific questions—raised the horrible specter of hordes of North Vietnamese regulars suddenly descending on the U.S. troops remaining after most of the combat troops have been withdrawn.

To the congressmen present, Westmoreland was conjuring up "a giant Dienbienphu"—a reference to the catastrophic French defeat by Ho Chi Minh in 1954.

Westmoreland's grim words could not be described as any veiled signal for a revolt of the generals. But they were tangible evidence of the rearward action that Laird, Secretary of State William P. Rogers and the President himself are now fighting to carry out the troop-withdrawal policy.

The words are testimony, too, to deepening fears within the White House of right-wing political reaction against the President's plan to "Vietnamize" the war. To the extent that U.S. casualties remain high as the withdrawals proceed, Mr. Nixon is highly vulnerable to political attack.

This partially explains the long delay in the President's announcement of a second troop pullback, following the first withdrawal of 25,000 troops announced on June 8.

Moreover, in making the decision to delay that second announcement, the President was buying time out of political factors having nothing at all to do with Vietnam. The success of the Apollo moon shot, it was decided in the White House, created so much pro-Nixon euphoria that a delay in the announcement promised for August would be politically acceptable. White House strategists also calculated that a troop pullout would have maximum effectiveness in cooling the campuses if it came after the start of the new school year.

In sum, the White House determined that Mr. Nixon could appease the generals by stretching out the process of de-Americanizing the war without triggering an immediate backfire from the doves.

But despite the euphoria of Apollo, the cost of the long delay has been severe. It has damaged Mr. Nixon's credibility and has revealed the fundamental split between his civilian advisers—Laird, Rogers, and Henry Kissinger, his national security adviser—and the generals.

It isn't generally known, for example, that during the polite, public spat between the State and Defense Departments over the level of North Vietnamese infiltration into South Vietnam, some high military officers in the Pentagon secretly lobbied the press. Their message: That the State Department did not know what it was talking about in claiming a major reduction in infiltration. This lobbying undoubtedly was done without Laird's knowledge.

Furthermore, the delay was deeply resented at working levels of the State Department (it came only four days after Rogers' careful press conference pledge that the U.S. would take major risks for peace).

This is the backdrop to the President's summit meeting Friday. With every major civilian and military official involved in the war present, Mr. Nixon will have to adjudicate growing differences between his generals, more convinced than ever that the enemy is now on the brink of military defeat, and his civilian advisers, who will insist on following the announced plan of withdrawals.

Whichever way Mr. Nixon chooses, the generals, emboldened by their success last month, are not about to give up their flanking attacks on the policy of pulling U.S. troops out of the war. That is the real cost of the President's delay.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1969]
DEATH OF HO IS A GRAVE BLOW TO HANOI AND
HOPES FOR PEACE

(By Marquis Childs)

The death of Ho Chi Minh is judged in all the assessments as a grave blow to Hanoi.

He was father figure who, in the ordeal of 30 years of war and occupation, stood for the independence of the Vietnamese people. However incapacitated he may have been in recent months, there is no substitute.

But it is also very likely to be a blow to the hope of peace by negotiation. Ho alone had the authority to put the stamp of approval on a compromise settlement which might have ended the bloodletting and have made eventual American withdrawal possible. His heirs have nothing like his unifying force or his authoritarian voice.

For Ho death in the midst of a still inconclusive war, taking such a hideous toll in misery and suffering, is the final grim irony. This reporter has a vivid memory of a talk with India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in 1951. This was as the guerrilla tactic in the jungles of Indochina had begun to tell heavily against the French colonial army.

At the end of World War II Ho had entered into long and painstaking negotiation in Paris for the independence of the democratic republic of Vietnam, which was his creation. After many months he believed he had obtained agreement insuring his role in an independent nation in which French commercial interests would be respected. Returning home, he stopped in New Delhi for a meeting with Nehru.

Ho told the Indian leader he was confident the agreement was workable. As Nehru reported their conversation, Ho envisaged a form of Socialist gradualism that would mean live-and-let-live in the developing nation.

This may have been a naive view. Nehru tended to look at communism through his own rose-colored glasses. There was, however, at least the hope that the conservatism of the Vietnamese peasant and the centuries-old tradition of resistance to the external enemy would restrain Ho's doctrinaire communism. Watching from afar with dread for the consequences in all of Asia, Nehru saw this hope vanishing in a savage colonial war.

The experiment died aborning. The French colonials, backed by the military, vetoed the grant of independence, if indeed it has been that, by Paris. Ho, as the leader of the guerrilla army, constantly invoked the nationalism of the Vietnamese people.

The French, propping up Bao Dai, the puppet emperor who had no popular following, fought the war with foreign legionnaires officered by the graduating classes out of St. Cyr, sacrificed in a hopeless conflict.

This was the first great error, original sin. It has been compounded again and again in the long, agonizing ordeal costing to date 38,000 American lives and at least \$100 billion in American treasure.

The first compounding of the error has been for this observer the most difficult to understand. The United States set out to give the French blank-check backing for that colonial war. One reason, of course, was the woefully deficient diplomatic reporting from America's representatives in Saigon. They simply took the optimistic French reports and gilded them with diplomatic verbiage.

In the first years of the Eisenhower administration Washington was pouring \$800 million a year into the French treasury to underwrite the cost of the war and sustain the franc. In the never-never-land rhetoric of the day Vietnam was a bastion of the free world against communism. As the French fell at Dienbienphu, armed intervention by the United States hung narrowly in the balance, with the then Vice-President, Richard M. Nixon, hinting at the need to send in American ground troops. President Eisenhower's cooler judgment prevailed.

The compounding of the initial error continued after the country was partitioned in 1954 between North and South. A country tribal and feudal in nature was to be converted into a western-style democracy and provided with a stout army as a contribution

to the containment of Chinese communism. One by one the steps were taken in a via Dolorosa leading up to the present impasse.

President Kennedy, sanctioning the sending in 1961 of 10,000 armed "advisers" authorized to fire at the enemy, took one of the critical steps. Lyndon Johnson was the grievous compounder, building up the American presence to an extent that overwhelmed Vietnam with an Americanized war.

The hopeful interpretation is that Ho's death opens a conviction path to negotiation in the Paris peace talks. But two formidable obstacles stand in the way. One is the conviction underscored in Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker's dispatches that Nguyen Van Thieu can achieve unity and political stability in South Vietnam. The other is the persistent warning of the Joint Chiefs of Staff against any speedier withdrawal of American troops. Short of boldly confronting these two obstacles, and that is not in the cards, there is no exit from Vietnam.

HO CHI MINH AS BLOODY TYRANT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, following the death recently of Ho Chi Minh, various comments in the press concerning the North Vietnamese leader provide a shocking contrast as to his record in behalf of the Vietnamese people. Ray Cromley, whose informative column appears locally in the Washington Daily News, commented on one aspect of the press treatment of Ho:

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.

Mr. Cromley then proceeded to outline the treachery which the Communist leader used in eventually gaining leadership of the unfortunate North Vietnamese people. The Cromley column dated September 10, 1969, appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11.

Another journalist whose appraisal of Ho Chi Minh is realistic and based on the facts is Philip Potter, who, in the Baltimore Sun of September 7, presented evidence of the barbarities inflicted upon the Vietnamese people by Ho and his cohorts. The Potter item, entitled "Ho Chi Minh as Bloody Tyrant," examines statements from various sources describing the extent of the brutal treatment which the people of North Vietnam alone received at the hands of the Ho Chi Minh regime.

Public sources confirm the charge that Ho was a bloody tyrant. With ample evidence available to prove his ruthless record, one can but wonder about the responsibility of journalists who lauded or glossed over Ho Chi Minh's blood-stained record of brutality against the people of North Vietnam alone.

To help set the record straight on this issue, I submit the Philip Potter article of September 7, "Ho Chi Minh as Bloody Tyrant," from the Baltimore Sun for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

HO CHI MINH AS BLOODY TYRANT

(By Philip Potter)

WASHINGTON.—Ho Chi Minh, the father-founder of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam, is dead, and now becomes legend.

Perhaps the best physical description of the old Communist who sought for 50 years to establish his rule over all Vietnam was that of an American expert in psychological warfare in Saigon who once wrote, "It's damned difficult to tell people to hate a guy who looks like a half-starved Santa Claus."

But there are those who did, and who would take sharp issue with, for example, the message of condolence India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi sent from New Delhi to Hanoi: "Ho Chi Minh has ceased to live, yet he is indestructible like his own people," she wrote. "His kindness, simplicity, love of humanity, self sacrifice and courage will inspire generations to come."

Bernard Levin, columnist for the London Daily Mail, was one of those who spurned such eulogies.

"The plain truth," he wrote, "is that Ho Chi Minh was a ruthless and bloody tyrant. His first action on completing the conquest of North Vietnam was to slaughter in cold blood some 50,000 men and women who might have opposed his rule. When his campaign to take over South Vietnam began it was waged with a policy of deliberate atrocity, as an instrument of terror, the like of which had not been seen in the modern world."

"From the cases of children literally chopped to pieces before their parents' eyes, in villages temporarily seized by the Viet Cong, to the hundreds of men, women and children who had been clubbed to death and whose bodies were discovered after the Tet offensive, the story was the same—the grossest atrocities, committed in the heat of the battle or the blood-lust of revenge but as a calculated and important part of gentle, witty Uncle Ho's policies."

That wispy-bearded Uncle Ho was butcher as well as poet and lover of children is chronicled by well-esteemed Vietnam authorities, including the late Bernard B. Fall, a one-time French resistance fighter who became a professor at Howard University here, and was killed on one of his many trips to Vietnam.

In one of these, "The Two Vietnams," published in 1967, he wrote of the "utmost ferocity" with which land reform was carried out in Ho's Democratic Republic—the Communist regime, purged of most of Ho's non-Communist allies in the struggle that drove the French from Indochina—that was established in the northern half of the partitioned Vietnam in 1954.

"While it is obviously impossible to give precise figures," Mr. Fall wrote, "the best-educated guesses on the subject are that probably close to 50,000 North Vietnamese were executed in connection with the land reform and that at least twice as many were arrested and sent to forced labor camps."

Ho finally relented after a popular explosion over the purge and removed Truong Chinh as secretary general of the Laodong or Vietnamese Workers party, a euphemism for the Indochina Communist party "dissolved" by Ho when he was heading a nationalist front against the French.

It is interesting that Truong is still regarded as one of the four most powerful men in the party politburo that runs the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam.

There are those who claim Fall's figure to be a vast understatement.

One was Hoang Van Chi, a North Vietnamese doctor and chemist who in 1942 joined the Vietminh against the French and was cited by Ho for his contributions in 1948, but fled to South Vietnam in 1954 after his

arrest as a member of the landlord class the Communists had marked for later extinction.

He put the slain in one province alone at 90,000 and gave this description of Ho and his ruling circle:

"A party organized by a group of intelligent and passionate youths who opposed French rule and fled to Moscow for studies, who absorbed Bolshevik philosophy and achieving control in North Vietnam pushed the class struggle, slaughtered rich peasants, ruined middle-class peasants and small town bourgeoisie and enslaved the proletariat and intellectuals, having lost their human feelings and developed a tigerish taste for blood."

Hoang, whom this correspondent interviewed in Saigon in 1957, was no admirer of the South Vietnamese regime of then (later assassinated) President Ngo Dinh Diem either accusing it of using the same methods as the Communists and predicting Diem's fall for failure to establish real democracy in the country.

The "Area Handbook for North Vietnam," prepared by the Foreign Area Studies of the American University in 1967, put the killed in the "social transformation" that followed the setting up of Ho's regime after the French defeat as high as 100,000.

Ho had set the stage for it in 1953, the handbook states, by issuing a party decree under which all heads of households in areas controlled by the Vietminh were classified according to alleged personal wealth, with landlords comprising the highest of five strata and landless and wage-earning peasants the lowest.

It was on the basis of this classification, said the handbook, widely used in the State Department that the Ho regime "undertook the systematic elimination of persons in the top strata who were condemned as 'enemies of the people' and imprisoned or executed."

"The victims were mainly Confucian scholars, Buddhist monks, Catholic priests and other traditional village leaders. This show of force and brutality, reminiscent of methods employed by the Chinese Communists in an earlier campaign, took the lives of 50,000 to 100,000 rural inhabitants."

That Ho, a Comintern agent who spent years in China, knew Chinese Communist ways was attested by the Peking regime in its message of condolence to Hanoi after his death.

It called him "close comrade in arms of the Chinese people . . . an outstanding proletarian revolutionary [actually he was the son of a minor mandarin] who applied the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete practice of Vietnamese revolution."

BANKING COMMITTEE MEETS TO DISCUSS BANK LOBBYING INVESTIGATION

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House, I wish to announce that the House Committee on Banking and Currency will meet in open session to discuss the bank lobbying investigation which the committee will undertake.

The meeting of the committee to discuss this investigation will be held on Wednesday, September 24, at 10 a.m., in the committee hearing room 2128, Rayburn House Office Building.

THE DEFACTION OF JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, from the moment that President Nixon announced his intention to nominate Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., for the Supreme Court there has been a veritable clamor of criticism from some of our liberal brethren, but as is pointed out in the editorial from the September 5, 1969, edition of the Chicago Tribune, the arguments of these critics have little or no merit. I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE DEFACTION OF JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

Professional "civil rights" agitators, labor leaders, and "liberal" columnists have launched a massive propaganda campaign against confirmation by the Senate of President Nixon's nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth Jr., of South Carolina, to be a justice of the United States Supreme court.

Judge Haynsworth is opposed mainly by the same forces that defeated Senate confirmation of President Hoover's nomination of Judge John J. Parker, of North Carolina, for the Supreme court in 1930. Judge Parker was chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the 4th circuit, of which Judge Haynsworth has been chief judge since 1964. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the labor unions, and other "liberal" elements attacked Judge Parker as a "reactionary," but some liberal senators who voted against him, notably Borah of Idaho, Wheeler of Montana, and La Follette of Wisconsin, praised him in later years.

Judge Haynsworth has been called a "hard core segregationist" by Joseph L. Rauh Jr., vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action and prime mover of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. Roy Wilkins, executive director of the N.A.A.C.P., has issued a manifesto charging that the judge "has been reversed four times by the United States Supreme court in civil rights cases" and is a "partisan of racially segregated public education."

These pillars of the liberal establishment looked pretty silly when John P. Roche of Brandeis university, former White House intellectual in residence and former national chairman of the A. D. A., came to Judge Haynsworth's defense. Roche remarked that Haynsworth "hardly looks like a red-neck segregationist from the piney woods" and added: "Haynsworth's record . . . was examined with a microscope and, as far as any critic could discover, he has never called for the restoration of slavery, for legalization of torture, or for the abolition of the federal government."

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, and some of the liberal columnists are attacking Judge Haynsworth solely on the basis of an alleged "conflict of interest" in a case decided by his court. The judge owned 15 per cent of the stock of the Carolina Vend-A-Matic company, of which he also was an officer and a director. While grossing about \$3,000,000 a year, this company received \$50,000 a year for the use of its vending machines in the plants of the Deering-Milliken company, a large textile manufacturer.

In August, 1963, on the basis of competitive bidding, Deering-Milliken awarded Vend-A-Matic a second \$50,000-a-year contract but turned down two other Vend-A-Matic bids. In February, Judge Haynsworth's court

began considering an unfair labor practice charge against the Darlington Manufacturing company, a Deering-Milliken subsidiary, and in November, 1963, Judge Haynsworth wrote the court's opinion in a 2 to 1 decision in favor of Darlington.

Thus the only question is whether 15 per cent ownership of a company that received less than 2 per cent of its gross income from a company which had a subsidiary involved in the litigation amounted to a conflict of interest.

In 1964, when Carolina Vend-A-Matic was purchased by ARA Services, Inc., Judge Haynsworth promptly sold the ARA stock he received for his interest in Vend-A-Matic. He said it might be all right for a judge to hold an interest in a small, local company but not in a national company doing business all over the country. Altho he received \$450,000 for his ARA stock in 1964, it is worth more than \$1,400,000 today.

The truth, it appears, is that the liberals are against Judge Haynsworth because he is a "strict constructionist" who applies the Constitution as it is written. The liberals believe the Constitution is made of rubber and can be stretched to accommodate their vision of a socialist welfare state.

MAJ. RONALD J. BRITZ KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Ronald J. Britz, a fine man from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MAJ. R. J. BRITZ DIES IN VIETNAM—PARENTS OF CAREER SOLDIER LIVE IN SEVERNA PARK

An Army major whose parents live in Severna Park has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Maj. Ronald J. Britz, 31, of Green Cove Springs, Fla., was killed September 3 when the helicopter in which he was riding was shot down by enemy gunfire. The helicopter crashed and burned in Binh Long province, 60 miles north of Saigon, while Major Britz was on a military mission.

He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph C. Britz, of 2 St. Ives drive, Severna Park.

Began tour on July 4

Major Britz was the operations officer of the headquarters company of the 8th Engineer Battalion of the 1st Cavalry Division (Air Mobile).

Major Britz began his second tour of duty in Vietnam on July 4.

During his first tour in Vietnam, from 1966 to 1967, he was awarded the Air Medal, for extensive air travel, and the Bronze Star, for the quality of his work. He also received the Army Commendation Medal for the excellence of his work while stationed in Germany in 1966 before going to Vietnam.

Between his two tours in Vietnam, Major Britz taught Reserve Officer Training Corps courses at Clemson University, in Clemson, S.C.

Major Britz was born in Philadelphia. He attended the University of Kansas, where he majored in mechanical engineering. He was a member of the ROTC there and belonged to the Phi Kappa Tau fraternity.

In June, 1960, after graduation, he en-

tered the Army as a 2d lieutenant. He planned to make the Army his career. In June, 1964, he was promoted to captain, and in January, 1968, to major.

In addition to his parents, Major Britz is survived by his wife, the former Ellen Irey; a daughter, Deborah Irey, and a son, Michael Irey, all of Green Cove Springs.

TAX REFORM

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in a rather hurried fashion, we passed the tax reform bill just prior to our summer recess and sent it to the Senate for their consideration. I voted for the bill, although I was opposed to certain sections such as the one that would alter the tax-exempt status of interest received from State and municipal bonds. My home State of Mississippi, like many other States throughout the Nation, has become concerned, and rightfully so, over the possible effects this section of the tax reform bill will have on providing State and municipal services in the future. I would like to share with my colleagues the following resolution passed by both houses of the Mississippi Legislature while in extraordinary session. I believe the resolution speaks for itself.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

(A concurrent resolution memorializing the Mississippi congressional delegation to oppose pending Federal legislation relating to tax-exempt interest on public bond issues because of the increased costs which would accrue to states, counties, and municipalities)

Whereas, the Congress of the United States is considering several proposals whereby the income tax exemption for interest paid on bonds issued by State and local governments would be limited; and

Whereas, it has long been considered unconstitutional for the Federal Government to tax State or local governments; and

Whereas, any plan which would directly or indirectly tax interest paid on State or local government bonds would be an impairment of the previously determined constitutional immunity; and

Whereas, any limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on State and local bonds would result in higher interest rates to be paid by State and local governments in their borrowing; and

Whereas, any increase in cost of borrowing is paid directly by the taxpayers of the community borrowing or by the users of publicly owned facilities; and

Whereas, any limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on State and local bonds would limit the market for such bonds; and

Whereas, any limitation of the market in which State and local bonds are sold would handicap State and local governments in providing funds for urgently needed public improvements;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, the Senate concurring therein, That by this resolution we express our opposition to any plan by the Congress of the United States that would in any way limit the tax-exempt status of interest paid on bonds issued by State or local government; and

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and every member of Congress from the State of Mississippi.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, September 2, 1969.

Adopted by the Senate, September 11, 1969.

JOHN R. JUNKIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CHARLES L. SULLIVAN,
President of the Senate.

CLEAN WATER MORE IMPORTANT THAN MOON SHOTS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, last month the House voted to spend \$256 million more for space exploration than the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had originally requested. Yet during the current year, the Federal Government is spending \$486 million less for aid to local units of government for water treatment facilities than it promised in the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. These facts show, so starkly, that we are not putting first things first.

In recent years water pollution has become a subject of increasing political attention. Unfortunately, the performance of the Federal Government in the protection of our environment from the effects of water pollution has been much less impressive than its promises.

The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 pledged a great deal of money to assist local municipalities in their efforts to reduce the amount of raw and inadequately treated sewage that floods our lakes and streams. But this pledge has been ignored and funds have not been made available. This inaction by the Federal Government has forced local municipalities to assume a larger share of financing pollution abatement projects and has resulted in skyrocketing increases in local property taxes.

The discrepancy between promise and performance has turned into a "credibility gap" of unprecedented proportions. The Clean Water Restoration Act authorized \$150 million for sewage treatment facility construction in fiscal 1967. The Congress, however, delivered only \$141 million. The "money gap" has widened starkly since 1967. In fiscal 1968, \$450 million was promised but only \$203 million was delivered. In 1969, \$700 million was promised for pollution abatement. Only \$214 million will be delivered. The same amount, \$214 million, has been requested for fiscal 1970 by both the Nixon and Johnson administrations, despite a promise of a full \$1 billion.

The situation is crucial in municipalities throughout the Nation. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration reports that 4,525 water treatment projects are being developed, which will call for \$2.3 billion in Federal aid in constructing water treatment facilities having a total cost of \$5.1 billion.

In Wisconsin's Seventh Congressional District alone, 87 projects are undergoing development. These 87 projects will cost an estimated \$12,809,553. An estimated \$4,688,543 in Federal funds has been requested. These requests total more than will be allowed for the entire State of Wisconsin during the coming year, unless Congress acts to raise the amount the Administration has asked for.

Fourteen of the 15 counties in the Seventh District have one or more water treatment projects undergoing development. Virtually every project is of vital importance to the streams and lakes in the respective counties. There follows a listing of the cost of the development of projects in those fourteen counties and the funds that are being sought from the Federal Government:

County	Total cost	Water pollution control funds requested
Adams.....	\$6,000	\$3,000
Clark.....	583,000	216,800
Forest.....	419,900	170,500
Langlade.....	13,000	6,500
Lincoln.....	720,000	360,000
Marathon.....	4,218,558	1,372,769
Marquette.....	359,000	179,500
Menominee.....	45,000	22,500
Portage.....	378,000	189,000
Shawano.....	2,128,405	666,657
Taylor.....	429,000	214,500
Waupaca.....	1,336,000	668,000
Waushara.....	398,714	179,100
Wood.....	1,844,976	548,217

The inadequate funding of pollution abatement programs becomes ironic when we contemplate the ease with which Congress can supply funds that exceed the budget requests of the administration. On June 10, for example, the House approved a budget which gave the National Aeronautics and Space Administration \$256 million more than it had originally requested. It provided for 10 manned space flights to the moon over the next 3 years rather than the six originally planned. I voted against the NASA budget. The \$256 million in excess funds which we so generously voted for NASA could have more than doubled the administration's requested funds for aid to local units of governments for water treatment facilities. A widely quoted remark is most applicable here:

Here we are, standing knee-deep in sewage, trying to land men on the moon.

If a Congress and an administration can levy the taxes we levy, and spend the dollars we spend and still not provide ample money to cleanse our rivers, streams, and air, then we simply do not know how to govern, we do not know how to make intelligent choices and we have no sense of values worthy of mention.

Unless we come to our senses, history will tell that ours was a generation which worked with computers of unimaginable complexity, sent men to the moon and functioned with thousands of devices which are a gadgetmaker's dream, but did not show wisdom, the good sense, or even the good taste to clean up its own habitat.

That is why it is essential that we provide at least the full \$1 billion to fund the Clean Water Restoration Act promised for fiscal year 1970. I urge the Congress

to respond to the millions of Americans who have joined in the citizens' crusade for clean water. The Moon and Mars can wait. Our water cannot.

FROM THE MOTHER OF A MARINE IN VIETNAM

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of two poems written by the mother of a marine who gave his life for his country in Vietnam.

All too frequently the depth of courage and the strength of faith which have been shown by those closest to these tragedies is overlooked. I have read these two poems again and again, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to share Mrs. Hodges' poignant thoughts with the rest of my colleagues and insert them in the RECORD:

FROM THE MOTHER OF A MARINE IN VIETNAM (By Erma Lea Hodges)

I wonder how my son is feeling today,
He's on the bloody battlefield so far away,
He's in Viet Nam with the U.S. Marines,
They are the world's Greatest Fighting
Machines.

I got up last night after I had gone to bed,
I got down on my knees and this is what I
said;

"Dear Lord, I'm coming to You right now,
I know You'll help me bear this burden
somehow!

My only son is on the battlefield,
I'm sure, Lord, you know just how I feel,
Because Your only Son was spit on and beat,
They hung Him on a cross with nails in His
feet.

You turned Your head because You couldn't
bear to see,

Your only Son suffer such terrible agony.
So I'm telling You things I can't tell my son,
He would only worry about his mom.

I haven't rested a minute since he's been
gone,

My nerves will stay on edge until he comes
home.

I cook a good meal and then I can't eat,
When I go to bed I can't even sleep.

It's the rainy season over there now,
I'm sure he misses me saying to him,
"Son, go change your wet clothes right quick,
If you wear those you know you'll be sick."

Please watch over him and give him strength,
Give him plenty of food and good water to
drink.

When he comes home then I will bake,
His favorite lemon pie and a big chocolate
cake.

I can't tell him, how often I write him all
my worries,

Then tear it up because he has more than he
can carry.

It seems so long since he's been gone and
nights will never end,

I know it's so much worse on him over in a
foreign land.

Lord, encourage him when he's low and for
this one thing I plead,

That he will never touch strong drink, but
always live for Thee.

And I ask this for his buddy, whom he loves
with all his heart,

Keep them always close together, never let
them be apart.

I can never forget how brave he was,
After You took his daddy home.
He worked so hard and stayed in school,
And always helped his mom.

I can't forget the boys that are there without
a mother,

Please take care of them, and help them to
comfort each other,

I know they all face death every hour,
Help them to know there is some one who
cares.

Lord, there is another thing I want to ask
of You,

Please always give me strength, and plenty of
work to do,

So I can take care of myself and help my son
Go back to college when the fighting is done.

I feel better Lord since I've been talking to
you!

I'll go to bed now and sleep an hour or two.
Put Your loving arms around my boy and
draw him close to Thee.

And when they've won the Victory bring him
safely home to Me."

THE CONCLUSION

I'm sitting up late again tonight,
Thinking about my son.

I thank you Lord, for bringing him home,
From the terrible war in Viet Nam.

He loved the Marines, so he reenlisted,
He was willing to do his part.
When he got orders to return to Viet Nam,
I cried with all my heart.

I begged and pleaded with him to let me,
Keep him from going there again.
I said, "Son it isn't fair,
When so many have never been!"

He said, "Mom it isn't my choice,
I hate to go you know.
Please don't cry. It is my orders,
So I feel it my duty to go!"

He was there only thirty-five days,
As Squad Leader of the Second Platoon.
Sept. 9th '68, on a search and destroy operation,
He and most of his men met their doom.

I cannot ask you why Lord,
You took my only son.
He told me he was ready to meet You,
And he said, "Don't worry Mom."

Please let me ask another favor,
That I'll always stay sweet in my heart.
And we'll all meet him and his Daddy,
When this life we shall depart.

I'm sure you know Lord, how I feel,
Because you gave your Son to die.
To save the souls of men,
Mine gave his to save their lives.

SENATOR EAGLETON'S FRENCH LICK SPEECH

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON, of Missouri, in a speech to the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association meeting in French Lick, Ind., has reminded us that the time has come for new and bold perspectives in facing the Nation's needs.

Senator EAGLETON has taken to task the present administration for not exercising more courage and responsibility

in meeting domestic issues which face this Nation. He reminds us they promised to solve some admittedly difficult problems and thus far they have not delivered.

The test of American statesmanship in the 1970's, he points out, will be the right and reasonable choice between guns and butter.

I include this excellent speech by Senator EAGLETON in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EAGLETON

The temptation for a Democrat to entertain a Democratic audience by taking pot shots at a Republican Administration is substantial.

There are plenty of good targets:

The highest rate of inflation since the last Republican Administration in the early 1950's . . . contrasted with Candidate Nixon's promise to control it;

Personnel policies that put the AMA in charge of picking the nation's health chief . . . and the drug industry in charge of naming the top drug evaluator.

That dinner in Los Angeles—you know, the one most of us paid for and didn't get invited to.

There is the new San Clemente style of national leadership, which is really based on the traditional Republican leadership principle identified by Adlai Stevenson: "Don't just do something, sit there." Unfortunately, if you're a housewife spending more and more of the family budget on inflation . . . or a poor man looking for a job . . . or a principal trying to educate more children for less money . . . or a mother with a son in Vietnam . . . leaders who just sit there are not good enough.

It is well to remember, however, that we Democrats lost the White House last year partly because of our own failures of leadership—because of a disastrous war we couldn't end, and because of the inflation it caused. We lost it partly because our message to the American people was not relevant enough. We lost it partly because our party was in disarray.

This doesn't mean we should humbly neglect our obligation to criticize the Republican Administration, and the solace it provides. After all, they promised to solve some admittedly difficult problems and thus far they haven't delivered.

But the fact remains that we Democrats need some better answers and a better record than we had last year when we go to the people in 1970 or 1972. And you can't build a record on criticism alone.

We are off to a good start on record-building with the tax reform legislation now before the Senate.

It was the Democrats in Congress who forced Mr. Nixon to accept tax reform in order to extend the surtax—a surtax he had promised during the campaign to end.

I predict that a Democratic Congress will pass the most sweeping tax reform this country has known in 15 years.

Tax reform is necessary. It is overdue. It is right. And the Democrats will earn—and deserve—credit for it from the average working men and their families who constitute the traditional backbone of the Democratic Party.

Then there are some traditional Democratic issues which need to be taken to the people with a new and bold perspective—issues which matter greatly to the average American family . . . issues on which Democrats have always led . . . and on which the Republicans have always dragged their feet.

Take health, for example. There is difference between the Party of Medicare and the Party of the AMA.

A million Americans die every year from

heart disease. But the Republican Administration has recommended a \$6 million reduction in the budget for the National Heart Institute.

Cancer kills one American man, woman, or child every two minutes. The Republican Administration has proposed a cut of \$5 million for the National Cancer Institute.

When this great nation ranks 17th in the world in infant mortality . . . when we are a dismal 21st in life expectancy for males and 12th for females . . . when two-thirds of the actual cost of health care in America is uninsured and 30 million Americans have no health insurance at all . . . you can be sure that millions and millions of Americans have known the tragedy of unnecessary and preventable illness in their own families.

You can be sure they are looking for answers, and will respond to the Party that offers them.

So too will the more than 20 million senior citizens. Three out of ten Americans over 65 find they have earned a life of poverty after a lifetime of work—an annual income below \$1,975.

These retirees find that fixed incomes and lifetime savings are totally inadequate in today's inflationary economy.

They have a right to expect a full measure of financial justice, and the Party that brought them Social Security and Medicare should be the one to give it to them.

There is also the issue of education.

President Nixon, who last year at this time was promising that his Administration would be second to none in education, promptly cut almost half a billion dollars out of the education budget for fiscal 1970.

Nearly two centuries ago, when our nation was very young and not very rich, George Washington said:

"In a country like this . . . if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power."

There is not a major city in America today where the common purposes of education by modern standards are being truly realized for the average child.

At a time when every parent knows that education is the first rung on the ladder to success for his child . . . and when every local taxpayer knows that the cost of education is nearly insupportable, American parents will respond, I believe to the Party which offers them a realistic blueprint of excellent education for their child and every child.

But we can never adequately educate and care for ourselves and our children—we can never fulfill the humane promise of our free and prosperous society—until we address ourselves to the fundamental problem of rectifying national priorities.

Something is wrong when our budget for ammunition alone in Vietnam last year equaled our entire federal budget for education here at home.

Something is wrong when we spend \$21,600 for each enemy soldier we hope to kill in South Vietnam . . . and 44 federal dollars for each American primary and secondary pupil we hope to educate here at home.

These are our national priorities today. They have not been changed. This is the most unforgivable failure of the Nixon Administration and the greatest opportunity for the Democratic party.

It does no good to play games about responsibility for Vietnam, or to trace once more the tragic sequence of accidents and blunders which brought us to our present position in Southeast Asia. Surely Mr. Nixon was not responsible until January 20, 1969.

But he sought and won responsibility for the war in Vietnam with a promise of new leadership to end the war and win peace in the Pacific.

Where is that leadership now? Where are the new initiatives for peace? What has changed? Like all new Presidents, Mr. Nixon had a chance to change outworn, discredited policies to which he personally had no commitment. But he hasn't.

Two and a half months ago the President announced his intention to withdraw 25,000 troops, with the strong and repeated implication that more would follow. As of today, only 11,000 have been withdrawn, and on top of that comes the announcement that a further decision on troop withdrawals will be postponed indefinitely.

In Saigon, the Thieu-Ky regime still enjoys our unwavering support. It has not broadened its base. Indeed just last week Premier Huong, a moderate civilian with some support among the people, was thrown out of the government and replaced by a four star general who is a close supporter of President Thieu.

The jails are still full of neutralists and others whose participation will be necessary in any government capable of standing on its own feet in South Vietnam.

Averill Harriman, one of our most distinguished diplomats, a man personally familiar with the Paris negotiations, has said, "It is absolutely vital that the President of the United States take the lead in ending the fighting, the killing." But the President of the United States has taken no lead. Since the Nixon Administration took office, there have been approximately 60,000 additional casualties, and today the killing continues. The talks remain on dead center.

But it is not only Vietnam that distorts our national priorities. For years we have watched the military budget escalate as the Pentagon and its suppliers have sold the American public new and costly pawns in a macabre game of overkill. The futile objective of winning the arms race has continually received more attention than efforts to control it.

Who is responsible? We all are.

But once again, President Nixon sought and won responsibility for beginning arms control negotiations . . . to "bring us from an era of confrontation to one of negotiation." And yet, a year after arms control talks were to be started they still have not begun.

President Nixon came in to office with the chance for a fresh start in arms control. He made his start by demanding construction of a new multi-billion dollar antiballistic missile system which will add yet another turn to the arms spiral without increasing our security. Testing continues on the MIRV (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles), the deadly missile hydra which threatens to push the arms race once and for all beyond the point where talks can control it.

The fact that the Secretary of Defense has grudgingly responded to Congressional pressure by cutting projected military spending for next year by \$3 billion is welcome. But it is only a slight constriction of the old priorities, not an assertion of the new.

Yes, we must spend every penny we actually need for defense, but we cannot expect to make our nation what it ought to be with small handouts from the Pentagon.

Today we can ask no more of the American taxpayers.

The President's Urban Affairs Council tells us candidly that even after the Vietnam war has ended we can expect very few additional resources.

So the hard fact is that we must now make responsible and courageous choice between guns and butter. This will be the great test of American statesmanship in the 1970's.

I believe the Democratic Party—in power or out—can and must be the party that leads America in making these choices.

LESSONS OF THE C-5 PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, any Monday morning quarterback can tell you how to win last Saturday's game. This is equally true regarding military contracts when overruns begin to appear. However, despite the sophistication of our computers, many variables in the economics of costing and pricing, still remain and the greatest experts still rely on the educated guess.

In the case of the Lockheed C-5A, there were many such educated guesses, made in good faith and based on the best available data. That some of these guesses proved wrong is unfortunate—unfortunate for the American taxpayer, for the manufacturer, and for the Air Force. Yet to condemn those who had a part in this enterprise without reviewing the case in detail is just as wrong. In the September issue of the Air Force and Space Digest, author Edgar E. Ulsamer does an excellent job of presenting the background and review of the C-5A procurement. In his article, "Lessons of the C-5 Program," he presents a fair and unbiased rundown on the C-5A development.

I am particularly impressed with one paragraph of the article which reports the conclusion of the Special C-5 Review Council "that even at the increased price the C-5 will be a good buy, as well as a good airplane."

I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

LESSONS OF THE C-5 PROGRAM

(By Edgar E. Ulsamer)

The harsh lessons in contract and cost management learned by government and industry from the C-5 program are providing new directions for future weapon systems development and procurement. Secretary of the Air Force Robert C. Seamans, Jr., has acknowledged that these new management policies—with direct impact on internal USAF management procedures, Air Force-industry relationships, and the nature and form of future contracting—are finding their first application in the F-15 air-superiority fighter program.

Underlying these reforms are the voluminous, recently released findings of a special C-5 Review Council, chaired by Air Force Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics, Philip N. Whittaker, and composed of eleven USAF review teams and a prestigious civilian advisory committee. In rendering its verdict on the costs and performance of the world's largest airplane, the review, which was requested by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird in April of this year, attempted "neither a whitewash nor a witchhunt." The Council affirmed the technical soundness of, and need for, the C-5 Galaxy and explained in detail the reasons for its increased costs. The Review Council recommended continuation of the program, subject to revisions of the present contract.

Neither the contractors (Lockheed-Georgia Co. and General Electric) nor the Air Force came off unscathed in the two-month review. The future of the C-5 program (be-

yond the four-squadron, eighty-one-aircraft buy, which the Air Force considers firm, as opposed to Lockheed, which believes the government is obligated to buy 120 aircraft) is contingent on the government's ability to renegotiate the existing contract satisfactorily with Lockheed, an endeavor currently in progress.

The Council's frank and critical approach was graphically demonstrated by its thorough evaluation of the Boeing 747 commercial superjet as a possible alternative to the C-5. The review found, however, that the commercial jetliner, in spite of adequate payload and range, could not meet many of the requirements peculiar to a military aircraft.

As for the contracting method, Total Package Procurement Concept (TPPC), the Council questioned the wisdom of applying such a new departure, for the first time, to a program of the magnitude and difficulty of the C-5 effort. Nevertheless, it concluded that the contract resulted in cost savings for the government. According to Secretary Seamans, Lockheed stands to lose between \$13 million and \$285 million on the program, based on the present estimates, an achievement of dubious merit as far as the national interest is concerned but obviously constituting a savings to the taxpayer. Even this saving would appear to be a Pyrrhic victory for, as Dr. Seamans explained, industry cannot be expected to endure such a loss.

Total Package Procurement, essentially authored by Mr. Whittaker's predecessor, Robert H. Charles, provides, as its name implies, a single contract for R&D, testing, evaluation, and production, and stipulates firm cost, schedule, and performance factors. Instead of a fixed-price approach, TPPC contains both cost and performance incentives, limited provision for inflation, and a repricing formula, which provides for either upward or downward adjustments to prevent intolerable loss or excessive profit (above the maximal ten percent). The Review Council termed the repricing formula "well intentioned for poorly structured, and not fully comprehended at the time of award." Repricing has stimulated much of the congressional and press criticism of the C-5 program, earning such headline-begging appellations as "the golden handshake," the "sweetheart clause," and "reverse incentive."

The Review Council found the repricing provision to be "best with ambiguities, complicating its implementation and raising the prospect of reverse incentive. Under a selected set of conditions, the point can be reached where, for each additional dollar of cost occurring in the production of Run A aircraft (the first fifty-eight aircraft ordered), an increase of total contract target and ceiling of more than a dollar could result. This potential could encourage the contractor to add costs to Run A so as to reduce over-all loss on both Run A and Run B (an additional buy of fifty-seven aircraft)."

Over-all, the review faults the basic contract approach for a lack in flexibility during the development phase with regard to trade-offs "between costs, performance, and initial delivery requirements."

Another area of deficiency in the contract administration, the review found, was that the "Air Force was either ineffective or deficient" in making clear that the C-5 contract did not include costs of "initial spare parts, depot level aerospace ground equipment (AGE), first destination charges," and certain facilities and necessary military construction. The Air Force also came in for criticism because it "seemingly motivated the contractors to strive for performance exceeding Air Force requirements without, in retrospect, commensurate regard for cost." The basic Air Force philosophy allegedly aimed at having a "tight contract and holding the contractor's feet to the fire," with

the importance of cost-effectiveness relegated to a secondary position.

The Council cited as a specific example the Air Force's rejection of a joint proposal by Lockheed and General Electric in 1967 to increase the thrust of the TF39 engine to overcome problems associated with the aircraft's empty weight increase, without degrading basic performance. While admitting to the "wisdom of over two years of 20/20 hindsight," the Council found that the cost-effectiveness of this refusal "can be questioned" because some of the costly and time-consuming redesigns "would not have been required and the expensive and costly use of advanced materials (titanium fasteners, beryllium brakes) and manufacturing techniques (chemical milling) could have been reduced." The Council stated that the actual savings realizable through this proposed relaxation of the contract terms are not known, but added that "a trade-off analysis, recognizing the impact of the schedule slippage, the redesign and the exotic materials and techniques on production would have been valuable."

The over-all job of managing the C-5 program and the Total Package Procurement Concept "seems to have been underestimated by the Air Force," according to the Council, which led to shortcomings in staffing of the System Project Office (SPO) and in contract administration, as well as a lack of defined policies.

While the staffing situation has improved, the "original, and basic, policy and guidance vacuum remains," the Council reported. The shift from the initial "engaged management philosophy [full Air Force control and supervision over the contractor]" to one of "disengagement" a year after the contracts were let, in the view of the Council, caused deficiencies that were not corrected until early in 1969 when a special Cost/Schedule Planning and Control System (C/SPCS) was instituted.

At the nub of the C-5 cost controversy, which with the help of distortion, exaggeration, and sophistry has been magnified into a convenient point of departure for wholesale attacks on the defense community, may well be what the report termed the initial "somewhat optimistic assumption" by both the government and Lockheed-Georgia Co. that the world's largest air-lifter was a "state-of-the-art airplane."

Mr. Whittaker said that, in actuality, "significant advances in the state of the art were required to accomplish the manufacturing of the aircraft." Tooling concepts, which were applicable to the C-141, were found to be totally inadequate for the C-5.

The Council found further that "extensive use had to be made of manufacturing processes, such as chemical milling, which had seen only limited use before. Advanced materials such as titanium and beryllium were called into use. Extremely close tolerances were a necessity. The avionics areas produced major development problems, which caused delays in delivery of the hardware in the early part of the schedule. The engine contains significant advances in technology such as high pressure ratio, high turbine-inlet temperatures, and low drag plug nozzle. The result is a high bypass ratio, turbofan engine with significantly reduced specific fuel consumption."

The report concluded, therefore, that while the C-5 required no major breakthrough in technology, "it is based on an extremely refined design to meet successfully its high-performance operational requirements. Each element for the system must operate at nearly maximum efficiency and little opportunity exists for compromise in manufacturing procedures. This should have been recognized at the outset and greater flexibility provided during development for technical tradeoffs and initial delivery requirements."

Yet, in spite of these difficulties and the need to substantially redesign the aircraft shortly after the contract award to meet necessary weight and payload-range performance factors, the C-5 has slipped only slightly in terms of production schedule, and so far has met all major performance specifications. This fact, in the view of the Council, reflects great credit on the Air Force, Lockheed, General Electric, and their respective subcontractor teams.

The Council summed up the C-5 performance with this statement: "An extensive evaluation by Air Force and NASA experts has revealed no major design deficiencies in the aircraft or engines, and that there is a high probability that all range, payload, take-off, and landing performance requirements will be met. Current predictions also indicate that the contract requirements for maintainability and reliability will be met although, this early in the program, such predictions must still be viewed with caution. Engine performance is considered excellent to date and there is excellent airframe/engine compatibility (which frequently has been a major development problem in previous aircraft systems)."

"In conclusion, although there have been forty-six design performance changes to date, none of these changes has degraded the mission performance requirements, e.g., payload/range, takeoff and landing distance, or cruise speed. In addition, consideration was received from the contractor (primarily additional testing) for these criteria changes, to the mutual benefit of both the Air Force and the contractor. It looks as though we'll have a good aircraft."

THE C-5 COST INCREASE

While the report—and Secretary Seamans in his presentation to the press—took great pains to explain that costs as established at this time could increase further until delivery of all Run A aircraft in 1971, the price estimate of the programmed total buy of 120 aircraft was increased from \$3.369 billion to \$4.831 billion, or forty-four percent. Flyaway cost of the C-5, exclusive of R&D costs, is given at \$26.9 million each, and at \$36.2 million if R&D is included.

Lockheed's share of the increase, according to the Council, is estimated to have grown from the target price at time of contract in 1965 of \$1.945 billion to \$3.169 billion. General Electric's contract costs to the government have increased by thirty-one percent from \$632 million to \$829 million.

In addition to these increases, according to the Council's report, the cost estimates for the C-5 program, premised on 120 aircraft, were upped further through the inclusion of \$295 million of spares and ground equipment not included in the original contract. The grand total for the program, as estimated by the Council, stands therefore at \$5.125 billion.

The growth in actual and projected costs under the Lockheed contract, according to the Review Council's report, is attributable, in the view of government and industry experts, to these factors:

An unrealistically low Lockheed cost estimate—possibly by as much as ten percent. There is, however, no evidence of "buy-in" (or deliberate underpricing).

Overoptimism in the areas of engineering and fabrication. The contractor considered the C-5 to be essentially a scaled-up C-141.

The sharply increased effect of inflation (\$500 million), coupled with the aircraft industry's boom resulting from the acceleration of commercial aircraft production and the tempo of the Vietnamese conflict, created material and labor shortages.

Increased material costs related to efforts to reduce weight (use of beryllium brakes, titanium rivets, chemical milling, and fabrication techniques associated with the newer metals) and plant facilities not fully suitable

for production of an aircraft the size of the C-5.

Additional subcontracting brought about by schedule problems and shortages of personnel, and increases in subcontract prices above the levels anticipated, due to sudden shift from a buyer's to a seller's market shortly after contract award; and

Increased overhead because the C-141 production was completed several months before Lockheed was ready to start C-5A production.

THE C-5-A "GOOD BUY" FOR USAF

The Council concluded that even at the increased price the C-5 will be a good buy, as well as a good airplane. Its "outsized" cargo capability, which can accommodate virtually all transportable equipment in the US Army's inventory, is not available in any other existing aircraft. Further, no aircraft in the Air Force's inventory can approach the cost per ton-mile of the C-5. The proposed freighter version of the Boeing 747 jetliner, the report finds, could equal ton-mile costs of the C-5, but some of the military performance features could not be incorporated into the 747 without redesign.

THE LESSONS LEARNED

Regardless of how unjustified, the wild attacks on the C-5 program have caused serious damage to the image of the defense community. Understandably, this spurred the Department of Defense, the Air Force, and industry to think about ways to prevent a recurrence. Fundamental is the question of whether or not cost overruns of programs involving major new aerospace systems are inevitable.

The answer, according to Secretary Seamans, is that overruns can be avoided and that "new management techniques, new methods of measuring performance, based on milestone achievements" currently under examination by the Air Force are designed to achieve this. Some of these measures have already been applied to the F-15 program and result in a streamlining [of] our own Air Force management," Dr. Seamans said.

Secretary Seamans explained that keeping costs down "is not so much a function of a contract as it is a function of having responsible people both in government and industry, with the proper relationship [between each other]." Concerning the C-5 program he said, "the mistake, if you want to call it a mistake, is that there was not really sufficient visibility . . . both performance-wise and cost-wise."

Two principal lessons from the C-5 experience are being applied to the F-15 program, Dr. Seamans explained. The F-15 System Program Office (SPO), while physically located at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, now reports directly to the AFSC Commander, Gen. James Ferguson, who in turn reports directly to the Chief of Staff and the Air Force Secretary. "In that way, we will shorten the lines of communication internally and . . . ensure that the project office has the proper authority to carry out the program within agreed-upon policy," Dr. Seamans stated.

Secondly, Secretary Seamans said, the new management procedure covers what he termed the "software part" of the F-15 program on a cost-plus-incentive-fee basis. This includes "all the work other than the building of the aircraft, including wind-tunnel testing, engine testing on the ground, electronic testing, and test-beds and the like." The actual production phase, involving R&D planes as well as standard operational aircraft, will be awarded on a fixed-price-plus-incentive basis.

In this way, Secretary Seamans explained, "We will be in a position to know where we stand [and] to have the visibility to make appropriate decisions before committing the government to a large production run."

RECOMMENDATIONS ON OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS

On the basis of its painstaking analysis of the C-5 program, the Review Council formally presented a ten-point set of recommendations which are "broadly applicable to other programs." They are:

Subject to greater flexibility and "tailored to each case," the Total Package Procurement Concept, "perhaps under a different name," should be retained and refined on a selective basis. "In some cases a cost-reimbursement-type contract may be appropriate for development, coupled with some type of fixed-price contract, placed competitively and at the same time to cover production."

Contracts which combine production with R&D must be structured to "adapt repricing, total system performance responsibility, and corrections of deficiencies to each individual procurement so that the appropriate degree of responsibility will be vested in the contractor." Precise policy guidance concerning concepts and criteria is not to reduce "flexibility in application and implementation," and repricing formulas must not be permitted to lead to reverse incentives. Price and source commitment concerning spares and aerospace ground equipment (AGE), even in the case of total system responsibility, is to be shunned in the absence of "definitive design specifications and parts provisions."

The handling of the economic fluctuation (inflation) clause requires definite standards, applied and understood uniformly by all bidders, and the index by which they are measured must "meaningfully" relate to the contractor's activity, yet retain an industry-wide scope to act as a cost-cutting incentive.

Uncertainties inherent in cost estimates require that such estimates be expressed early in the life of a program in ranges which are periodically updated.

"Cost visibility" must be maintained throughout the contract, even when the extent of the economic risk assumed by the contractor dictates that cost management should be left primarily to him.

The longer the performance life cycle of contracts involving R&D and production, the greater the intrinsic economic uncertainties. Such contracts, therefore, must be preceded by a "particularly careful review . . . to determine that the contract-definition phase has been really complete and effective," an issue to be emphasized by the Defense Systems Acquisition Review Council.

Before committing the government to a production contract, contractual development milestones should be established and critically reviewed. These milestones, covering both the development and production phases of the program, should be the primary tools used by the government in maintaining visibility of the program.

Congress is to be informed rapidly and fully concerning program status and cost estimates of major weapon systems, and there is need "for developing deeper public understanding" of their problems and progress.

Major System Program Offices must be organized early in the system's life cycle and staffed with highly qualified and trained personnel, with staff turnover held to a minimum.

There is excessive layering of activities and independent organizations between the SPO director and the contractor on one hand, and top-level Air Force management on the other. The Air Force should reduce this layering of intermediate agencies and clarify the responsibilities of the SPO director.

The government should develop independent cost estimates prior to source selection to judge the effectiveness of the program and for use in evaluating the contractors' proposals. Once a particular contractor and systems configuration have been selected, the independent cost estimate can serve as

a base line to measure performance, as well as for budgetary purposes.

If these recommendations, indeed achieve an improved development and procurement process for future Air Force weapon systems, the ordeal of the C-5 over the past year may have been compensated for, at least in part.

POSTAL CORPORATION QUESTION MARK

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to John Cramer's "9 to 4:30" column that appears in the Washington Daily News today. Mr. Cramer has invited Dave Silvergleid to comment on the Postal Corporation proposal and as Mr. Cramer says:

Much has been written against the Administration proposal to turn the postal service into a Government Corporation. But no one has done it better than Mr. Silvergleid.

Few people, Mr. Speaker, are in a better position to do this than Dave Silvergleid who is president of the National Postal Union and through the years has gained a full understanding of the postal operation. When a knowledgeable leader such as Mr. Silvergleid speaks up on an important matter such as this it behooves all of us to listen.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 15, 1969]

POSTAL UNION HEAD HAS SAY ON REFORM
(By John Cramer)

Much has been written against the Administration proposal to turn the postal service into a Government corporation.

But no one has done it better than David Silvergleid, president of the independent National Postal Union. So today, I give you Mr. Silvergleid as a guest columnist, telling why he considers the corporation proposal "a Trojan gift-horse."

Mr. Silvergleid:

Americans generally are bewitched by the concept of the Postal Corporation, and the concept is now being peddled as the cure for all that ails the Post Office Department.

The summer of 1969 should be at least somewhat disillusioning regarding the infallibility of the corporation:

Washington heard appeals from the electric utility that serves it to conserve power and shut off air-conditioners lest there be a breakdown of service.

Southeastern Florida experienced a blackout due to power failure;

New York's Consolidated Edison's service deteriorated badly. There were several partial and near-power failures within the city, which sweltered as air-conditioners were turned off to prevent total failure;

The much vaunted efficiency of the Bell System was put to a test and came thru with colors dragging in the dirt. In Washington, there were sometimes exasperating delays due to overload, and in New York, there were disconnects and wrong numbers by the score. So greatly did service deteriorate that one advertising firm ran a full-page ad in the New York Times to assure its clients that it still existed.

And, to add insult to injury, the same utility companies that were unequal to the test of service have filed for juicy rate increases . . .

IT DELIVERED

Much is wrong with the Post Office, but it delivered the mail without failure during the past long, hot summer. Even the Service's most adamant enemies admit that the failure rate is surprisingly low. Far less than one per cent of the mail is not delivered or returned to sender if the addressee cannot be found. A failure rate of one percent would mean a loss of 800 million or more pieces of mail. Small business all over the nation would flounder because of non-delivery of checks, and personal hardship would mount drastically. Few corporations can boast the low failure rate of the Postal Service.

If the record of the Post Office in mail delivery were as poor as that of stock brokerage houses in delivering stock certificates to their customers, the howls of the public would rebound from the heavens. The citizen depositing a check in a mail-box does so with full confidence that it will be delivered within a few days at the very most . . .

There is much more to the proposal than has been publicly discussed by those who would abolish the Post Office, remove it from Congressional control and replace it with a public corporation. The legislation would require the corporation to become self-supporting and prohibit it from incurring deficits. While this sounds commendable enough, the price of self-sufficiency would almost certainly be soaring postal rates and possibly wildcat strikes in the Postal Service.

The alleged heinous crime of the Postal Service is its publicized deficit of a billion dollars annually. That comes to about \$5 each year for each man, woman and child in the nation. The deficit is made up from general taxation, meaning that the poor and those in the low and moderate income brackets pay a lesser share of the cost.

There seems to be no sin in subsidy except when it comes to the Post Office. America subsidizes her ships at sea, her defense establishment, her universities, her airlines, her agriculture, her non-taxed religious institutions and many other areas of endeavor. There's nothing wrong with subsidy when it is used for public purposes. Most metropolitan newspapers and the big magazines that support the corporation concept are at least partially responsible for the postal deficit. The Reader's Digest, an almost rabid proponent, receives a postal subsidy of some \$17 million annually. . .

First-class mail accounts for 60 percent of the postal load and it pays for itself. Most so-called junk mail is handled in off-hours and because of the way it is handled, it also pays for itself. The deficit grows largely from special rates to publication publishers, educational institutions, non-profit organizations and the blind, and from service to rural and other areas of low population.

Rural America has never been served gracefully by the Bell System and the big utility companies. Only after the Rural Electrification Agency of the Federal government began to move did the utilities even express interest. Many farmers and other rural residents even now must pay for pole lines to get service.

The U.S. domestic postal service delivers the mail to the Nebraska farmer far from the city, to the Eskimo in a frozen village in Alaska, to the teacher on an Indian reservation, to the small businessman who runs the general store in some Wyoming hamlet. If these citizens are to continue to receive the mail, we dare not have a utility approach to the Postal Service.

But the Administration bill has called for changes in rates and services that will eliminate the "cost-service gap." It has also called for a surrender by Congress of the right to establish rates and the substitution of utility rate-making procedures. This could mean the abandonment of delivery in much of rural America, and even zoned postal rates based upon distance between sender and receiver.

TURKISH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously indicated, it was my privilege during the August recess to visit a most interesting part of the world and to include lands where striking developments are in progress. One of these was Turkey. The friendship of the Turkish Government and people for the United States is indeed inspiring. This is a most interesting land where definite progress in democracy and in opportunity is being made. Many of us do not realize that in Turkey can be found many of the famous sites of biblical times. They are protected by the Turkish Government, and a visit to these sites adds to the significance and interest of any trip to Turkey.

In my limited time in that nation, I was privileged to talk with Turkey's distinguished Prime Minister, His Excellency Suleyman Demirel, and with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, His Excellency Ihsan Sabri Caglayan. I now have the opportunity to offer for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made to me by the Minister of Foreign Affairs at the beginning of our conference in Ankara. I feel that it speaks volumes which are of interest to the people of our country, and I am glad, indeed, that it is my privilege to include his comments in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in Congress and others who will be interested:

STATEMENT MADE BY HIS EXCELLENCY MR. IHSAN SABRI CAGLAYAN, MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF TURKEY

Your decision to visit Turkey had made me very happy and I am very pleased to meet you. We have come to know you through your activities in the U.S. Congress as a person who has an interest in the problems of our area and towards Turkey. We appreciate your endeavors very much.

We attach in Turkey a great importance to the Turkish-American friendship. This is as well a consequence of our common interest and both countries' espousal of the same philosophy and way of life. The world displays today substantial ideological and political differences. Turkey, taking into account her strategic and geopolitical location, has made her choice.

The fact that Turkey sides with the West is not only a government policy but is also the result of a decision taken by the Turkish people. Our Allies, nevertheless, tend to see today a change in Turkey and they are worried because of this. This change is due to the anti-Western and anti-U.S. attitude adopted by some small factions in Turkey. The reason for this could be explained as follows:

Democracy is a system which has been attained in every country through an evolutionary process and bloody struggles. Turkey, actually, has been struggling for democracy since two centuries. We have achieved in a short time fundamental structural changes in our regime. The new Constitution adopted after the Revolution of May 27th has brought a wide range of liberties. It has recognized many democratic rights and liberties. But the tradition of using these rights and liberties without abusing them has not been yet completely

established. The new Constitution almost resembles an over-size suit which does not fit the body. Instead of narrowing the dress to our own size, we are trying, as the party in power, to change ourselves by enlarging the concept of democracy so that we can fit the suit. In order to properly install a free regime, an Administration which displays tolerance and at the same time which wages a struggle against the internal and external antagonists of freedom is required.

When four years ago I was appointed as Minister of Foreign Affairs, I used to sit, during international meetings, far behind the Allied Foreign Ministers. This was due, both to the system of seniority and to the place which Turkey occupies according to the alphabetical order. But during the last four years most of my colleagues have relinquished their office. Now, during international meetings I sit just behind Mr. Luns who is the most senior member of the "Allied Foreign Ministers Syndicate". This is but an example that a politically stable administration is prevalent in Turkey.

I wish to refer in this connection to the regretful incidents associated with the strikes which have taken place in some of the joint Turkish-American installations. It would be irrelevant to consider these acts as an attitude taken exclusively against the U.S. The right to strike has a long past in the U.S., whereas in Turkey this right has been acquired only very recently. If I am not mistaken, there are some 191 unions in the U.S. for approximately 13.5 million American workers. On the other hand, there are about 236 unions (if the local unions are also included the figure is 711) in Turkey for some 950,000 workers. The effects of the strikes—which are the result of the recent unrestricted atmosphere—are felt not only by the joint installations, but also by the Turkish industry itself.

I would also like on this occasion to say a few words about Turkey's position in NATO. Seven (out of a total of eight) political parties in Turkey support her membership in NATO. The single party against NATO enjoyed only 2.6% of the votes cast in the last elections.

As in every country, leftist institutions are very well organized in Turkey. Notwithstanding their very limited membership, they are very clever in finding slogans that spread rapidly all over the country. For the present the leftist propaganda remains superficial and is not effective. But with the future in mind, taking the required measures even from today has a manifest importance.

Now I want to talk about Turkey's defence efforts. One does not choose one's neighbors. In the past, we have fought with our neighbors many times. During those days, neither NATO nor the American military aid existed. But despite this, we have been able to protect ourselves. The fact of sharing a common border with a very powerful country does not, therefore, cause any apprehension in us because we know each other very well and because the present state of our relationship does not warrant any anxiety. We must, however, in the event of a surprise attack, be able to carry out our defence obligation duly. If we cannot accomplish this, even if our Allies come to our aid later on, we shall have to endure great sacrifices in trying to regain what has been lost. For this reason the Turkish Armed Forces must reach the required force levels. We have been very pleased to learn that the American military assistance which was accepted with the McNaughton plan and which underwent some alterations later on, has been presented to the Congress for approval, this time on a more favorable level. We expected that this proposal will be approved by the Congress. I am confident that Your Excellency will support this proposal during its debate in the Congress.

The U.S.A. is a living example of how a country can develop in freedom. But this de-

velopment took place in a historical evolution phase by phase. As you know, Turkey is also experiencing a development effort with her roughly 300 dollar per capita yearly income and is striving to accomplish this under a free regime. If Turkey becomes successful in this respect, she will prove that developing countries can progress under free regimes. We are determined to demonstrate this.

This is all I have to say to Your Excellency. I thank you for listening to me.

PRIVACY BECOMES FANNIE MAE

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when postal reform appears imminent and when we are forced to recognize the failure of bureaucratized government, the following article, which deals with the newly acquired private status of Fannie Mae—Federal National Mortgage Association—is didactic.

I would hope that the experience of Fannie Mae will prove instructive to my colleagues and to all Americans—as the Republic moves to consider reforms in the area of conversion of Government appendages to more efficient private operations.

The article, from the August 30 issue of Business Week, follows:

PRIVACY BECOMES FANNIE MAE

(NOTE.—After a year as a private company, the ex-federal agency is a winner, despite tight money and other problems.)

The career of the one-time government girl, Fannie Mae, now that she has turned to private enterprise, is proving an eye-popping success.

Fannie Mae—nickname for the Federal National Mortgage Assn.—is slimmer, more productive, and far richer after one year as a private corporation than she ever was in 30 years as a federal agency. Indeed, her accomplishments since Congress made her a private company in September, 1968, have given heart to those who think that many other agencies—in particular the Post Office—would do better if cut loose from the federal bureaucracy.

Fannie Mae's primary role as a federal agency and now as a private concern is to feed money into the mortgage market—buying government-backed mortgages in the secondary market and in the process providing lenders with funds to use in making new loans.

OPERATIONS

Mortgage money tends to dry up when credit gets tight; even Fannie Mae, despite access to Treasury cash, ran short of funds midway through the credit pinch of 1966. Credit this year is very tight, and Fannie Mae can't even hit the Treasury for money; every dime it gets must be borrowed in the market.

Yet Fannie Mae still will feed \$6 to \$8-billion into the mortgage market in 1969 against \$2-billion in 1966. Moreover, it is moving into new fields. Recently it began buying hospital mortgages for the first time—though only when the hospitals are non-profit institutions and the mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

At the same time, Fannie Mae is busy learning to act and look like a private corporation. It hired McKinsey & Co., the consulting firm, to teach the staff management skills and to reorganize it along private in-

dustry lines. It is well along with cost-cutting schemes—one plan being to pare its staff to less than half the 1,038 employees who worked there when it was a government agency. Only 832 are on the payroll today, and 125 of them already have received dismissal notices.

HOLDING DOWN

Cost-cutting is critical right now, since Fannie Mae must keep borrowing in a money market where interest rates never have been higher. But mortgage rates also are at record levels. Fannie Mae earned \$8.5-million in the first half of 1968 (and \$15.4-million for the whole year) but \$11.3-million in the first half of 1969. Should money rates ever turn down, the corporation's mushrooming portfolio of high-yield mortgages, now about \$8-billion against \$6.5-billion a year ago, would assure still richer earnings.

This observation hasn't been lost on investors. Fannie Mae doesn't try to woo shareholders. "What's best for the mortgage market may not be what's best for stock market," notes President Raymond H. Lapin, "but if [stockholders] are not happy, they can invest elsewhere." For all that, Fannie Mae's stock has risen from 70 in early 1968 to 245 last June. It slipped to 190 in July as the rest of the market plummeted, but is back over 220 now.

Lapin, the man responsible for Fannie Mae's dashing new look, suggests that other government agencies could get a similar suave appearance. Indeed, he urges private management for such service agencies as the Post Office, the FHA, and the General Services Administration. At Fannie Mae, he says, "We are developing a way to meet the objectives of public policy through the corporate form with the least cost to government and the least disturbance to private business."

SWITCH

Fannie Mae always was a hybrid sort of agency with a rare degree of self-sufficiency. In its government days, as a borrower it was second only to the Treasury itself. The Treasury once owned \$216-million worth of Fannie Mae preferred stock—bought back by Fannie Mae when it became a private company. However, Fannie Mae also had some 1.2-million nonvoting shares, held by some 9,000 shareholders and traded over the counter.

The decision to shift from a government to a private corporation made sense from both sides. With its public shareholders, and its unique role as a participant in the mortgage market, Fannie Mae never felt very comfortable as a federal agency.

On the other side, under the revised federal budget adopted two years ago, each dollar that Fannie Mae put into the mortgage market would count as a government expenditure. So in the 1968 Housing Act, Congress directed Fannie Mae to retire its preferred stock and go its own way, with the running of some government subsidized housing programs that Fannie Mae used to handle given over to a new federal agency, the Government National Mortgage Assn. (or Ginnie Mae).

Even now, Fannie Mae isn't totally free of the federal government. It still can buy only government-insured mortgages—those backed by the FHA and Veterans Administration. Its primary chore will continue to be keeping the mortgage market liquid, with a secondary responsibility—not too clearly spelled out—of financing some government low-cost housing programs. But in a pinch, Fannie Mae can sell up to \$2.25-billion of its debt securities to the Treasury—a nice cushion that gives Fannie Mae securities extra allure in the marketplace.

GUARDIANS

Fannie Mae still functions under the Housing and Urban Development Secretary—since he appoints a majority of the board. In a year or so, though, it will be run by a 15-member board, five chosen by the President

and 10 elected by shareholders. Once the board takes command, it will pick the executive team that will run Fannie Mae—perhaps replacing Lapin, who was named president two years ago by Lyndon Johnson. Lapin, 50, was a highly successful California mortgage banker before he received the Fannie Mae appointment. He's a six-footer with a capacity for talking quietly, but at length, about mortgages. Apart from his appetite for and knowledge of housing finance, Lapin's second obvious asset is a politician's sense for the power relationships in Washington.

The most striking shift at Fannie Mae came even before it became a private company and involves the way it buys mortgages. It once told how much it would pay for mortgages and then kept buying until its money ran out. Now each week it announces how much it can spend on mortgages and lets lenders bid for the money. It just raised the weekly figure from \$130-million to \$150-million.

What lenders get now is a commitment that Fannie Mae will buy their mortgage at some future date. Lenders pay a fee of 0.5% for this pledge, a nice fillip for Fannie Mae earnings.

CLEAN SWEEP

Now with the help of McKinsey & Co. and of Western Operations, Inc., computer consultants, Fannie Mae is changing more of its operation.

Instead of using many clerks in five regional offices, it is centralizing—and computerizing—its mortgage buying operations in Washington. The old Fannie Mae would check the credit of every home buyer whose mortgages it bought—"rather crazy," says an official of Fannie Mae, "after FHA and VA had already done the same thing." The new Fannie Mae makes an occasional spot credit check but leaves the primary responsibility for credit-worthiness to whomever services the mortgage, usually, the original lender.

Fannie Mae officials claim they have had few serious problems in converting to private corporation status. But one difficulty came in recruiting management talent. Fannie Mae, in common with most government agencies, had a high ratio of lower echelon people to executives.

More disturbing is the debt situation. Fannie Mae has \$7-billion in debt outstanding with the average maturity one year and five months. This means Fannie Mae must keep coming back for funds in today's tense financial market. "I am highly critical of our situation," says Lapin, "but nobody thought rates would go as high as they are."

Lapin is trying to stretch out Fannie Mae's debt. Just this week, he announced plans to raise \$600-million through a sale of debentures—including \$350-million of a 14-month security but also \$250-million of a five-year issue. To replace the day-to-day cash it once got from the Treasury, Fannie Mae has opened a \$150-million line of credit with a group of banks led by First National City Bank of New York.

TOMORROW

Fannie Mae still sees itself in the early stages of growth toward becoming the nation's central mortgage bank. Looking ahead, Lapin wants it to expand beyond FHA-VA mortgages—which today make up only 20% of all mortgages—into conventional mortgages.

Lapin also keeps in view the low-cost housing sector—"that's the mass market," he says. He would like to see FHA concentrate more than it does now on low- and moderate-income housing. Once FHA moves into an area, of course, Fannie Mae can then follow.

Finally, Lapin wants the Treasury to give a green light to a new kind of security that he thinks will provide the financial base for the housing market of the 1970s. The instrument, approved by the 1968 Housing Act but not yet approved by the Treasury, would be

backed by pools of mortgages and guaranteed by the Government National Mortgage Assn. The aim would be to sell these instruments to pension funds and other sources of capital that only buy a few mortgages now.

MARINE MAKES APPEAL TO STAY IN VIETNAM

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, in these times of sometimes bitter and sometimes unpatriotic fervor over our involvement in Vietnam, I cannot help but be deeply impressed by a letter I received recently from a marine corporal, serving his second tour of duty in Vietnam.

This marine, whose home is in Bath, N.Y., in my 38th Congressional District, heard a report that his unit is due to leave Vietnam and he has asked my help in seeing to it that he be allowed to stay there so he can, as he puts it, "serve my country's needs."

The spirit exemplified by this marine is typical of the devotion to duty that I found in my talks with our soldiers during my recent visit to Vietnam. Their morale, despite the sometimes dismaying reports of beatnik disorders at home, was a source of deep pride to me.

Because the letter from this marine corporal demonstrates a loyalty to country felt by our servicemen in Vietnam but not often stressed enough, I am placing it in the RECORD, so all may share it with me:

FPO SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

August 27, 1969.

DEAR SIR: I am writing hoping you can solve my problem. I am now serving my second tour here in Vietnam. I volunteered to come back after four months of duty in the U.S. I landed here in May and am not due to leave here until June of next year, 1970.

I have about 18 months left in the Marines. I've been in for 2½ years now and have earned the rank of Cpl. The first of September I am to be Sergeant so I was told.

As for my problem, there is the rumor here in this unit that 2nd Battalion 7th Marines is to leave this country. I as for one like this duty here and am willing to serve my country's needs here. There are many others whom would be more than happy to leave Vietnam. I am writing to you Sir to ask for help. I would like to stay here if we (2/7) does leave. Is there any way possible you can help me?

Also, sir, is there any certain address of which I can get to purchase a New York State flag. I am a mechanic and I would love to fly my state flag high of my motor pool.

Thank you for your time, I will understand any reason of yours if it is not possible to remain here.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN K. SINCERBOX,
Corporal, U.S. Marine Corps, 2361430.

DUNDALK JAYCEES

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently learned of an outstanding com-

munity endeavor in Dundalk, Md., which is being sponsored by the area Jaycees. In early fall, they will open an activity center for the mentally retarded to provide a program for the retarded who are past school age but who are unable to work because of their handicap. I should like to commend the Dundalk Jaycees and the community of Dundalk by including a description of this program in the RECORD:

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Dundalk Jaycees have recently embarked on a project we feel will greatly benefit the Greater Dundalk Community. In cooperation with the state and county governments an Activity Center will be opened for the Mentally Retarded. The center will be located in the Watersedge Shopping Center.

The Activity Center is the first attempt on our part to provide a program for retarded young men and women who have passed the school age, but are not capable of being placed in private employment nor to cope with placement in the sheltered workshop. Heretofore, the kids graduating from Battle Monument School for example, had no alternative but to sit at home and regress, usually forcing their parents to place them in a residential facility such as Rosewood in preference to nothing. Our alternative provides the opportunity of keeping the young adult in the home where he can be nurtured and sustained by the love of his parents and at the same time, be provided an opportunity to spend his days at the shop in a dignified pursuit.

The work the individual will be called upon to do in the Activity Center will be as close to the activities of his normal brothers or sisters as possible. In other words, the Activity Center program will be work oriented. The Center will take all kinds of unsophisticated sub-contract work and attempt to push each individual to the limit of his capabilities. Some of the work force will become proficient enough to be moved upwards to a sheltered workshop or, in a few cases, even out to private employment, but for the most part, those who are placed in the Activity Center will remain.

Although operating costs have been appropriated by the state and county governments, initial expense for renovation of the facility and purchases of equipment must be assumed by the community.

PROFESSIONAL STAFFS OF CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the book, entitled "Professional Staffs of Congress," was written in 1962 by Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl of Purdue University. It is not only an excellent reference for Members of Congress and for staff members, but has become an outstanding text for classroom study of Congress and its work.

It has proved so popular in these respects that it is now in its fourth printing. Professor Kofmehl has written a new preface, bringing readers up to date on the changes and developments in congressional staffs since the book was completed 7 years ago.

The preface itself is worthy of the attention of all of us in the Congress. It reads as follows:

PREFACE TO FOURTH PRINTING

To paraphrase a popular saying from the comic strip *Peanuts*, "Happiness is sustained demand for a book seven years after publication." Besides occasioning such expressions of joy, the fourth printing of this work affords an opportunity to comment on some relevant developments that have occurred since the study was originally completed in January, 1962.

On January 12, 1965, The Senate Republican Conference adopted a rule relaxing adherence to seniority in the making of committee assignments. It provides that no Republican Senator already on one of four committees designated "exclusive"—Appropriations, Armed Services, Finance, and Foreign Relations—may be assigned to another of these four until every other Republican Senator has had an opportunity to go on one of them. However, the force of the rule was weakened by stipulations that Republican Senators currently holding assignments on two "exclusive" committees could continue to do so and that at any time a Republican Senator could transfer from one exclusive committee to another on which a vacancy existed. Because Senator Jacob Javits (R.-N.Y.) had advocated such a change for many years and chaired the subcommittee of the Republican Committee on Committees that formulated the specific proposal adopted by the Republican Conference, this modification in procedure has been appropriately nicknamed the "Javits Rule."

In the 90th Congress, the number of standing committees in the House of Representatives was increased to twenty-one. On April 3, 1968, the House established the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as a permanent standing committee. This action carried out a recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, a brief history of which will be included below.

More recently, another House standing committee was transformed but retained the same membership. After an acrimonious debate on February 18, 1969, the House approved a resolution changing the name of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Internal Security Committee and redefining its jurisdiction. Opponents of the change unsuccessfully attempted to amend the resolution to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee and transfer its functions to the House Judiciary Committee.

A few months earlier, however, a twenty-year-old congressional agency, the House Coordinator of Information, was eliminated. In the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, the House cut off funds for this office "not later than October 1, 1967." The accompanying House report noted that the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress had recommended abolishing it.

Perhaps even more importantly, since preventing is easier than correcting mistakes, Congress has avoided adopting inappropriate forms of staffing that could have had untoward effects on the whole legislative process. During the spring and summer of 1963 when Congress reached a new high in concern about science policy issues, several bills were introduced to establish a Congressional Science Advisory Staff. While well-intentioned, these proposals were based on faulty assumptions about the nature of science policy questions and the requirements for a congressional staff to handle them. Congress wisely rejected them in favor of expanding and refining extant arrangements for obtaining advice on science-related issues.

Beginning with the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, Congress has provided substantial funds for the Legislative Reference Service to hire additional high-grade specialists in science and technology. And a number of congressional committees have imaginatively experimented with the use of consultants, advisory panels, and the Na-

tional Academy of Sciences for advice on science policy issues.

Both chambers have made it possible for each member of Congress to hire a legislative assistant at a professional staff salary level. On May 26, 1966, the House adopted a resolution authorizing an additional clerk and an increase in the basic clerk-hire allowance of \$7,000 (\$19,220 in gross salary then) for every member of the House of Representatives. On July 10, 1967, the Senate amended the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, to provide an additional \$23,400 (gross salary) in clerk-hire allowance for each Senator. When introducing this amendment, Senator Joseph Tydings (D.-Md.) stressed that its purpose was to enable every Senator to hire the legislative assistant authorized by the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, S. 355, which had been passed by the Senate on March 7, 1967, but which he felt had poor prospects for speedy approval by the House. Unfortunately, Senator Tydings' foreboding proved justified; for fifteen months later, S. 355 died at the close of the 90th Congress still incarcerated in the House Rules Committee.

As indicated at several places above, the most momentous factor influencing congressional structure and procedures since January, 1962, has been the creation of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress and the continuing efforts to enact measures embodying its recommendations. This action was in response to a demand that had been mounting for a number of years. Increasingly, journalists, political scientists, and members of Congress had voiced the need for a thorough review of congressional structure and functioning. During the early 1960's, numerous resolutions to authorize studies of congressional reform were introduced. On September 19, 1963, one of them, S. Con. Res. 1, was reported favorably by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee but was not voted upon by the Senate. The 1964 election results strengthened elements in Congress pressing for reform, prominent among which was the House Democratic Study Group, an organization of liberal Democratic Congressmen. House DSC leaders won the crucial support of Speaker John McCormack (D.-Mass.). On March 11, 1965, Congress approved S. Con. Res. 2 establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress to conduct a comprehensive study of the organization and operation of Congress.

Closely intertwined with this endeavor was the campaign for minority staffing, the beginnings of which are discussed in Chapter XIV "Postscript" (pp. 210-17). In 1962 Representative Fred Schwengel (R.-Iowa) joined Representative Thomas B. Curtis (R.-Mo.) and Senator Carl Curtis (R.-Nebr.) as leading proponents of minority staffing, and during that year they concerted their efforts rather informally. On January 24, 1963, then House Republican Conference Chairman Gerald Ford (R.-Mich.) appointed a Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing, headed by Representative Schwengel and including Representatives Curtis and Robert Griffin (R.-Mich.) among others. The Schwengel Subcommittee propagandized vigorously and coordinated a drive by Republican members of House committees for more minority staff members, which according to them enjoyed significant success. In 1964 Representative Schwengel was defeated for re-election, but the organized effort by House Republicans continued. On March 30, 1965, the House Republican Conference Committee on Planning and Research appointed a Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, with Representative James Cleveland (R.-N.H.) as chairman. House Minority Leader Gerald Ford later explained that this task force "was created in part to assure that every significant aspect of the operation of the House of Representatives would be studied and to serve

as a reservoir of recommendations should the Joint Committee [on the Organization of the Congress] fail to report out a comprehensive set of proposals for modernizing the machinery and strengthening the role of Congress in the twentieth century."

At its first meeting on March 17, 1965, the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress elected as co-chairman Senator Mike Monroney (D.-Okla.), who, as a young member of the House, had been vice-chairman of a similar joint committee that produced the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and Representative Ray Madden (D.-Ind.), a member of the House Rules Committee, to which any bill emanating from the Joint Committee would be referred. The other Democratic members of the Joint Committee, which was evenly divided between the parties and the two chambers, were Senators John Sparkman (Ala.) and Lee Metcalf (Mont.) and Representatives Jack Brooks (Tex.) and Ken Hechler (W. Va.). The ranking minority member from the Senate was Karl Mundt (R.-S. Dak.) and from the House was Thomas B. Curtis. Republican Senators Clifford Case (N.J.) and J. Caleb Boggs (Del.) and Republican Representatives Durward Hall (Mo.) and Robert Griffin rounded out the committee roster. In May, 1966, when Representative Griffin was appointed to the Senate, he was replaced by Representative James Cleveland.

Although many of the Republicans on the Joint Committee had been identified as crusaders for more minority staffing, the Joint Committee launched its undertaking in an aura of bipartisanship. It adopted a rule that forbade making any recommendation that had not been endorsed by a bipartisan majority of the members from each house. The staffs of the Democratic Study Group, the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, and the Joint Committee cooperated harmoniously in their research efforts. In its *Second Interim Report*, the Joint Committee acknowledged: "The research and presentations of members of the Democratic Study Group and the Republican Task Force, as well as other Senators and Representatives, have been most helpful to the Joint Committee on Organization."

Between May 10 and September 23, 1965, the Joint Committee held forty days of public hearings. The testimony, together with statements submitted for the record and supporting documents, totalled 2,322 printed pages. Along with this material and studies prepared by its own staff (including a computer analysis of the demands made by the committee system on members' time in the 88th Congress), the Joint Committee utilized reports of other committees and state legislatures, published and unpublished works by political scientists, and studies of congressional organization by foundations and other private institutions. All in all, Co-chairman Monroney was able to claim "that no proposal for congressional reform made in recent years—irrespective of source or media—escaped the attention of the joint committee." From January through July, 1966, the Joint Committee met in more than fifty executive sessions to consider what recommendations to make.

On July 28, 1966, the co-chairmen filed the final report of the Joint Committee in their respective chambers. Essentially moderate in the scope of its reforms, this report contained over 100 proposals concerning the committee system, fiscal controls, staffing, research facilities, ethics, housekeeping functions, and the lobby regulation act. In what turned out to be among the most controversial portions, the report recommended a "bill of rights" for committee members to give the majority more control over the chairman and the minority a larger role in committee operations, increased staffing, and realignment of some committee jurisdictions. This last recommendation entailed creating a

Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and committees on education in both houses with a corresponding redefinition of other committees' jurisdictions, redesignation of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee as the Science and Astronautics Committee in the Senate, expanding the jurisdiction of both science committees, and renaming the banking and currency committees as the committees on banking, housing, and urban affairs with appropriate additions to their jurisdictions.

On August 26, 1966, the Senate established a Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress (consisting of the Senate members of the Joint Committee) to receive, consider, and report a bill carrying out the recommendations of the Joint Committee. The authorizing resolution stipulated, however, that the Special Committee was not to report any bill until it had given the chairmen and ranking minority member of each Senate standing committee an opportunity to appear before it and present their views. At hearings of the Senate Special Committee on August 31 and September 8, 1966, three committee chairmen testified in person while three others and a ranking minority member submitted written statements for the record. In some cases vehemently, they criticized certain recommendations of the Joint Committee and the corresponding provisions of a proposed bill—mostly those involving changes in the jurisdictions of their respective committees. Despite this adverse reaction, on September 21, 1966, the Senate Special Committee reported a bill, S. 3848, incorporating the Joint Committee's recommendations virtually unchanged. On September 29, 1966, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D.-Mont.) announced that this bill would not be considered by the Senate prior to adjournment because of the heavy legislative workload but that it would be reintroduced and taken up early in the 90th Congress.

Accordingly, on January 16, 1967, the Senate Special Committee reported out S. 355, the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, which had been carefully revised to remove all the Senate committee jurisdictional changes except for the creation of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs and for adding urban affairs to the jurisdiction of the renamed Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. However, S. 355 retained all the recommended modifications in the jurisdictions of the House committees. The accompanying committee report rather plaintively stated:

"The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress recommended two additional Senate jurisdictional changes which have not been included in this bill. . . . The hearings held by the Senate Committee following the publication of the Joint Committee's Final Report indicated wide opposition to these proposals and a view that sufficient consideration had not been given to potentially detrimental effects on the existing committee operations. After receiving this testimony, the Committee has concluded that these realignments should not be proposed at this time."

After eighteen days of debate between January 25 and March 7, 1967, the Senate approved S. 355 by a vote of 75 to 9. Although forty amendments were adopted, efforts to delete the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the whole portion on the lobby regulation act were defeated. More importantly, the staffing provisions emerged almost intact with only minor amendments clarifying the status of a proposed legislative review specialist for each standing committee and adjusting the salaries of Senate staff members.

On March 9, 1967, the Senate messaged S. 355 to the House where it was referred to the Rules Committee. Except for a short hearing on April 11, 1967, the Rules Committee took no further public action. Purportedly, strong

opposition to the measure centered around the projected changes in House committee jurisdictions and the provisions on committee procedures, staffing, and regulation of lobbying. Through 1967 to the end of June, 1968, various versions of S. 355, revised to remove certain of these objections, were introduced in the House. Besides the House members of the Joint Committee, two members of the House Rules Committee, Richard Bolling (D.-Mo.), long-time articulate advocate of congressional reform and prominent member of the Democratic Study Group, and H. Allen Smith (R.-Calif.), the ranking Republican on the Rules Committee, participated in this endeavor to produce an acceptable bill. On December 31, 1967, after having received several renewals of authorization, the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress expired. Likewise, the Senate Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress went out of existence on June 30, 1968.

Meanwhile, in addition to those proposals already mentioned as having been accomplished (legislative assistants for Senators, creation of a House ethics committee, and discontinuance of the House Coordinator of Information), Congress continued to enact particular recommendations of the Joint Committee, such as increased travel allowances for Congressmen, separately in other legislation. This led to widespread speculation that the popular provisions of S. 355 would be extracted in this fashion, leaving the mutilated remains buried in the House Rules Committee.

Periodically between October, 1966 and August, 1968, the House Republican Policy Committee, House Republican Conference, and House Minority Leader Ford issued statements urging favorable action on congressional reorganization bills. The 1968 Republican Platform exhorted:

"Congress itself must be reorganized and modernized in order to function efficiently as a co-equal branch of government. Democrats in control of Congress have opposed Republican efforts for Congressional reform and killed legislation embodying the recommendations of a special bipartisan committee. We will again press for enactment of this measure."

On September 11, 1968, a group of thirteen Republican Representatives led by Donald Rumsfeld (Ill.) and including Thomas B. Curtis and James Cleveland delayed proceedings in the House for over 2 hours by engaging in dilatory parliamentary maneuvers. Their avowed purpose was "to dramatize the need for House consideration, and hopefully, House action" on S. 355 and a campaign spending reform bill (H.R. 11233). Thirteen days later, Representative Rumsfeld made public a letter to Speaker McCormack, signed by 134 of the 187 House Republicans, urging him to schedule the two bills for floor action.

Also in September, 1968, five liberal House Democrats headed by Representative Thomas Rees (Calif.) tried to extricate S. 355 from the House Rules Committee by resorting to a discharge petition, but they failed to get the requisite 218 signatures of House members.

On October 8-9, 1968, the Rumsfeld group again impeded the conduct of House business. By means of forty-five roll calls and other delaying tactics, they kept the House in continuous session for more than thirty-two hours. Although Democrats accused the Republicans of trying to defeat the bill before the House to allow television debates between the presidential candidates, Rumsfeld maintained they were trying to influence the House Democratic leadership to bring S. 355 and H.R. 11233 to the House floor. House Minority Leader Ford publicly endorsed their actions and promised that these bills would have high priority on a Republican agenda for the 91st Congress.

Inescapably, these events gave a partisan coloration to the struggle for House consideration of S. 355, which had been developed under such thoroughly bipartisan auspices. With the adjournment of Congress on October 14, 1968, all pending legislation died. On November 5, 1968, the prospects for congressional reform were further worsened when Senator Monroney was defeated for reelection and Representative Thomas B. Curtis left the House in his unsuccessful bid for a Senate seat.

In the months immediately preceding the 91st Congress, some liberal House Democrats continued to advocate congressional reorganization. On January 23, 1969, Speaker McCormack, who the preceding year had steadfastly contended that he was for congressional reform, said he would like to see the House Rules Committee hold hearings on it soon. And House Minority Leader Ford reiterated his desire that Congress take up the subject early in the session.

On February 4, 1969, Senator Mundt introduced S. 844, a proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969, with the four other remaining members of the defunct Senate Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress as co-sponsors. The next day in the House, Representative Rumsfeld introduced a similar bill, H.R. 6278. Both were essentially variations on S. 355 of the 90th Congress. On March 4, 1969, the House Republican Policy Committee again urged enactment of legislation reorganizing Congress. About a week later, Representative Rees announced his intention to introduce a congressional reform bill, which also would be a revised reincarnation of S. 355. By April 3, 1969, when he had aggregated 103 Republican House members as co-sponsors of his bill, Representative Rumsfeld asserted that the chances of obtaining early floor consideration of such a measure by the House were greater than any time in the preceding twenty years.

Whether or not this is an accurate forecast and if so, whether or not that would mean enactment of a comprehensive congressional reorganization bill is difficult to say at the time of writing (April 12, 1969). The loss of Senator Monroney's leadership is an incalculable handicap to moving another omnibus reform bill through the Senate. The extent to which the adoption of various attractive features of the measure as originally proposed has diminished the appeal of the remainder and the amount of bipartisan support that can be mustered in the House are hard to assess.

Whatever the outcome, however, the provisions on committee staffing in S. 355, as approved by the Senate in the 90th Congress, warrant examination. For they have been carried over substantially unchanged in most successive versions of the bill and hence should foreshadow any legislation amending the existing law on committee staffs.

S. 355 adheres to the original philosophy of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 of keeping the permanent professional staffs of the standing committees small in size. It increases the quota for each standing committee (except the appropriations committees) from four to six, with the proviso that the two more professional staff members would be in addition to any other extra staff previously authorized for a specific committee and to a legislative review specialist which all the standing committees (except the appropriations and House ethics committees) would be allowed to hire.

Officially recognizing the practice of supplementing the regular staff with specially-authorized employees, S. 355 requires each standing committee to consolidate all such requests into a single annual authorization resolution that specifies by name and amount every subcommittee to be funded for that year. This has the twofold purpose of enabling the committees to gain greater con-

trol over their subcommittees and each chamber to evaluate better the overall requests for such extra staff.

After redesignating "legislative oversight" as "legislative review," S. 355 states in some detail the legislative review responsibilities of each standing committee and requires it to submit an annual report on their performance. Then S. 355 authorizes a review specialist for each standing committee, to be appointed by the chairman with the prior approval of the ranking minority member, to assist the committee in carrying out its legislative review duties.

To permit access to outside experts on a part-time basis, S. 355 authorizes each standing committee to hire temporarily (not to exceed one year) consultants and consultative organizations to be selected by the chairman and ranking minority member acting jointly. Likewise, S. 355 encourages improving the skills of the permanent employees by authorizing each standing committee to provide assistance to professional staff members in obtaining specialized training. In each instance, the committee must get the approval of the administration committee and of a resolution in the House or Senate, as the case may be, supplying the requisite funds.

With respect to the controversial demands for minority staffing, S. 355 makes the following concessions. In the case of specially-authorized staff personnel, it admonishes that "the minority shall receive fair consideration" in their appointment. For the regular staff of each standing committee, it provides that a majority of the minority members may, if they desired, select two of the six professional staff members for appointment, that these appointees "shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority members deem advisable," and that they shall be dismissed upon request by a majority of the minority members. The rest of the professional staff continues to be hired and fired by a majority vote of the committee. S. 355 retains the language of the existing law assigning the professional staff members "to the chairman and the ranking minority member . . . as the committee may deem advisable" (except where the minority exercises the option to select its own), requiring appointment of all professional staff members "on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office," and prohibiting the assignment to them of any work other than committee business.

Likewise, S. 355 provides that a majority of the minority members may, if they desire, select one of the six clerical staff members for appointment. Further, it stipulates that all minority staff members shall be accorded equitable treatment on salary rates, the assignment of facilities, and accessibility of committee records. And S. 355 makes clear that it does not authorize minority members of a committee to select staff members for appointment in any case in which two or more professional staff members or one or more clerical staff members, who are satisfactory to a majority of the minority members, have already been assigned to assist them.

Relatedly, S. 355 establishes an Office of Placement and Office Management, which, upon request, shall assist committees as well as members and officers of the Congress in obtaining qualified staff and shall furnish advice with respect to office management procedures. By placing the use of this office on a purely voluntary basis, S. 355 has removed the principal objections to the creation of such a facility in the past.

For the most part, the committee staffing provisions of S. 355, as passed by the Senate in the 90th Congress, embody the lessons of twenty years experience with professional staffs and probably unavoidable compromises with forces challenging principles incorpo-

rated in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Confining expansion largely to specially-authorized staffs, making possible more effective checks by the House and Senate on their growth, helping to combat the centrifugal tendencies of subcommittees, encouraging resort to outside expertise, and facilitating professional growth of the permanent staffs of committees are all laudable objectives.

The desirability of a review specialist for each standing committee is less obvious. In the process of passage by the Senate, an amendment vesting legislative review functions in the committee rather than in the proposed review specialist helped clarify that he would work under the control of the committee and within its existing staff structure. However, there still remains a potential for conducting legislative review through a more or less independent staff operation, with all the bad effects that could produce.

The procedure of having the chairman and ranking minority member act jointly not only in appointing the review specialist but also in selecting consultants and consultative organizations is questionable. Although in most instances these two individuals might have the main say in making such choices, it would be prudent to retain the safeguard of requiring approval by a majority vote of the committee. Also, this would be more consonant with the pervading philosophy of S. 355, expressed in the "committee bill of rights" and elsewhere, of placing ultimate control over the committee in a majority of the membership.

The departures from the principle of non-partisanship for committee staffs in S. 355 probably represent the minimum concessions acceptable to the proponents of increased minority staffing, who have constituted such a major element of support for the congressional reform movement in the 1960's. The exhortatory language on according the minority fair consideration in the appointment of specially-authorized staffs merely recognizes prevalent practices, which reflect the results of a more than decade-long crusade. By being couched in permissive rather than mandatory language, the provisions authorizing the minority of each standing committee to select part of the permanent staff as a matter of right, if they so desire, allow the maintenance of nonpartisanship in committee staffs wherever possible while taking care of situations where the minority might otherwise be denied adequate staff assistance. Moreover, the procedure for selection by a majority of the minority members is responsive to a basic desire of many advocates of more minority staffing: that on each committee there be more staff to assist the minority as such and not just the ranking minority member. For to some extent this cause, like many other aspects of the congressional reorganization movement, is but another manifestation of the generation gap, with junior members of Congress assailing the bastions of power manned by their elders.

PORNOGRAPHY IS BIG BUSINESS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, pornography is one of the most pressing social problems of the day.

Our Subcommittee on Postal Operations has begun hearings on several measures aimed at controlling the sending of smut through the mails to homes where minors reside.

As anyone who has studied the matter

knows, it is a most difficult one to deal with where first-class mail is used because of the traditional sanctity of first-class mail.

The Buffalo Evening News in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., has begun a series of articles which starts out as a most comprehensive look at the problem of pornography/erotica.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the first installment of the series titled "Smut in Buffalo":

SMUT IN BUFFALO—I: PORNOGRAPHY/EROTICA IS BIG BUSINESS HERE AND ACROSS NATION

(By Ralph Dibble)

Pornography/erotica is big business in Buffalo.

It's a business dealing in smut—smut literature, dirty films, erotic still pictures and devices.

Police estimate that pornography/erotica's take in Buffalo is between \$1 million and \$2 million a year.

And they suspect that sales are closer to the top figure than the lower.

Nationwide, however, sales are estimated at \$2 billion a year for all the products of pornography—books, magazines, movie, films, recording, miscellaneous printed materials and devices.

In Western New York, you can buy pornography/erotica in respectable book stores, the corner drugstore, and at corner newsstands.

And they're not kept under the counter anymore. They're right out in plain view.

EVEN ON TV

Conscientious parents find it necessary to monitor even prime time television shows.

Buffalonians can see a "dirty movie" anytime. The dirty records aren't on the counter-tops (yet), but they're readily available.

Even so, Buffalo is a rather tame middle-of-the-road town in the vast network of the pornography/erotica industry.

The undisputed American capital of pornography is Los Angeles. The pornographic publishing business has 200 companies that take in \$500 million a year. And 75% of them are located in the Los Angeles area where one despairing policeman declared: "We are so deep in hard-core obscenity that I feel we will never recover."

SEX BEST SELLER

The head of this pornographic publishing world is Marvin Miller. His annual volume is \$10 million. His all-time best sex seller sold 500,000 copies in one year—which put it on equal footing with 1967's best seller, "Death of a President."

Altogether the book's sales have totaled \$2.5 million. Mr. Miller's publication costs totaled \$2,500, including \$1,000 for models' fees.

Los Angeles is not only the major producer of smut. It's also a conspicuous consumer center.

LA barrooms have come up with a latter-day version of the free lunch. They edify their patrons with free movies—dirty, of course.

New York City, a place of contradictions in every field, has one refinement that apparently has escaped West Coast centers—do-it-yourself pornography. In New York, the seeker of truth can rent a model and take his own obscene pictures.

NOT IN PARIS

Foreign cities present strange ironies. Toronto suffers from a trade deficit. It consumes pornography voraciously—and imports it all from the U.S.

Paris—everyone's idea of a "naughty" city—is one of the few places in the world where it's difficult to buy obscene literature.

But in Scandinavia, all laws barring obscenity have been repealed and everything goes. The natives' reaction to the glut of pornography has been massive indifference.

Pornography, which no longer sells in

Scandinavia, is being exported by Sweden and Denmark to the U.S.

Some realists think Scandinavia may have found the answer—people soon will sicken of pornography that surrounds them.

But Sweden, the first country to lift bans on filth, leads the world in incidence of syphilis and also has the highest of all suicide rates.

OPPOSITE DIRECTION

In fact, New York State is traveling in the opposite directions. Two new state laws became effective Sept. 1, increasing the severity of the punishment for selling indecent material to minors under 17 and creating degrees of guilt in obscenity cases, one degree for wholesalers and another for retailers.

Buffalo shares a set of ironies with other major cities. Most of its traffic in pornography is legal. But it assigns a policeman to battle the tide of filth—detective Sgt. Frank V. Spano.

Sgt. Spano admits: "I've been on the job for six years and the flood of what I call pornography is worse than ever."

The flood of pornography was loosed by a U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1957.

REDEEMING VALUE

In a majority-approved decision, Justice William J. Brennan wrote:

"All ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance—unorthodox ideas, controversial ideas, even ideas hateful to the prevailing climate of opinion—have the full protection of free speech provisions of the Constitution's First Amendment."

Subsequent high court decisions have further widened the channels of free expression.

Something is legally obscene now if its "predominant appeal is to prurient or morbid interest in sex," goes "substantially beyond" customary limits of candor and is "utterly without redeeming social value."

The way it works out is that magazines featuring nude pictures can get under the legal umbrella with almost any kind of text material.

WAY TO REBEL

So America finds itself in a strange, new world. Older citizens find it hard to accept that what used to be sold under counters and seen in backrooms now is out at the street corners.

Probably it was inevitable that some youthful rebels would embrace pornography—another way of rebelling.

That phase of pornography began March 3, 1965, when a young man named John Thompson appeared barefoot on the Berkeley campus of the University of California carrying a big sign which bore a single four-letter word.

The word became almost a campus battle-cry. It turned out that Thompson was not a student, but an itinerant exhibitionist who thought the campus would be a good stage. But no one cared by then.

How does pornography affect your life?

Is there a chance the tide will ebb as it has in some parts of Europe?

What do Buffalo policemen think about the law and courts?

How will pornography affect the future of the theater and literature?

The Buffalo Evening News is exploring all the aspects of pornography in this series of articles.

A CITIZEN PETITION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John G. Muller, 7818 Cal-

purnia Court, McLean, Va., has written to me asking that I submit in his behalf a petition to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Muller's request to me follows:

McLEAN, VA.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am a forty-eight year old business executive writing a Congressman for the first time in my life.

I would like you to submit in my behalf the following petition to the Congress of the United States:

"The United States of America, one of the world's leading democracies, has been waging a controversial war in Viet Nam without the direct involvement of its legislators. As a citizen I ask that the people's elected representatives in Congress vote on whether or not the United States should continue this war."

I would like to see a vote taken on various suggested solutions including the following:

1. Pull out at once even if it means a blood bath for our Vietnamese allies.

2. Utilize nuclear weapons to bring the war to a speedy conclusion.

3. Continue with the stalemated war as heretofore allowing the Executive Branch to do what it thinks best without direction from Congress.

This vote could be conducted in secret session so that the result would not give aid or comfort to the enemy. It could, however, be of great help to us in clarifying our own policy and deciding on a future course of action.

It seems to me that Congress has both a moral and a constitutional obligation to vote on this major issue.

It is not right that the lives of our young people be sacrificed by the thousands to implement a policy that Congress has never explicitly endorsed or rejected. It is not right that the Legislative Branch should abandon its responsibilities to the Executive Branch. Section 8 of the Constitution states that "the Congress shall have the power . . . to declare war."

To continue the war without ascertaining, recording, and implementing the wishes of the nation's elected representatives in Senate and House makes a mockery of the basic concept of democracy.

I understand that petitions are printed in the Congressional Record and then forgotten. In this case, however, I ask that you use your influence to bring about a vote on this crucial issue.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. MULLER.

**EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE
GETS HIGH PRIORITY IN JACK-
SONVILLE**

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD this article which appeared in the August edition of Traffic Safety published by the National Safety Council. I think that this excellent explanation of the problem concerning emergency services and how the city of Jacksonville, Fla., solved it has a lesson for all of us.

In view of the fact that I have introduced a bill to create a separate Ambulance Service Corps for the District and since I have actively participated in an

emergency drill with helicopters, I urge my colleagues to read this article. Here is a clear example of the use of the helicopter in solving this ever-increasing and serious problem of transportation for accident victims. We must act now to employ this air vehicle for emergencies and to save lives. The reliability and versatility of the helicopter, plus the experience we have gained through its use in Vietnam should be made available to improve our civilian medical rescue efforts.

The article follows:

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE GETS HIGH PRIORITY IN JACKSONVILLE

(By John M. Waters, Jr.)¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Oddly enough, until less than five years ago, there was no concerted national effort to do much about automobile accidents, which by then were claiming 50,000 dead yearly. In sharp contrast, we, probably to a greater degree than any other nation, have

for over 100 years maintained an extensive rescue system for ships at sea, and in later years for aircraft. Cost has not been a deterrent to this complex and efficient rescue system; and, although only 3,000 non-combat people were lost at sea and in the air in our areas of responsibility in the last year recorded, the Coast Guard incurred a cost of \$34,000 for every seaman and airman saved, while the Air Force in Viet Nam paid out \$48,000 per save. While cheap in terms of human life, the highway victim in comparison had little or nothing spent to rescue him, and thousands died needlessly. It often became literally true that a citizen could be safer on a boat sinking 20 miles at sea than he could in a wreck in the middle of one of our largest cities.

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

The National Highway Safety Act of 1966 was a sweeping one, aimed at all facets of highway safety. One of them was the medical care and transportation of those injured on the highway. In early 1967, I was loaned from the Coast Guard, where I had been chief of the search and rescue division, to the newly created National Highway Safety Bureau (NHSB) to see if the methods and techniques of our military system could be applied to our highway problem at the state and city level. We made a great deal of progress in the next 18 months, initiated considerable research and passed out volumes of guidance to the states. In the summer of 1968, I elected to retire from the military, left the NHSB and became director of public safety of Jacksonville, Fla. In this position, I think I am well situated to evaluate the problem from both sides of the hill, compare theory with practice and report on our progress in emergency medical services in a dynamic and forward looking city. Some of our "Ivory Tower" thinking from Washington has been battered a bit, but on the whole, I think we may develop a system which, though not ideal, will be unsurpassed in this country.

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

Jacksonville is a city unique in many ways, the most notable being the recent "consolidation" of the City of Jacksonville and Duval County, in which the county was abolished, the city limits extended to the county line and several sets of duplicating governments replaced by one. Now we have one mayor, one police department, one fire department and unified chain of command. The creation of one governmental unity to replace many has not only greatly simplified government and avoided duplication and confusion but has made us into the largest city in the world geographically, with an area of 848 square miles and a population of 525,000 people. It consists of dense urban areas, rural terrain, rivers and ocean, express highways and city streets. The city contains three large military bases and two colleges, with a third university building. The implication of this large group of over 50,000 sailors and students for the auto accident rate is clear. Jacksonville serves as

the gateway to the Florida vacationland for the entire East Coast and much of the Midwest, and out-of-state transient traffic is very heavy. As a resort, the city and its beaches draw hundreds of thousands in the summer months. A large retired population contributes to the medical problems. More than 125,000 of the city's population are medically indigent.

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

The National Highway Safety Bureau has stated that an efficient highway EMS system (outside the hospital) consists of communications, emergency care at the scene, transportation and command and control. One more item should have been included here—the physician and hospital team, and their role in definitive medical care. This omission was a calculated policy of the NHSB to avoid any implication that the government was entering further into the world of professional medicine. Yet, we have major problems in our hospitals, and they must be solved before we can have an efficient emergency medical services system.

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

We have replaced all the old fire alarm pull boxes with emergency telephones. In our main city area, they are located on every other corner. One simply opens the box, picks up the phone, and talks directly to the fire operations center. A larger wall chart in the center shows a light where the street phone is in use, so our men know the location immediately. When called on these phones, we can dispatch police, firemen, ambulances or auto repairmen to the caller. An interesting phenomena is that our fire false alarm rate has dropped from 90 per cent to less than 5 per cent since we installed these phones. People apparently cannot lie well over a phone while they are being recorded on tape. An equally great advantage is that people can tell us in advance what their trouble is. In the old pull box days, a fire alarm pulled in mid-city required us to dispatch a full assignment of fire equipment adequate to deal with a large building fire,

¹ Capt. John M. Waters, Jr., is director of public safety, Jacksonville, Fla. This article is adapted from an address given at the Third International Congress on Medical and Related Aspects of Motor Vehicle Accidents.

even though the trouble may have been only an auto with ignition wires afire. Now, knowing the trouble in advance, we can respond appropriately. We intend to add more of these street emergency phones, primarily in our ghetto areas, where most homes do not have phones, and one on the corner will provide emergency communications for the whole neighborhood in time of trouble. We have these emergency phones at every cutoff from the main expressways. The highway department is putting up signs on the highways pointing out that the emergency phones are at the exits. Furthermore, we have placed large signs over each such phone to let people know they are for public use. Many people thought they were either the old pull type fire alarms, or were for use of police and firemen only.

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

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

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

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

Dispatching. Let me again stress that in a large city, ambulance dispatching should be handled by the fire or police department operations center, depending on which is providing the service. Even where municipal ambulances are not provided, and private ambulances are used, they should be dispatched for emergency calls by the city center. I favor the fire department operations center doing it, because they don't have as many total calls daily as do the police. The

use of private ambulances on routine patient transfer calls is no real concern of ours. However, if it is an emergency run, we either dispatch the private ambulance from the fire operations center, or they inform us if they have been called by a private party. The fire department is responsible for emergency ambulance service, but we may need backup from private operators on occasion.

When an ambulance is dispatched, all times are kept on a running card punched by a time machine. All conversations, radio and telephone, are recorded on 24-hour tapes. The center has direct "red phone" connections with every hospital emergency room in the city and can quickly determine load condition and readiness to receive patients. In serious cases, we alert the receiving hospital while the ambulance is still outbound, following this up with an estimated time of arrival when received. All of our ambulances have two-way radio communications, not only with the operations center, but with the emergency rooms of all the hospitals. This was an easily solved problem. We found that the hospitals all had a civil defense radio in each emergency room. We, therefore, put the civil defense frequency crystal on one channel in all of our ambulance radios, and we were in business. We perform a radio check with every hospital at a set time each morning, then the volume of the radio in the emergency room is turned all the way down and the set left on. When an ambulance operator wishes to talk with the emergency room, he asks center, which tells the emergency room by "red phone," "Call rescue seven." The emergency room nurse then merely turns up the radio volume and calls to establish communication. We have actually had little use for this, as our men usually know what to do in first aid, and center can relay needed information quickly to the emergency rooms. However, we expect the use of direct communications with the emergency room to pick up as our cardiac program progresses.

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

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

Transportation. Our ambulances are not luxury jobs but practical cabins mounted on one-ton Chevrolet chassis. Complete with equipment, they run about \$12,500 each. Our last four are in full conformance with the "Medical Requirements for Ambulance Design and Equipment" of the National Academy of Science, both as to vehicle and equipment; in fact, we have already exceeded the equipment requirements. From an economy viewpoint, these ambulances are winners. Not only are they cheaper initially than the large custom jobs, but every two or three years we simply insert a new chassis and have a new vehicle. We expect the cabin to last through three chassis. These ambulances have plenty of working space and ample stow-

age space for both medical and extrication equipment. Our ambulance personnel carry out all except heavy extrication. The primary drawback of this type ambulance is that it rides roughly on bad roads, and a fast run can be excruciatingly painful for a person with broken bones. In such cases, we return at a slow speed without lights or siren. In fact, 80 per cent of our return runs are made in this manner, for we emphasize treating and stabilizing the patient on scene and returning at a safe speed whenever possible. Outbound, we seldom have enough information to determine the seriousness of the case, and such runs are made with light and siren; we never forget, however, that running a red light still leaves us as the responsible party should an accident occur, and street intersections are crossed at reduced speeds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

At a recent meeting of the American College of Surgeons and of the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, it was recommended that this concept of the highly trained ambulance attendant be adopted. It was also recommended that the emergency medical technician be adopted as a full member of the medical team, and that appropriate job description and training courses be prepared. The training recommended was similar to that I have just outlined. It would appear that the training of these men and their acceptance as part of the professional team offers a partial solu-

tion to the acute shortage of nurses in our emergency rooms and intensive care units. Certainly, our Armed Forces hospital corpsmen carry out functions even in advance of that allowed nurses in some locations, and the emergency medical technician, with similar training and under supervision of a physician could carry out many functions now required of physicians and nurses when not on ambulance runs.

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

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

Private Ambulances. In our city, we have a number of private ambulance services, including a number of funeral directors. For the most part, they are not interested in emergency service. Some funeral homes haul chronically ill patients to and from hospitals free, realizing that they will get the funeral business later. I see nothing wrong with the practice, especially when it involves indigents. Florida is one of the few states that has an ambulance law, but it is a weak one. We realize that our private ambulance operators can neither afford the salaries nor the equipment to render service

comparable to that given by our fire department rescue service. Yet, if they are going to engage in emergency service at all, we must insist on minimum standards. A new city ambulance law is now pending before the city council, and I am confident that it will pass. It will be a major step forward in eliminating marginal and untrained operators, and we intend to enforce it strictly. Those remaining in the emergency business will do so under the supervision of the department of public safety and the health department.

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

Costs. To operate 10 rescue ambulances, we require 66 men, a chief of the rescue branch, a training supervisor and a secretary. Personnel services, including fringe benefits and pensions, total \$595,481 yearly. Each private, for example, is paid \$8,357 yearly, including benefits. Commodities total \$22,986, and other direct costs about \$16,000. Each ambulance costs us \$63,447 per year to run, of which 94 per cent is for personnel. The predominance in personnel costs and the great disparity between public and private salaries are what separate private and public ambulance service. Yet, if we are to have quality, we must pay enough to get high type individuals and retain them. Ambulance service costs, like all medical costs, are skyrocketing. We are attempting to defray this in many ways. We charge \$17.50 per run, and are going to raise the fee to \$22.50, primarily to discourage needless calls. Our collection rate, which is running at about 40 per cent, must be raised, and we are looking for ways to do this. We are receiving a subsidy from the NHB of \$11,890 per ambulance, which helps defray expenses. Lastly, as the number of runs increases, the cost per run decreases. We estimate that by 1970, we will be making 13,000 emergency runs yearly. The cost breaks down as follows:

Cost per ton.....	\$48.85
NHB subsidy.....	9.15
Fee collected.....	9.00
Tax supported.....	30.70
Total	48.85

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

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

ber needed and the money the city can afford to devote to the service must vary with the peculiarities of each city.

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

No one doubts that the helicopter can do a superb job of medico evacuation. The problem is one of costs. We cannot justify a helicopter just to evacuate highway injured. We can, however, in certain localities, use one economically (1,000 hours yearly or more) if we use it for highway rescue, sea and land rescue, police and highway patrol, apprehension of lawbreakers, riot control, accident investigation, cardiac and inter-hospital transport, fire control (both urban and forest), photo missions and administrative flying. These missions would be assigned on a priority basis, with rescue as top priority. Until we utilize the helicopter on such a basis, with firm central control, or unless we can obtain use of available military helicopters, I see little prospect of widespread and successful use of these machines in EMS.

Operation Heartbeat—Answer to the Greatest Threat. For the months I was with the NHB, my attention was devoted to the highway victim and, as a result, trauma. For 27 years before that in the Coast Guard, I had been concerned with aid to the distressed at sea and in the air. Naturally, when I came to Jacksonville, it was with visions of starting up vigorous programs in these fields. But when I asked for the vital statistics for the past year, it caused a realignment of my thinking and a drastic change in perspective.

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

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

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

have to transfer him to the emergency room anyway."

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

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

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

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

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

we expedite the training and equipping of our rescue personnel to deal with cardiac emergencies outside the hospital.

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

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

The training of the personnel will require time and will be a continuing process. The equipment is being procured now. We believe the number of people saved will be considerable. If we can bring to the hospital, alive, every patient we take into the ambulance with a detectable pulse and breathing our program will be a great success. We believe this goal is attainable. We believe the chance is worth the \$51,000 of special equipment for our ambulances and special crew training involved. Compare the cost for this city of over half a million with a heart transplant cost of \$30,000. If we save only one person, the equipment will have been paid for.

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

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

WIDOW ACCEPTS MEDAL FOR HERO

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp3c. George A. Demby, a fine young man from Maryland, has been awarded posthumously the Bronze Star for heroism in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

WIDOW ACCEPTS MEDAL FOR HERO OF VIETNAM

The Bronze Star Medal for heroism has been awarded an Abingdon, Md., soldier posthumously in ceremonies at Edgewood Arsenal.

The decoration—the First Oak Leaf Cluster with "V" Device for valor—was presented to the widow of Specialist 4 George A. Demby, Mrs. Janice L. Demby, by Colonel Walter J. Davies, deputy commander, on behalf of the President.

Specialist Demby was killed in action on March 11, 1969, while on a combat mission with the forces of Company A, 2nd Battalion, 22nd Infantry, 25th Infantry Division.

Other awards presented posthumously were the Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, two Republic of Vietnam Service Medals, the Combat Infantryman Badge and the Sharpshooter's Badge for machine gun, automatic rifle, and rifle.

Specialist Demby received his second award of the Bronze Star Medal for heroism in connection with military operations while on a sweep operation.

According to the citation, his company came under intense enemy attack.

"Immediately, Specialist 4 Demby began to place a devastating fire on the hostile emplacements. As the battle progressed, Specialist Demby, with complete disregard for his own safety, exposed himself to the hall of fire as he threw numerous grenades on the insurgents' positions.

"His valorous actions contributed immeasurably to the defeat of the aggressor force. Specialist Demby's personal bravery, aggressiveness, and devotion to duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, the 25th Infantry Division and the United States Army," reads the commendation.

Specialist Demby is survived by his wife and an infant daughter, his mother, Mrs. Evelyn Richardson, his step father, Harold Richardson, his father, Alexander Demby, a brother, Alexander Demby Jr., and six half-sisters.

THE LATE HONORABLE HAROLD A. PATTEN

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve in this body with, and be considered a friend of the Honorable Harold A. Patten of Arizona, and so it is sad to note his passing. "Porque," as he was better known, was a warm, gracious, and outgoing man as a host of his friends attest. He led a full life and served well and faithfully the people of Arizona who sent him here for three terms. He was very much a part of the history of the young State of Arizona, having moved there with his family from Colorado just 4 years after the State of Arizona was admitted to the Union. He was an outstanding college athlete and in fact his first job on graduating from the University of Arizona was that of coach and teacher of physical education in the Tucson High School. He went on to be director of recreation for the city of Tucson and in 1939 moved to the same position on the State level. During the war he compiled an outstanding record and list of decorations. He was first elected to the 81st Congress and served in the 82d and 83d Con-

gresses as a member of the Armed Services Committee. He declined to seek re-nomination in 1954. For the past several years he was ill but it was the measure of "Porque" that he bore it without complaint. To his lovely wife, Mary, and his sons I extend our deepest sympathy.

THE UNANIMITY GAP

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared recently in the Washington Post, gives, in my opinion, a clear picture of the frustrations which we in Congress and in the Federal Government have been experiencing during the past several months. I thought you might find it interesting reading.

THE UNANIMITY GAP

Although we expressed some considerable reservations about President Nixon when he was running for President a year ago, and some preference for the thinking of his opponent on a number of issues, we never meant to suggest that if Mr. Nixon was elected, he should not serve. In our system of government, as it is presently constituted, somebody has got to be President, and while this may seem elementary, we bring it up at this point for the record, and because of the uneasy sensation we have had of late that nobody is in charge here.

What with one thing or another—and some of it may have to do with the summer doldrums—we have not felt the presence of the President. True, he has been variously sighted by reliable witnesses on an aircraft carrier in the Pacific, in Saigon, in Djakarta, in Bucharest, and more recently driving a curious jeep-like buggy on a golf course on the West Coast. Last night, a man answering the description of Mr. Nixon addressed a conference of the nation's governors in Colorado on the subject of domestic welfare programs, and we will have more to say on this later. For now it is enough to welcome a firm public pronouncement of Presidential policy on anything.

For while there is ample evidence that Mr. Nixon is alive and well and living in San Clemente, California, there is an alarming lack of evidence that he is imposing the powers of his office on the urgent, day-to-day business of the government.

Rather, what we have been hearing and seeing is a cacophony of contradictory pronouncements and even some contradictory action on crucial matters, from assorted departments and agencies, including the White House. The Department of Justice is at odds with itself, and with HEW, which is itself wracked by inner dissension, on the question of how to proceed towards the desegregation of Mississippi schools. State and Defense are quarreling out loud about the importance of the decline in the infiltration rate of enemy forces into South Vietnam, a determination which could bear crucially on any judgment about the next step in our efforts to scale down our involvement in the war. The White House—although we haven't heard a word from the President himself—seems incapable of making up its mind on a further troop withdrawal, and apparently is anxious to see more statistics about the course of the war before making a decision that was due the end of August. Meanwhile the Pentagon offers the official view that the best infiltration statistics are too unreliable to

count on while State argues publicly that the current fall-off in infiltration is "significant."

By way of keeping us on our toes, the West Coast White House produced a report which, according to Mr. Daniel P. Moynihan, pretty well punctures any hopes of a "peace dividend" from money saved when the Vietnam War is over and responsible officials here in Washington promptly took vigorous exception to it. Since neither side in this argument has troubled to define what is meant by "after the war"—will it wind down slowly or suddenly stop?—this controversy seems particularly senseless. But it is also a little unsettling, because if Mr. Moynihan is right, and other demands are going to chew up any savings from the \$30 billion now being spent annually on Vietnam, then it would seem in all logic to follow that we are going to become increasingly incapable of paying for the war in any event.

Almost as baffling is the dispute involving the State Department and the CIA over the question of whether or not the Russians may be seriously contemplating a surprise strike against Chinese installations at work on nuclear weapons. This is one of those judgment calls about which honest men can differ, but sooner or later somebody will have to furnish the President with some sort of common appraisal on which our strategy can be reasonably soundly based.

In short, there has developed in the Nixon Administration over the summer dog days a good deal more than the usual evidence of what might be called a unanimity gap. A case can be made that this is normal and healthy and even interesting to watch—like a cut-away cross-section of an anti-hill, with all the to-ing and fro-ing laid bare. But a stronger case can be made that the war and the economy and poverty and racial discrimination deserve better than the confusion and paralysis of a continuing, sometimes rancorous, and quite often unnecessary open conflict between the leading power centers in the government. There are decisions that need making and disputes that need reconciling and contradictions that need explaining and nobody can do it under our system except the President.

INCREASES IN THE COST OF LIVING MUST BE ABATED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, while the House was in recess, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor made its monthly announcement that the cost of living had increased again. Last year many were led down the primrose path when they bought the idea that the 10 percent tax surcharge was the answer to curbing inflation, easing the tight money situation, and holding interest rates in check. As we all know too well, the surtax has achieved none of these objectives. Who is being hurt by this inflationary spiral which seems to have the Nation so firmly in its grasp? It is the middle-income American who pays more than his fair share of taxes, obeys the law, goes to church, and does not participate in violent demonstrations. Many of these people have written and told me that, while their salaries have increased, their buying power has remained constant since they got out of school. This situation is unacceptable.

Americans are not happy about the

way this administration is administering the fiscal affairs of the Nation. They are not happy with the priorities that are being established nor are they happy about the prospect of no relief when the onerous burden of the Vietnam war is lifted from their shoulders. A recent Harris poll indicates that 61 percent of the American people feel that the administration is doing an unacceptable job of keeping down the cost of living; 62 percent do not approve of the surtax extension and the administration's attitude toward tax reform; 59 percent do not approve of the administration's attempts to cut Federal spending; 64 percent believe that this administration has not acted forcefully enough to hold the line on interest rates; and finally 53 percent of the American people do not believe that the administration is looking effectively to the general economic health of the Nation.

The mood of middle-income America is easy to discern—it is a mood of seething discontent. The system of taxation in this Nation was not established so that the rich could avoid paying their fair share to run the Government of the Nation which has made the opportunities for accumulating wealth so plentiful. Our tax system was established so that each and every citizen pays his fair share to support the Government of these United States. Tax justice is what we must have in this Nation before the overwhelming majority of the American people will accept the heavy tax burden they must bear.

The figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics give us every indication that the cost of living will increase by at least 7 percent this year. Increases have been most noticeable in food prices and consumer credit.

Every month the Bureau of Labor Statistics compiles a new list of average retail food prices. These prices are checked throughout the Nation—with small corner stores and very large supermarkets included in the average. In June in the Philadelphia area the average price for round steak was \$1.45 per pound and the preceding January the price was \$1.34—a rise of 11 cents. Frying chicken went from 39 cents per pound in January to 44 cents per pound in June, and bacon went from 84 cents to 88 cents.

During the month of July, the cost of living went up an additional half percent over June. The price of beef and veal increased by 1.6 percent. In the steak category, porterhouse and sirloin increased by over 1 percent. Rump roasts increased in price by 1.5 percent, rib roasts also by 1.5 percent, chuck roasts by 2.4 percent, and hamburger by 1.5 percent. The price of veal went up only a little under 1 percent but this increase, although small, tells us that the price of veal has increased by 61 percent since the base pricing year of 1957. In the pork category, salami and canned ham have increased in price by over 1 percent in July and bologna increased by 2.5 percent. Poultry products increased in price by over 3.2 percent, with frying chickens, chicken breasts, and chicken roasts all showing substantial increases. Fish prices only increased by 0.6 percent during the

September 15, 1969

month, but this index is inaccurate because of the wide variations in the types of fish which are available in different areas.

During the month of July, milk prices increased slightly, but it was in the category of fruits and vegetables that substantial increases were noted. On the whole, the prices of fruits and vegetables went up by only 1.5 percent. However, apples increased by 4.1 percent, bananas by 3.4 percent, oranges by 2 percent, grapefruit by almost 10 percent, potatoes by 6.9 percent, onions by 4.8 percent, asparagus by 7 percent, cabbage by 6.4 percent, carrots by over 8 percent, pascal celery by 9 percent, lettuce by 5.5 percent, spinach by 6.9 percent, and tomatoes by 17.1 percent.

The most marked increases in prices have been for meats. High and rising prices for fresh meats are straining the food budgets of families across America and especially in the Philadelphia area. In fact, during the last year, meat prices of the city of Philadelphia have increased by over 10 percent.

Despite words of encouragement from the U.S. Department of Agriculture that the price of choice cattle has eased off by some \$4 per hundredweight retail prices are expected to hold up because the full impact of higher prices has not as yet been passed on to the consumer. Word is that retailers will keep prices where they are and even increase them in some instances in order that they can recoup profits which were lost because they had been operating on a smaller margin.

The average American family spends 25 percent of its income on food, and food is the area where families scrimp least when their income is pinched by higher prices. The same Harris poll which I referred to earlier indicates that 61 percent of the American families surveyed feel that they are not getting fair value for their money when the purchase food or beverages; 45 percent feel that they are not getting their money's worth when they purchase clothing; 38 percent do not feel they get proper value of their outlays for transportation and automobile upkeep; and 35 percent feel that credit and installment payments are too high.

Since this administration came into office in January not only have food prices been increasing out of control but the commercial banking industry has been turned loose to prey on the American people as well. Five times since December of last year commercial banks have managed to impose interest rate increases amounting to 36 percent in the cost of money. The administration's attitude toward these increases was clearly demonstrated when Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee on June 19. When he was asked by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN whether he was doing anything to curb these interest rate increases, Secretary Kennedy answered, "Why should I?"

One good reason why he should do something is the tremendous increase in the cost of mortgage money which is necessary so that the average American

family can buy a home. For example, if a family buys a \$40,000 house with a \$30,000 mortgage at 8 percent for 30 years, total interest payments on the loan come to just a little over \$49,000. At 7 percent, the interest payments on the same house would be reduced by some \$7,300 and at 6 percent the homeowner pays over \$14,000 less in interest payments than he does at 8 percent.

As a result of the high cost of mortgage money, interest rates are bumping usury ceilings in a number of States including Pennsylvania. Here interest rates cannot be in excess of 7 percent. As a result the amount of mortgage money in the State is drying up and families will be unable to purchase a home unless they can assume an existing loan or pay for their new home in cash. Either of these situations is very rare.

I believe that the Democratic 91st Congress must move swiftly to take action which will bring down food prices and interest rates. We must move into the leadership vacuum which has been created by the Nixon administration. A democracy cannot avoid chaos over the long run if it cannot discipline itself.

STATE GOVERNORS SHOULD BE NOTIFIED OF MILITARY SHIPMENTS OF TOXIC MATERIALS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the Governor of any State of any shipment of poison gas, infectious agents, or other chemical or biological warfare material which is proposed or planned to be shipped into or through such State by a military department or agency. This bill speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, we have been exposed to the dangers of poison gas shipments for too long. And we have already reaped the injurious consequences in a number of accidents. The most recent accident occurred in Mississippi and while substantial numbers of people were injured, thank God, lives were spared.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we can no longer allow the military to jeopardize the lives of American citizens by unilaterally shipping highly toxic materials throughout the United States. My bill, while it recognizes the inherent dangers of such shipments, will not in any way restrain the military from carrying out their essential functions. This bill will, however, allow civilian authorities the information vital to them in carrying out their responsibility for the health and safety of their various peoples.

In the interest of public confidence, and military responsibility, I would hope that my bill receives full support and favorable action by legislators who have been awakened to the dread and horrible consequences of poison gas accidents.

A PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY OF MORTGAGE CREDIT

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 4 frustrating years it has been evident to the home purchasing public, the Federal regulatory officials and, of course, most Members of Congress that there was something very seriously wrong with the savings and loan industry. Ever since the credit crunch of 1966 we have observed—with growing concern—two trends: An increasing need for privately financed housing and decreasing capacity on the part of the primary source of private housing financing, the savings and loans, to respond to that need. Efforts to deal with the dilemma illustrated by these trends have been numerous. During the 90th Congress several important remedial measures were considered. Most significantly, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee authored the Federal Institutions Act. The committee spent months on this far-reaching measure and reported it. While this bill ultimately failed to win House approval it did prepare the way for a series of important amendments to the authorities of savings and loans; these provisions became law as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

Before going further, it seems essential to deal with a threshold question: Why should the Congress concern itself with the problems of the savings and loan industry? It would be sentimental and naive to suggest that the business should be granted a legislative sinecure in return for its rich history of meeting the thrift needs of middle-class America. Instead, the answer is disarmingly simple, and necessarily very pragmatic—the savings and loan industry is the only institution which is equipped, by reason of experience and orientation, to help our Nation meet its overwhelming need for privately financed housing. The antecedents of the modern savings and loans, the building societies, were founded over 200 years ago to assist people to finance the homes they wished to build. To this day, savings and loan associations devote nearly all of their resources to financing housing. Around 80 percent of their funds are involved directly in financing one- to four-family homes. The balance of the moneys available to these institutions are devoted to financing multi-family structures or providing loans for reasons related to homeownership. The performance of this industry in the late fifties and early sixties illustrates that when able to acquire a sufficient supply of funds, the saving and loan industry does have the organizational capacity to finance the level of housing activity required to sustain a rate of progress toward meeting the housing needs of our Nation. During that period savings and loans were furnishing about 48 percent

of all residential housing financing and were channeling roughly \$18.2 billion a year in residential housing financing. In other words, they were, by themselves, financing roughly 560,000 units a year.

Since 1966, the saving and loan industry has been handicapped by an inability to compete effectively with other investment options available to the individual whose dollar it needs if it is to expand its ability to finance housing. Since that time the savings and loans have not had any appreciable rate advantage over the other depository intermediaries—commercial banks, mutual savings banks and credit unions. This, although historically savings and loans had had a significant rate advantage over their prime competitor, the commercial bank. The adoption by the Federal supervisory agencies of rate regulations brought about this result. It is illustrative of the plight of the savings and loans and, therefore, home mortgage credit, that the savings and loans who had most adamantly opposed the regulation of rates in 1966 have become the prime proponents of rate regulation. They take this posture because they—who have a relatively low yielding and ill-liquid loan portfolio—realize they are incapable of engaging in a rate war with commercial banks which have more flexible and higher yielding investments. While the primary reservoirs of residential financing was losing its rate advantage and the ability to reacquire it in the foreseeable future, the Congress was charting ambitious housing goals for the next decade. Twenty-six million units of housing were to be constructed, over 22 million of which were to be financed privately. It was assumed, of course, that the savings and loan industry would play its part in financing over 10 million units. Now, just a year after the goal was set, it is evident that the savings and loan industry cannot shoulder its share of the burden. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the other components of the effort, the building industry and the federally assisted programs have likewise fallen far short of the goal. What is surprising is that while we are moving to shore up our other components through the implementation of an exciting "breakthrough" program for building and by a reordering of Federal program policies, we have yet to put into action the effort to equip the savings and loan industry to meet our projected private home financing requirements.

Today, we will outline legislation intended to strengthen the savings and loan institution so that it will be capable of playing the part it must if we are to see our imperative national housing goals reached. In preparing this measure, we analyzed at length the several recent studies which have been done on mortgage credit and the institutions that supply it. We reviewed carefully the legislative recommendations advanced in responses to requests by this administration and its predecessor. We consulted with industry groups, former regulatory officials and present regulatory officials. All this is offered, not to provide a basis for blaming others for any shortcomings which may appear in the proposal—and there are

sure to be some—for the purpose of establishing that there is no pride of authorship associated with this effort. The bill, hopefully, represents an assimilation of the best ideas available from all sources. If it does not, the fault is ours. If it does, the credit belongs to those who first advanced the ideas.

The bill which we have prepared for introduction has four significant and separate titles. They go to five facets of the present inability of savings and loans to meet modern needs for mortgage finance. The bill's first title, "Increasing Funds for Mortgage Credit," proposes to better enable the savings and loan associations to tap secondary sources of funds for mortgage financing. It does in two ways. First, by calling on Federal home loan banks to move more aggressively to provide member institutions needed liquidity. Second, it provides the Federal home loan banks with authority to generate funds for members by engaging in secondary market activity including: purchasing and selling both conventional and government backed mortgages; selling debt or equity securities backed by its real estate portfolio; and, acting for members in issuing securities backed by mortgages held by members.

The second title of the bill is aimed at "attuning Federal savings and loan statutes to modern housing requirements." The provisions of this title aim to update certain statutory limitations last subjected to scrutiny some 5 years ago. It would amend savings and loan powers to recognize the following factors which have become facts of life in housing and home finance: Rapidly rising housing costs; increased emphasis on multifamily development; and maturities of 35 years on home mortgages, and participation in project profits by the financing institution.

The third title of this bill would recognize the savings and loan as a "consumers bank." In the minds of many, including those who would tax the savings and loan as if it were a bank, it already is. If this title becomes law it would have two significant effects. First, it would enable the institutions to engage in activities which promise a rate of return which is sufficiently high so as to enable the savings and loans to—over time—secure the ability to pay attractive rates to savers. Rates which would enable savings and loans to once again attract a supply of funds sufficient to enable them to adequately serve their primary purpose—financing a substantial share of America's housing need. In addition, the transformation of the savings and loans into a consumers bank would insure the savings public of better banking service. It would provide the savings and loan with the power to meet consumer needs which are frequently left unmet because the only institution now empowered to act—the commercial bank—elects to engage in other more lucrative forms of activity. Specifically, the savings and loans would be authorized to: engage in limited consumer lending; act as trustee for trusts up to \$100,000; serve as trustee for self-employed retirement funds, stock bonus, pension or profit sharing plans; and, provide credit life insurance.

The fourth title of the bill authorizes the conversion or chartering of Federal capital stock savings and loan associations. Most savings and loan associations are organized in line with the original mutual ownership concept. Recent experience in the few States which allow the capital stock form of organization has illustrated that associations so organized move more aggressively in response to the greater incentives available under this organizational approach.

I include in the RECORD a more detailed summary of the bill:

SUMMARY OF THE SAVINGS AND LOAN ACT OF 1969

TITLE I—INCREASING FUNDS FOR MORTGAGE CREDIT

Section 101. (a) Encourages Federal Home Loan Banks to act liberally on applications by members for funds during times when adequate real estate mortgage credit is lacking in the Bank's district. Lists other criteria to be used by Banks in processing applications, such as need to meet withdrawals and to get members over cyclical drops in savings.

(b) Expressly authorizes Federal Home Loan Banks to make unsecured loans to members.

(c) Removes requirement that System members or nonmember borrowers have creditor liabilities, other than Federal Home Loan Bank advances, not exceeding 5 percent of their net assets in order to qualify as recipients of unsecured advances up to 1 year maturity. Such advances count as 1 of 4 methods in which Federal Home Loan Banks must invest deposits in the Bank received from its members. The change frees up the ability of System members to borrow from sources outside a Federal Home Loan Bank, under terms and conditions the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may prescribe.

Section 102. Authorizes Federal Home Loan Banks to purchase real estate mortgages from members (or make commitments to do so) and to sell or commit to sell such mortgages. Urges each such Bank to assign high priority to acting as secondary market for members' mortgage holdings in times of lack of adequate mortgage credit in the Bank's district.

Also authorizes each Federal Home Loan Bank to use its real estate mortgage portfolio as backing for debt or equity securities it sells to public.

Further authorizes each Federal Home Loan Bank to act as agent for consortiums of members in issuing debt or equity securities backed by pool of real estate mortgages contributed by members for that purpose.

TITLE II—ATTUNING FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN STATUTES TO MODERN REQUIREMENTS FOR HOUSING

Section 201. Amends Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

(a) To qualify individual homesites as security for loans.

(b) To increase to \$60,000 from \$40,000 the principal of home loans Federal associations can normally make.

(c) To delete the 15% of assets limitation on apartment house loans a Federal association can normally make.

(d) To increase the statutory maximum mortgage maturity on housing for the elderly to 35 years from 30 years (other mortgage maturity limits are set by regulation instead of by statute).

(e) To allow a Federal association to invest up to 5% of assets in loans to individuals to help them acquire homesites; and to authorize Federal associations to act as owner, developer and manager of apartment house projects.

Section 202. Amends Federal Home Loan Bank Act to allow Federal Home Loan Banks

to accept as security for advances mortgages carrying up to a 35-year maturity and single-family home mortgages carrying a principal amount up to \$60,000.

TITLE III—CONSUMER'S BANK

Section 301. Declares the sense of Congress that the authority of savings and loan associations should be adapted to enable them better to serve individuals as consumer's banks.

Section 302. Authorizes Federal association to make secured or unsecured consumer's loan to individual up to \$7,500 outstanding at one time.

Section 303. Authorizes Federal Home Loan Bank Board to grant general trust powers up to \$100,000 per trust and other fiduciary powers to Federal association upon application. Board is to consider adequacy of capital and surplus, needs of individuals in community and other proper facts and circumstances.

Section 304. Authorizes Federal associations to act as trustee under Keogh Act for self-employed retirement funds and as trustee for stock bonus, pension or profit-sharing plans.

Section 305. Authorizes Federal association to sell to savers insurance paying beneficiaries amount equal to balance in saver's account upon his death. Also authorizes Federal association to sell to borrowers credit life insurance that will cancel the outstanding balance of his debt to the association upon his death.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL STOCK SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Section 401. (a) Amends Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to remove requirement that Federal associations be mutual in form and to allow chartering of Federal stock savings and loan associations. Stock issued to organize an association must be paid for in cash at not less than par. Allows conversion of Federal mutual association to Federal stock association with Federal Home Loan Bank Board approval under conditions prescribed. These include preventing "free riders" by cutoff date of 1 year prior to approval of conversion and requiring time-weighting of savings accounts over 5 years or more. To approve conversion, Board must find the plan fair and equitable.

(b) Amends Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to remove prohibition against issuing capital stock.

(c) Stock association must maintain ratio of capital and surplus to liabilities that meets Board requirements.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 501. Permits Federal associations to negotiate exact rate of interest or dividends on same class of savings certificates, all within rate ceiling prescribed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Section 502. Provides FSLIC insurance up to \$15,000 for each "separate use" fund held by a public unit official and deposited in a single savings and loan association. Changes the present interpretation that a single official is generally entitled to a total of only \$15,000 for all moneys deposited in one institution, regardless of the fact that the moneys may consist of funds destined for separate uses.

TRIBUTE TO BARRATT O'HARA

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear of the passing of Representative Barratt O'Hara; yet, I cannot

imagine a person who had a more complete and colorful life than our former colleague. There is a good stretch of years between his first and last Federal service—70 to be precise. From teenage military service in the Spanish-American War of 1898 to octogenarian civilian service in the 90th Congress—that was his record.

It is exceedingly rare when a person can set age records at both ends of the life cycle. However, Barratt O'Hara was at 30 the youngest lieutenant governor in the Nation in 1911 and the youngest in Illinois history. Later, much later in fact, he became in 1964 the oldest Member of the House and remained so until his retirement at 86 at the end of the 90th Congress.

Representative O'Hara, whose entire congressional service was spent in the retirement years after 65, wanted to be the oldest active Congressman. He missed by about 3 years the record of Representative Charles Stedman of North Carolina who passed away in September 1930 when he was 89½ years old. Representative Stedman was the last congressional survivor of the Civil War, just as Representative O'Hara was of the Spanish-American War. That was a fitting distinction for the energetic and long-lived legislator from Illinois.

THE DIRKSEN PRAYER BILL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the late Senator Everett Dirksen was identified with a number of issues of national importance. I would hazard a guess that if the Senator were to be remembered for any one issue dear to his heart, he would have chosen the subject of prayer in the public schools as the issue which he would have liked to have seen resolved. For those who are not familiar with the wording of Senator Dirksen's constitutional amendment "with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings," Senate Joint Resolution 6, the text is as follows:

S.J. RES. 6

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legis-

latures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

The need for a classification of the school prayer issue was recently illustrated by a situation which has developed in Netcong, N.J., where a board of education regulation provided for 30 seconds of "voluntary, silent meditation." Protests were forthcoming from the New Jersey chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union and the former mayor of Netcong in which they charge a violation of existing laws.

The religious news editor of the Washington Star, William Willoughby, in his column, "Washington Perspective," of September 13 gave us an excellent explanation of why Senator Dirksen could not help but be involved in the school prayer issue. The thorough and deep-seated religious training which was an intimate part of his youth and which never left him through all of his illustrious public life would not allow Senator Dirksen to ignore the judicial restrictions placed upon the time-honored custom of American youth speaking to divine providence in their school assemblies.

When our schoolchildren are permitted once again to send heavenward their spiritual salutations, so pleasing to our Creator, no little credit should be given to the late Senator from Illinois whose religiously oriented youth knew not the shackles which silence today this Nation's youth.

I insert at this point the above-mentioned column by William Willoughby in the RECORD:

DIRKSEN PRAYER BILL—DEVILISH PLAN FELL SHORT

(By William Willoughby)

"I don't know all the details yet, but it's going to be devilish," the deep, deliberately theatrical voice declared. Behind the voice was the unmistakable, earthy, impish look in the eyes of Sen. Everett Dirksen—the kind of look he got when he was dead serious about something.

That was about four years ago following a meeting of Sigma Delta Chi, the journalists' fraternity. He was speaking of his intentions to push a prayer amendment through Congress. He wasn't at all pleased that some time-honored practices in the public schools had been altered by the Supreme Court or by what school officials thought the Supreme Court said.

The Illinois legislator who grew out of a childhood background in the Christian Endeavor movement and the grooming of a mother who took her religion very seriously, had lots of "devilment" in him, as any of his legislative friends and foes readily recognized. At one time he had almost enough of it in him to pull the stunt off.

In September, three years ago, Dirksen came within six or seven votes of getting enough strength to get his prayer amendment past one of its many big hurdles. Considerably more than half the senators voted in favor of his measure, but in an effort to amend the Constitution, a two-thirds vote is required, and he lost the whole ball game.

Devilish? At one point he tacked his bill onto a measure that probably had more backers than his prayer amendment—a bill to recognize National Baseball Week. At another time he tried tacking it onto a bill recognizing the UNESCO fund—you know, where the little goblins go out trick or treating, only instead, they collect pennies for the aid of the hungry children overseas.

Now that Dirksen is dead and buried in

Pekin, his Illinois homeland, there is a groundswell among those who still believe a prayer amendment is needed. Back-to-God movements headed by Harvard graduate Rufus Webb in Maryland, Dr. and Mrs. L. H. Blevins in Virginia and Mrs. Bennett G. Miller in the District are pressing Congress to pass S.J. 6 as a memorial to the legislator. Similar appeals are coming from across the nation.

"The anti-poverty bills were passed as a memorial to President Kennedy; the civil rights bills as a memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King, why not the prayer amendment as a memorial to Sen. Dirksen?" Mrs. Miller reasoned.

Dirksen was dead serious about prayer. No one ever shook him from his belief that, while on bended knee on a train enroute to Baltimore where he was to have an eye removed, God answered his prayer on the spot and healed his eye.

Imagine the surprise when Dirksen went up to the doctor at Johns Hopkins Hospital and said: "Doctor, I have decided not to have the operation."

"Why did you come here?" the doctor queried.

"I came because other doctors said I should come and see you. But you see, Doctor, I found another doctor."

"Impossible," the doctor said, knowing Dirksen could not have had such an encounter. "You couldn't have."

"But I did . . . He's the Big Doctor way upstairs," Dirksen said in the way few except maybe Al Jolson could have imitated.

That was 21 years ago, when it looked as if the political sun was going to set on him in Pekin. But to the end, he declared that eye was his better one.

In the last article he ever prepared for publication, in his month's Guideposts magazine, Dirksen said he had plenty of opportunity to learn to pray when he was a balloonist during World War I with the United States Army in France.

During service in the "suicide squad" he said, "I can honestly say that I was devoid of fear because of the presence of the Almighty. I knew He was there . . ."

When he was a kid back in Pekin his mother made him promise not to become an actor—he had been flirting with the idea. She thought acting was an evil profession and that he should have no part in it.

But who will question that he did not heed his mother's advice? Some of the real color has gone from Congress with his departure. He knew the tricks of the acting profession well.

Dirksen saw Washington as the stage where another act was being performed—by God.

"I have found the nation's capital to be an incredibly interesting place. It is where history unfolds and discloses a divine pattern if we will only look for it.

"I believe it must be in accordance with His plan. For if there is a creative hand behind this universe, there must be that same creative hand to shape the unfolding and give direction to this good land."

Certain call has come for Dirksen. Wouldn't it somehow be just a bit "devilish" if a prayer amendment became the final accolade?

must rise to defend the freedom of our many liberal leaders here in Washington to send their schoolchildren to private schools.

With the HEW appropriations bill (H.R. 13111) under consideration in the Senate, the American people will watch with keen interest the actions of these advocates of freedom of choice for their own children, as they vote on the Whitten amendment which assures freedom of choice indiscriminately for all Americans.

How can Mr. Finch be so hypocritical as to urge the Senate to strip from the House appropriations bill the freedom of choice clause? After all, other Americans are entitled to the right to seek the best possible education for their children—just as Mr. Finch, Mr. Mitchell, and others do for theirs.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial and a column follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 15, 1969]

INTEGRATED SCHOOLS ARE FOR OTHERS

Nick Thimmesh of Newsday reports in his syndicated Washington column that "liberal" officials and politicians in the capital who demand severe punishment of the southern states for refusing to integrate public schools send their own children to private schools or all-white suburban schools in Maryland and Virginia.

Sen. George McGovern [D., S.D.], who yields only to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy [D., Mass.] as a liberal and offers himself as a better Democratic candidate for President, has two children in the Maryland public schools, for whom he pays annual tuition of \$1,014 each. Sen. Kennedy himself, Sen. Charles Percy [R., Ill.], Sen. Birch Bayh [D., Ind.], Sen. Eugene McCarthy [D., Minn.], Sen. William Proxmire [D., Wis.], Sen. Clifford Case [R., N.J.], Sen. Abraham Ribicoff [D., Conn.], and Sen. Charles Goodell [R., N.Y.], all liberals of purest ray serene, have either sent or are sending their children to high-priced private schools.

Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell says Negro and white children should attend school together, but his 9-year-old daughter goes to Stony Ridge Country Day school in Virginia. Vice President Spiro Agnew's daughter attends the private National Cathedral school in Washington. Robert Finch, secretary of health, education, and welfare, whose heart bleeds for children in segregated schools, sends his own to a public school in white suburban Virginia. The justice department lawyers who have threatened to resign because the Nixon administration was not forcing schools in the south to integrate rapidly enough, also live in the suburbs, where their children are denied the privilege of attending racially mixed public schools.

Even Justice Thurgood Marshall, the only Negro on the Supreme court, and James Farmer, the Negro assistant secretary of health, education, and welfare, have sent their children to private schools.

The liberal proponents of racially mixed schools for other people's children all say they send their own to private or white suburban schools because they want them to get the best possible education. This is a natural and laudable desire, but, while sending their own children to schools of their choice, they loudly condemn the "freedom of choice" principle in the south as a subterfuge to perpetuate segregation. The United States Commission on Civil Rights, headed by the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame university, condemned the Nixon administration for what it called "a major retreat" on integration, including Secretary Finch's failure to come out against a "freedom of choice" amendment until the House had passed it.

When the Supreme court ruled in 1954 that racial segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, the school population of Washington was equally divided between Negro and white children. Now it is 94 per cent Negro, because the whites, including the liberals who lauded the Supreme court's decision, have moved to the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia. If the same trend in other big cities continues, only a few integrated schools on the fringes of the black slums will be left and the only whites attending them will be children of working class families too poor to move to the suburbs.

The liberal integrationists cannot be unaware of the obvious effects of their policy. Apparently they feel that integration is good for the yahoos of the south and the ethnic groups of the north but not for themselves.

SCHOOL INTEGRATION BARES HYPOCRITES IN GOVERNMENT

(By Nick Thimmesh)

WASHINGTON.—School integration makes some people mad and others hopeful, but it also reveals human frailties, including hypocrisy. Some of the worst hypocrites on this controversial, yet inevitable, development in our democracy are right here in the capital city.

In its 1954 decision, the United States Supreme Court said that segregated Negro children were not only short-changed in facilities and teaching, but also lost out by not being around white kids when they grew up.

Politicians and government officials of liberal bent in both parties have been hollering ever since at the South to integrate and give those Negro kids a break. But most of these finger shakers don't practice what they preach when it comes to their own children.

The Washington public school population was evenly divided between white and Negro children in 1954. Now it is 94 per cent Negro, because whites, including those who yipe at the South, have either moved to the white suburbs or send their children to private schools, predominantly white or with token integration.

Atty. Gen. John Mitchell says he's for Negro and white children attending school together, but his nine-year-old daughter is carted miles away from his D.C. neighborhood to the stuffy Stone-Ridge Country Day School in nearby Maryland.

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew's daughter attends the private National Cathedral School.

James Farmer, the Negro assistant secretary of HEW, has his two children in private schools to "avoid boredom."

The only Negro on the Supreme Court, Thurgood Marshall, placed his children in a private school. Julius Hobson, a black militant on the D.C. school board, had a child in private school.

"Liberal" senators who live in Washington are the same way. George McGovern has two children he sends across the District line into Maryland public schools, and pays \$1,014 annual tuition for each.

Senators Charles Percy, Birch Bayh, Edward Kennedy, Abraham Ribicoff, Clifford Case, Charles Goodell, Eugene McCarthy and William Proxmire have either sent or are sending their children to high-priced (up to \$1,900 a year tuition) private schools afflicted with the racial double-standard and status-conscious bickering that privileged folk indulge themselves with.

These folk apparently think integration is for lowbrow Southern whites, the poor and those beer-drinking ethnics in the North whose cars bear bumper stickers reading "support your police."

Integration is a moral as well as a legal matter, and the hypocrites want to unload the moral burden on lower income groups. This thinking, pervasive among affluent, better educated whites and Negroes, betrays a moral failure.

DE FACTO FREEDOM OF CHOICE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as an advocate of freedom of choice and representing the people of my district who have been denied freedom of choice, I

CONGRESSIONAL FAMILIES

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the August 14 issue of Roll Call carried a detailed historical article on congressional families by L. Robert Davids, a congressional fellow in my office this past summer. This article deals with brothers and fathers and sons who served in the same Congress and with families who represented a State or area one generation after another.

My own family has a modest background in the national Congress, my father having served in the Senate 1939-53, and his uncle and my great uncle Charles having represented the Cincinnati area in the House 1895-97. But, as the article points out, this is short duration compared to the records established by such families as the Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania, the Bayards of Delaware, the Frelinghuysens of New Jersey, the Bankheads of Alabama, and the Fishes of New York.

My colleagues should find this material interesting and informative. I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

(By L. Robert Davids)

The American Congress has no hereditary tradition like the British Parliament—the old House of Lords or even the House of Commons where it has been rather common practice for son to succeed father. The United States has lacked much of that aristocratic tradition, and yet there has been a remarkable number of Representatives and Senators related to previous members of Congress.

Rep. Fred Schwengel of Iowa, who serves as head of the Capitol Historical Society, recently noted that more than 50 of the present members of Congress had antecedents who also served in the House or Senate. There appears to be no special pattern to this legislative lineage except possibly in the case of the women members. Thirty of the 75 women who have served in Congress gained first admission by succeeding their deceased husbands. Another succeeded her father.

It is somewhat surprising to note that the closest thing to a dynasty in Congress was not established by the Adams, Tafts, or Kennedys, but by the Kees of West Virginia. They have had a lock on that state's fifth district for the last four decades. John Kee represented that district 1933-51; he was succeeded upon his death by his wife Elizabeth, who served 1951-65; and their son James then took over in 1965 and is now in his third term. The Long family of Louisiana had a similar record of family service in the Senate with father Huey, mother Rose, and son Russell, but it was not consecutive service like the Kees.

The New York delegation in the current Congress has a familiar name in Hamilton Fish. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, all named the same, have represented New York in Congress over widely varying periods of time. Historically, their Congressional careers can be tabulated:

Hamilton Fish I, H 1843-45; S 1851-57.

Hamilton Fish II, H 1909-11.

Hamilton Fish III, H 1919-45.

Hamilton Fish IV, H 1969—.

The Bayards of Delaware also had four successive generations in Congress, all serving at some time in the Senate.

James A. Bayard, Sr., H 1797-03; S 1804-13.

James A. Bayard, Jr., S 1851-64; S 1867-69.

Thomas F. Bayard, Sr., S 1869-85.

Thomas F. Bayard, Jr., S 1922-29.

In addition, Richard H. Bayard, another son of James, Sr., was Senator from Delaware 1836-39 and 1841-45.

In reviewing Congressional dynasties, one can pose the quiz program question of "what member of Congress was both the son of a President and the father of a President?" It was the forgotten figure of John Scott Harrison, who served in the House 1853-57. He was the son of President William Henry Harrison and the father of Benjamin Harrison, both of whom also served in Congress. The recent Representative from Wyoming, William Henry Harrison, was a direct descendant of the above Harrisons, being a grandson of Benjamin.

On very rare occasions, father (or mother) and son may serve in the same Congress. The present Congress has the unusual distinction of having two father-son combinations in the Symingtons and Goldwaters, bringing to seven the total number of duos who have served. They are listed, parent and son, as follows:

1821-21 Rep. Henry Southard, N.J.—Sen. Samuel Southard, N.J.

1848-55 Sen. Henry Dodge, Wis.—Sen. Augustus Dodge, Iowa.

1917-20 Sen. John Bankhead I, Ala.—Rep. William Bankhead, Ala.

1914-41 Sen. John Bankhead II, Ala.—Rep. Walter Bankhead, Ala.

1957-59 Rep. Frances Bolton, Ohio.

1963-65 Rep. Oliver Bolton, Ohio.

1969— Sen. Stuart Symington, Mo.—Rep. James Symington, Mo.

1969 Sen. Barry Goldwater, Sr., Ariz.—Rep. Barry Goldwater, Jr., Calif.

As can be noted, most of these periods of joint service were very brief. The second generation Bankheads were together only one month when son Walter resigned his seat. The Southards were together only two months, but in that time, the father in the House and the son in the Senate worked together on the joint committee which reported the Missouri Compromise measure.

Mrs. Bolton and son Oliver served together two separate terms in the House. The Dodges served longest together, seven years, and both in the Senate where they sat side by side for several years. Jefferson Davis presented the credentials of Augustus Dodge and Thomas Hart Benton those of the father. At the swearing in of Henry Dodge, Jessie Benton Fremont said in her winsome way, "General, I am sure you will be the best behaved man in the Senate on the ground that a dutiful son will be exceeding decorous in the immediate presence of his father." But the two senators did not always see issues the same way. Son Augustus voted for the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854 and father Henry opposed what he felt was an extension of slavery. They were both northerners, however, and had no conflict in views when the war started.

While there have been very few fathers and sons serving at the same time, there have been numerous brother combinations. Dating from the first Congress in 1789, there have been occasions where two or more brothers served in the same Congress. On only two occasions have brothers served in the Senate at the same time. They were Edward and Robert Kennedy in 1965-68 and the Fosters, Dwight of Massachusetts and Theodore of Rhode Island in 1800-03. Incidentally, Dwight Foster ran as a Federalist while his brother ran as a Law and Order candidate. This was in the 1790's, not the 1960's.

All the other brother combinations were in the House or the House and Senate. The first brother act started with the first Congress when Frederick and John Muhlenberg of

Pennsylvania served. Both were ordained ministers. Frederick became the first Speaker of the House. Almost 160 years later his great-great-grandson Frederick A. Muhlenberg represented Pennsylvania in Congress.

It was not unusual, as in the case with the Muhlenbergs from Pennsylvania, to see two brothers in the same State delegation, and it didn't have to be a large state either. In fact, in the 37th Congress in 1861-63, Maine's delegation of nine was dominated by two families. They included Sen. William Fessenden, and Reps. Samuel and Thomas Fessenden, and Sen. Lot Morrill and Rep. Anson Morrill.

Maine was also the state that produced the biggest Congressional family of all, the Washburns. A total of four brothers served in Congress, three at one time. This was a typical New England family of the 19th century and in some ways resembled the Kennedy family of the 20th century. For as the Kennedys were the only family to have three brothers serve in the Senate, the Washburns were the only family to have four brothers serve in the House or in Congress.

The Washburns were a large family of 7 boys and 3 girls. They were at first not very well off and the boys went off to make their fortune. One became a Navy captain, another a writer and diplomat, another a banker in Boston, and the other four went to Congress. Israel, the oldest, stayed in Maine and eventually became Governor. He was elected as a Whig to Congress in 1851 and was instrumental in founding the Republican Party in 1854. Short, serious, and bespectacled, he served ten years in the House.

Elihu went to Harvard Law School and then went west to set up a law practice in Galena, Illinois. He was elected to Congress in 1853 and after several terms became ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and finally of the House. His efforts to keep down spending earned for him the title "Watchdog of the Treasury," a designation which was later applied to other legislators. He was chided once when he let a bill of his brother's get by calling for needed funds in Wisconsin—"The watchdog never barks when one of the family passes by."

Elihu was probably the most famous of the Washburns and also stood out otherwise because he added an "e" to the end of his name. He was a close friend of Lincoln and also of Grant through their association in Galena and was present at the surrender of Lee at Appomattox. Grant named him Secretary of State in 1869 but he served only briefly (being succeeded by Hamilton Fish I) before going to France as Ambassador. He rendered capable service there during the Franco-Prussian War and during the strife in Paris that followed.

The third son was named Cadwallader Colden after a Mayor of New York but was better known as C. C. or Cad. He migrated west to Wisconsin where he made a great fortune in lumber, real estate, and banking. He entered Congress in 1855 where he served six years in the House with Israel from Maine, and Elihu from Illinois. The three brothers, to the satisfaction of their respective constituencies rendered each other considerable aid on local matters.

C. C. took part in the Washington Peace Conference of 1861, but when that failed to resolve the sectional dispute, he went home and organized the Second Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry. He led this unit into some hard fighting during the Civil War, serving as a Major General. After the war, he returned to Congress for two terms and then emulating his brother Israel, who had been Governor of Maine, he became Governor of Wisconsin. This also set a standard for the Governors Rockefeller a century later.

The youngest of the seven brothers was William, who went west to Minnesota. Brother Cad got him started in the milling industry in Minneapolis and later he branched into railroading with all the drive and enter-

prise that characterized the actions of his other brothers. He became a major figure in the business and financial life of his state and was elected to three terms in the House 1879-85 and then a term in the Senate 1889-95. By that time, all three of his Congressional brothers had passed on.

This remarkable family, which saw its seven sons settle in seven different states, seldom got together for a reunion. Only in 1861 were all of them able to return to their old home in Maine. At that time they voted as to who was the greatest man among them. After a facetious first vote, Cad won 6-1 over Elihu.

The number of brother combinations in Congress in the last century has been somewhat reduced. There are none in the present Congress, but there were two in the previous Congress. In addition to the Kennedys in the Senate, there was Sen. Thruston Morton of Kentucky and Rep. Rogers Morton of Maryland. In the 88th Congress there was Sen. Howard Edmondson and Rep. Ed Edmondson of Oklahoma. Before that there was Henry and John Lodge, Max and George Schwabe, and John and William Bankhead. The Bankhead family was unusual in that it not only had two brothers in Congress but two father-son combinations.

The last two Congresses also have had another family relationship in Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois and his son-in-law Senator Howard Baker of Tennessee. In fact, about the only family relationship Congress has not had is a husband and wife as members at the same time. The closest to this was the case of Albert Gallatin Simms and Ruth Hanna McCormick, both members of the 71st Congress in 1929-31, who married after leaving office.

LET US STOP KICKING THE SOUTH AROUND

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Star carried a column by James J. Kilpatrick, a fellow Virginian, entitled "Let's Stop Kicking the South Around!" which I believe would make interesting reading for each Member of the House.

In this day when we hear so much about minority rights and equality for all citizens of our land, it seems proper to remind the balance of the country that the Civil War is over, the South has rejoined the Union, and the people of the South are entitled to all rights and privileges enjoyed by the remaining citizens of the country. My own congressional district is one of the most northern areas among the southern States, but, of course, is a part of South and one which I am proud to represent. This district was the home of Washington, Madison, Monroe, William Henry Harrison, and John Tyler, all Presidents of the United States, and the home of such patriots as George Mason and Robert E. Lee. It is rich in American heritage and is an area which helped our Nation grow to greatness. Is it not possible that areas of the country which produced these giants of the past might produce men and ideas today that are worthy of consideration by the Congress and the country?

Perhaps in examining our prejudices, it might be good to consider what part sectionalism plays. Do we actually oppose

a given proposition because the Member who suggested it comes from a particular area of the country? Or are ideas and suggestions considered on their merits and whether they are in the best interest of the Nation?

The article by Mr. Kilpatrick is thought provoking. I commend it for your consideration. The column is included in the RECORD at this point:

LET'S STOP KICKING THE SOUTH AROUND!

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Reconstruction came to an end in the South, or so the history books tell us, during the reign of Rutherford Hayes some 90 years ago. But there are times, honest to Pete, when Southerners wonder if the South ever is to regain an equal standing in the Union.

There is something about the South, apparently, that draws an unrelenting anathema from the North. Old abolitionists never died; they write on for The New York Times. It has only to be said, or hinted, that a particular program or appointment may be pleasing to the South—the conservative South, that is—for the program or appointment to be damned out of hand. As a Southerner, I protest.

We are witnessing the syndrome just not in the nomination of Clement F. Haynsworth to the Supreme Court. It is entirely proper, of course, that the Senate Judiciary Committee inquire into his qualifications. No one is suggesting that the Senate's duty to advise and consent should be treated in perfunctory fashion. But the noxious clouds of complaint against this appointment have little to do with qualifications. The objection, at bottom, is that Haynsworth is a Southerner—a moderately conservative Southerner. That is enough. Lynch him!

Thus, an entirely phony challenge is raised that Haynsworth acted unethically by not disqualifying himself eight years ago when the great Deering Milliken case first came to his Circuit Court. The charge is baseless. The Fourth Circuit's major opinion in the Deering Milliken litigation came in November of 1963. Haynsworth did not write the opinion—Judge Albert Bryan wrote it, and Judge Herbert Boreman concurred. Two other judges dissented. Haynsworth's position on the law and the evidence was in no way irrational; it was a position shared not only by Bryan and Boreman, but also by two members of the National Labor Relations Board and by the board's own trial examiner.

Haynsworth's critics know that their charge of a particular conflict of interest is flimsy. Thus they were seeking, last week, to puff it up to a more general charge that Haynsworth is "Mr. Textile Interests." These are the same critics by and large, who smiled benevolently in other days upon the nominations of Arthur Goldberg and Thurgood Marshall. There are times, in Washington's political rainy season, when we wallow in tides of hypocrisy; and one of those times is upon us now.

It is not only the Haynsworth nomination that suffers the "Southern stigma." Harry Dent is a skilled and dedicated executive, worth his weight in gold at the White House; but he comes from South Carolina—he formerly was with Strom Thurmond—and his appointment as a presidential assistant brought slurs that were simply anti-Southern. No matter what the administration does about school desegregation in the South—no matter what it proposes on voting rights—a hostile reaction arises.

Even Spiro Agnew succumbs. The vice president appeared on Meet the Press the other day, and was asked about the "Southern strategy" that has been urged on his party. He began his response by denying that he was in any sense a traditional Southern-

er. Then he got even more defensive: "How could someone seeking to court the forces of reaction propose a welfare program of the magnitude and scope the President has just proposed?"

Aarghh! The South, with the largest racial problems, has demonstrated the greatest racial peace. It has suffered less than its neighbors from strikes, riots, and campus disorders. The South continues to raise daughters who are ladies and sons who are gentlemen. It is characterized not by "forces of reaction," but by innovation and by solid progress. The old Confederacy is part of the Union now; it is a great place; I love it; and it would be pleasant indeed if the damned Yankees who dwell in Washington would stop kicking my South around.

JAMES HAUGHTON AND 500,000 MORE JOBS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, James Haughton, a dynamic fighter for jobs and housing, is, I am sure, known to most Members of the House who will recall that last year the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 set a goal of 600,000 units of low- and moderate-income housing for 10 years and included the "jobs in housing" concept requiring that jobs be given to low-income indigenous persons residing in the project area.

As a sponsor of the original "jobs in housing" bill, I know how diligently James Haughton, Timothy Cooney, and the National Committee for a Confrontation With Congress—now the National Citizens Lobby—worked to insure passage of the bill which it was estimated would generate 500,000 new construction jobs for low-income people.

The connection between housing and construction jobs for black and Puerto Rican workers is clear, and Jim Haughton has been bringing that message to the Congress of the United States.

After the passage of the 1968 Housing Act, Jim Haughton and Tim Cooney understood the need for grassroots pressure in the appropriations process, for we witnessed the gutting of authorized programs through the failure of Congress to provide the necessary appropriations and also the need to pressure the administrations both in New York and Washington to implement fully existing programs.

The goal of the National Citizens Lobby was to serve as a poor peoples' lobby, asking for the kind of money needed to help alleviate the urban crisis in America.

James Haughton believes that the only way to get jobs for black and Puerto Rican workers in the construction trades is to use constant pressure in every urban center.

This example of a man determined to provide better homes and jobs for the people of our cities should be an example of what one individual can do to inspire others to help themselves.

James Haughton is doing the work that must be done if our cities are ever going to become a decent place for all men to live.

I insert in the RECORD an article about

James Haughton which appeared in the New York Times Magazine on Sunday, September 14. I hope that "James Haughton Wants 500,000 More Jobs," by Marion K. Sanders, will make the urgent need for jobs and housing all the more vivid. It follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine]

JAMES HAUGHTON WANTS 500,000 MORE JOBS
(By Marion K. Sanders)

In a muddy five-acre canyon gouged out of lower Manhattan, the steel skeleton of New York's mammoth World Trade Center is beginning to reach skyward. It rests on foundations 70 feet below street level. City planners dispute the merits of this behemoth, with its 110-story twin towers, and displaced local merchants and residents are unhappy about it. But to the men who are building it, the project is exhilarating. Hundreds are already to work here, and over the next five years thousands more will earn good wages, ranging steeply upward from \$5.30 an hour for the lowliest laborers. Hopes are particularly high among black men, long barred from the lucrative construction trades by lily-white unions. For the builder of this giant structure is the Port of New York Authority, which has a notable record of compliance with state and Federal civil-rights laws. The Port Authority is not, however, in direct control. Actual hiring is done by contractors, private companies long accustomed to hiring through union halls, where equal-employment-opportunity laws have been either ignored or evaded by the reluctant admission of a "token" handful of Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

Because of the magnitude of the World Trade Center, two concerns share the contract for the concrete work, which will use the largest number of unskilled and semi-skilled workers. This combine—Dic-Underhill—as is usual in the trade, has its nucleus of regular employees. Each day, however, as the work requires, additional men are taken on in the same random fashion in which longshoremen are hired on the city's piers.

This process, known as the shapeup, takes place on the narrow porch of a construction shanty that overhangs the excavation. Here at 7:30 on a recent morning, several dozen white workers are lined up. They have come from Local 6A of the laborers' union, shepherded by their shop steward, Larry Ruggiero. He watches sullenly as 10 black men join the queue. The 8 o'clock whistle blows. The chosen have been tapped; they put on their tin hats and make their way down into the canyon. There are no blacks among them.

A handsome, confident Negro with an Afro haircut pushes open the shanty door and walks in. He is James Haughton, a militant champion of black construction workers who has spent the last five years at shape-ups, on picket lines, in demonstrations and in urgent negotiations with builders, union officials and Government agencies. He is well-known now in the construction trades. Disliked by some for his nagging persistence, labeled a Red by others for his militancy, he is generally respected among union leaders, contractors, public officials and the Harlem community as a black man who has no personal "hustle" but is single-mindedly devoted to his chosen mission: getting "top-dollar" construction jobs for the black men he calls brothers.

Haughton and Nick Forcino, the Dic-Underhill superintendent, exchange back-slapping greetings. Forcino launches into a harangue, saying that the job is behind schedule and he will have plenty of work for the "brothers" a few months hence. Haughton—an eloquent man with a plaintive voice and pale eyes that shine like searchlights in his dark face—counters with the story of unemployment and menacing unrest in the ghettos now. The encounter is friendly but tense. The 10 men waiting silently on the

porch are not a picket line or a demonstration, but they could easily become one. During the summer the frustration of just such black men erupted into violent protests that halted work on some 20 major projects in Chicago, the Three Rivers Stadium in Pittsburgh and a new \$650-million campus in a Buffalo suburb for the State University of New York.

The summer was less volatile around New York construction projects, Haughton says, because "we went through that stage back in '63 and '64, when we closed down the Harlem Hospital job and the Downstate Medical Center for three years. Afterward, they took down a lot of names, but not a single black guy got a construction job. We've learned a good many lessons since then."

In the Dic-Underhill shanty, Forcino, on whom the lessons of recent summers were not lost, cautiously says there will probably be some openings tomorrow; Haughton leaves with a careless nod to shop steward Ruggiero, who has been uneasily eavesdropping.

"I don't consider the unions my adversaries," Haughton says later. "They're too pitiful—just looking out for their own guys. We've got to put on pressure where the power is, where the loot is—on the employers. They can hire anyone they want."

And technically, he is right. More than 20 years ago the Taft-Hartley Act outlawed the closed shop. But the threat of strikes by union plumbers, carpenters or other construction workers has been enough to keep most contractors from hiring outside the unions.

Followed by his dark cortege, Haughton heads for the Port Authority field office a few blocks away. While the black men wait silently in an anteroom, he chats with Ray Monti, the authority's top man on the site. There are phone calls back and forth to compliance officers in the authority's headquarters and to Forcino in the shanty. The authority requires contractors to submit biweekly ethnic reports and says that percentage of "minority" workers has risen from 12.4 to 20.5.

"Paper compliance," say Haughton. "You know as well as I do, Ray, these contractors just keep pulling black guys off other jobs and putting them on here to look good. What I'm after is jobs for the brothers who aren't working anywhere, who'll be walking the streets today."

Four jobs are finally promised for tomorrow—two for carpenters and two for mason tenders.

"You're a pain in the neck, Jim," Monti says, "but I know you have to fight for your guys."

It is 10:30 now, and Haughton is well behind schedule. He will visit two more construction sites during the day; ride over to a Brooklyn sweatshop where some black "sisters" have asked for help; meet with Joe Carnegie, leader of the black transit-workers' caucus, for a strategy session, and speak at a meeting on community control of schools. He hopes to cover a lot of territory today because one of the brothers has offered to drive him on his rounds; Haughton cannot afford a car himself.

Late in the afternoon he arrives at his headquarters, a storefront on Fifth Avenue near 125th Street known as the Harlem Unemployment Center. It is dingy in the style of an old-fashioned union hall, with notices and posters tacked to the peeling walls. By 7 P.M. rows of folding chairs are nearly filled with a hundred or so black men—most of them dressed in neat business suits or sports jackets, but a few in work clothes and mud-caked shoes. They have been recruited over the last four years, mainly from the ranks of the disappointed at morning shape-ups, where Haughton still distributes small blue cards reading:

"Construction workers, join us in the struggle for:

- "1. Equal Job Opportunity For All.
- "2. Foreman's Jobs Regardless of Race.
- "3. Democratic Trade Unionism.
- "4. A Slumless America—Now!
- "We Meet Every Tuesday at 7:30 P.M."

Some of the men are skilled carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers and electricians who learned their crafts in their native South before migrating to the city. The majority are unskilled men in their middle 30's or 40's with little education but with strong backs and a zest for hard physical work. Strength and willingness are the only necessary qualifications for laborers' work if—and this is the big if—a man has a buddy or a cousin on the job who will help him learn the ropes in the first bewildering days on a strange, often dangerous construction site. This, indeed, is how generations of poor, uneducated immigrants from Italy, central Europe and Scandinavia found decent work virtually on their first day off the boat. But for black men the situation is different. As one of them put it: "We got no one to bat for us. You know, the white guys they got cousins and uncles and nephews; they got the pull. We got no one till we gets this organization here."

As the hall fills up, Haughton sits at a desk near the back of the store, alternately greeting brothers and answering the phone, which jangles with inquiries about job possibilities and reports from men he has referred to specific sites during the day. Tacked to a wallboard is his filing system—a maze of small slips of paper with names, phone numbers and assorted notes.

Promptly at 7:30 he opens the meeting and points to a large attendance chart on the wall. Welcoming new brothers, he reminds them that they are expected to show up every Tuesday evening, sober, and to pay their dues of \$3 a month when they are working. "We got no use for in-and-outers," he warns. A sufficient number are now employed to enable the center to make ends barely meet out of members' dues.

As Haughton reports on negotiations under way at building projects around the city, the men seem subdued, tired. They stir when he injects one of the code phrases of militancy—appealing, for example, for volunteers to "picket a well-known racist bastard"; in the slurred accents of rural Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and Florida, there are cries of "Right, brother," "Yeah, brother."

There is a lively response, too, when he calls for volunteers to work Saturday at Mount Addis Ababa, a tract of land in the Catskills belonging to a lady known as Queen Mother Moore, who hopes to make the place a vacation camp for blacks. Now in her 70's, Queen Mother has been a militant agitator and a Harlem celebrity since the nineteen-thirties. Last winter, she made headlines by leading the local contingent that disrupted the premiere of a Harlem museum. "Can't let Queen Mother down," Haughton says. "Every other national group got a place in the country where they can go to relax. White folks go hunting. How come there's no black hunters?"

A carpenter, two laborers and an electrician sign up to leave by truck from the center at 6:30 Saturday morning. Majestically turbaned, Queen Mother rises from her chair against the wall to beam her thanks. "She's great on a picket line," Haughton says later. "Community sees Queen Mother marching, they know you mean business." (Indeed, Queen Mother is such a well-known fixture around Harlem that the visitor from downtown who inquires about her origins receives an incredulous stare and is told: "Why, Queen Mother she's just always been here.")

The main business of the evening is matching men with the openings Haughton has lined up in the last week. First, the four jobs at the World Trade Center—two mason tenders, two carpenters.

"You got your tools, brothers?" Haughton asks anxiously. Like such skilled craftsmen as tool-and-die-makers, carpenters must bring their own boxes of tools to the job. When a man quits he "picks up his box."

The Board of Education needs a painter and a laborer. Scattered openings elsewhere are announced. And good news about the metal-and-wire-lathers. As a result of complex negotiations, the precise nature of which Haughton will not divulge, seven brothers can get union permits and start work tomorrow. Who wants the jobs? Hands go up. Haughton writes down names and tells the men that Brother Edinborough Williams, who is a skilled lather, will conduct an instant training session after the meeting. He has brought along his pliers and metal clippers and rises to assure everyone that it's an easy job to learn, even though the union has been insisting that it takes four years of training.

And now the big item of the evening. Governor Rockefeller's office has signed an agreement for the employment and training of substantial numbers of black and Puerto Rican workers on the 23-story state office building that is planned for Seventh Avenue between 125th and 126th Streets. The agreement, which Haughton calls a major breakthrough, is spelled out in an addendum to the building specifications. An advisory committee will be set up representing contractors, unions and the Harlem community. Haughton, who is widely credited with working out the pact, will, of course, be a member of the committee. Of the anticipated 500 workers on the project, a third are to be from the community, and half of them will be in training for skilled crafts. Haughton has fought the idea of an all-black work force: "They could make a show of it by pulling every black construction worker in the city off his job and we wouldn't have gained a single new job." He is particularly jubilant about the training program on the state project. "The problem is going to be selection," he explains. "For the training program we've got to pick guys who really want to be carpenters or pipe-fitters, who'll stick with it."

There is one white man in the room—Timothy J. Cooney, who quit a \$25,000-a-year city post to join forces with Haughton in December, 1967. The two men met when Cooney was working for the city's Human Rights Commission, which Haughton and his men were picketing for its inaction in the building trades.

"Here was this striking-looking black guy, an educated guy, too, with his workmen troops, out there marching rain or shine," Cooney recalls. "We used to talk a little, and one day I asked him for lunch. I convinced him that the way to really lick this problem was to have the country get going on such a tremendous construction program that there would be more than enough work for every able-bodied guy irrespective of color. And at the same time we'd tear down and rebuild all the slums in the country."

Together they organized Haughton's men into a vigorous lobbying organization bent on awakening Congress to the enormous need for and the enormous potential of a vast jobs-in-housing program.

Busloads of black construction workers traveled to Washington to call on Congressmen from urban areas with a specific demand: active support for legislation to build 600,000 new low-cost housing units across the country and in the process create 500,000 new jobs for construction workers. The persistence of these black lobbyists and the explicitness of their program stiffened the spines of friendly but previously inactive Congressmen. Those who refused support were confronted with the jolting spectacle of black picket lines in their home districts. Typical of many were the processions that marched in front of Congresswoman Edna

Kelly's Brooklyn home, prior to her defeat, distributing handbills that read:

"We don't want Integration, Public housing in white communities, Welfare."

"We do want to rebuild America's slums, Top-dollar construction jobs, Decent jobs and decent housing for Black and Puerto Rican Americans."

"The question today is rebellion or jobs... but Kelly couldn't care less."

Shortly after Martin Luther King's murder a number of Cooney's friends, white liberals eager to "do" something, joined the lobbying effort. Some contributed money, others mounted a nationwide chain-letter-writing campaign. Last year, the otherwise penny-pinching 90th Congress authorized and President Johnson signed the largest public-housing bill in history, the 1968 Housing and Development Act. The Congress adjourned, however, without voting the appropriations needed to get the program fully under way, and so far the 91st Congress has done no better.

"This act is nothing more than a piece of paper if it is not fully funded," Cooney says. He adds that Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney "is beginning to talk the rhetoric of a massive housing program. That's encouraging, but it isn't enough. We've got to get rolling to Washington again and turn plenty of pressure on the Nixon Administration."

As the formal meeting ends, it is time for the "good and welfare," a traditional union-meeting postlude dedicated to camaraderie and the discussion of individual problems. The "good and welfare" at the unemployment center includes an ample supply of beer and bourbon. The scene is convivial but not boisterous. At the back of the store an earnest group is huddled around Brother Williams in a wire-lathing class.

Haughton listens sympathetically but calmly to an assortment of gripes. "They got me doing white porter work and mine, too," one brother complains. "White boy, they put him to passin' up nails. Me, they got me passin' up the jacks to the men on top."

"You gotta remember, Brother, you belong to a union now," Haughton answers. "We're not a union. Complaints like that, you take them to the shop steward."

"I been laid off," another man reports.

"Drinkin' on the job?" Haughton asks suspiciously. "Construction workers all like to drink too much," he continues, sipping his favorite Old Forester out of a paper cup. "Course they got to relax some time. After work, after meeting—that's okay. Back in the old days when we were getting started they'd come in drunk and before the meeting was ended somebody got his head busted and somebody got cut. Liquor bottles were all over the place. The guys were demoralized; it was a jungle out there, like a slave market. The guys who are left standing day after day lose their self-respect and they turn their hostility on each other. Maybe they would take a job dishwashing for a day or pushing a hand truck around the garment district for \$50 or so a week. But these guys are construction workers, so it's demoralizing. And there's always welfare. So now they're getting a handout and they're totally demoralized and then the booze takes over..."

Haughton's ideological roots are in the militant labor movement of the thirties and forties—the era of sit-ins and bloody battles for union recognition. Now 39, the son of West Indian parents, he grew up in Brooklyn, where his father was a construction worker. He graduated from C.C.N.Y. and served as a lieutenant in Korea, an experience that made him a zealous pacifist. He spent a few unhappy months on a graduate fellowship at Princeton, which he calls a typical Southern university. Later he acquired an M.A. in public administration at N.Y.U. Qualified for a well-paid job with one of the public agencies or foundations increasingly

eager to employ educated Negroes, he chose instead to throw himself into the front lines of the black workers' struggle. The decision was enthusiastically supported by his wife, Dr. Eleanor Leacock, an anthropologist of strong leftist sympathies. He served for a while as a Youth Board street worker and in the Labor and Industry Division of the N.A.A.C.P. In the early nineteen-sixties, he joined A. Philip Randolph in organizing the Negro-American Labor Council with high hopes that it would become a militant black caucus within the labor movement. The organization, however, was soon mired in factionalism and achieved little. Haughton was aligned with a left-wing group that was ousted in 1964. It was then that he decided to strike out on his own in behalf of black construction workers, for whom he feels a peculiar affinity.

A fund-raising party at his Greenwich Village home yielded a month's rent for a Harlem store. A group of black longshoremen produced a desk and some chairs. Already a familiar figure on the streets of Harlem—where he had participated in many protests—he began building his organization. To date, according to his estimate, he has placed more than 800 black construction workers in 6,000 jobs lasting anywhere from two weeks to more than two years. Many of these men have subsequently become union members.

"Even after a black man gets into the union," Haughton says, "he isn't guaranteed a job. He's got no friends in the hiring hall to look out for him. The civil-rights folks who are demonstrating in Chicago and Pittsburgh are showing that we have a weapon, but they aren't construction workers. After the sit-ins, after the barricades are down, the black men need a strong persuasive organization right in the community to deal with the formidable institutions we're up against. I think the pattern we've worked out shows what is needed in every city in the country."

White union men in Pittsburgh and Chicago have staged angry counterdemonstrations against the protests that have kept them off their lucrative jobs. In New York, they tend to be tight-lipped about the black men who are edging their way into the unions. Word has come down from the leaders that racist statements are out of style these days and that the labor movement favors equal opportunity for all; there have been few overt clashes. One New York contractor who has made a particular effort to hire from minority groups says, "On a man-to-man basis, there is no problem when a black man joins a predominantly white gang. Like all middle-class whites, the union men greatly fear and are greatly angered by militant rhetoric. But they have no worries about the qualified black man who may work alongside them."

Another contractor who has a sizable proportion of Negroes in his regular work force agrees. "However," he adds, "by today's standards I guess you'd call my fellows Toms. They know how to stay out of trouble with the white guy."

Many of Haughton's men are so hardened by years of rejection by the white society that they shrug off minor slights or rebuffs. The attitude of the foreman seems to make more difference than the behavior of their co-workers, which they assume will be tinged with racism. The men recently admitted to work as wire-lathers, for instance, were pleased. "That cat—that foreman," said one after a week on the job, "he really treat me good. None of this 'boy' stuff or 'Hey, you.' He knows my name." Said another who had started work at the World Trade Center: "I like it fine. I does my work and no one bothers me. 'Course they wouldn't of taken me on if Jim hadn't shaped-up for me."

Haughton is not discouraged by the fact that the gains he has made are the result of tedious, time-consuming individual negotia-

tions and pressure. "This is a retail operation," he concedes. "No other way black brother's going to get the job. All the executive orders from City Hall, all the compliance officers sitting in their posh offices won't do anything unless you push and push, day after day. But we've got to do a lot better, especially when public tax dollars are being spent. I'm totally dissatisfied, for instance, with the response of the Port Authority so far. Maybe we're going to have to make the World Trade Center the big civil-rights issue of 1969."

In theory, at least, there are other means of opening up the construction trades to black workers. One of the most logical—and potentially the most valuable in dollars and cents—is through the apprenticeship programs that train skilled craftsmen such as sheet-metal workers, electricians, carpenters and plumbers. An apprentice, who usually must be under 21 when he starts, learns by working on the job for considerably less than union wages as a helper to a journeyman. He also attends evening classes at vocational high schools financed out of state and Federal funds and certified by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the U.S. Department of Labor. Traditionally, apprentices are the sons or other relatives of journeymen. As of 1968 only 3 percent of registered apprentices were Negroes. And, according to a Bureau of Labor Statistics study, if the Negro share of the construction work force were proportionate to the black share of the population, there would be 37,000 more Negro carpenters, 45,000 more laborers, 97,000 more mechanics, 82,000 more metal craftsmen and 112,000 more construction foremen. In 1964, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training was ordered to decertify and thus cut off the funds of any apprenticeship program that did not comply with Equal Employment Opportunity legislation. Although many programs are in open violation of the law, not a single one has been decertified to date.

"The bureau," says Herbert Hill, national labor director of the N.A.A.C.P. and a veteran of hundreds of legal battles against discriminatory unions, "is a rest home for retired A.F.L. business agents, who continue to represent their lily-white craft unions and use the power and authority of the Federal Government to maintain the pattern of Negro exclusion from the well-paid craft occupations."

The Labor Department has announced a plan—to be tried in Philadelphia—under which contractors bidding on Federal construction jobs will be required to employ a certain number of minority workers in the skilled trades—as iron workers, carpenters, plumbers, pipefitters and roofers, for example. Congressional conservatives have objected that such a quota system violates the civil rights act, however, and the success of the Philadelphia experiment will depend upon the zeal and determination of the Labor Department, which has been notably lacking in those qualities in times past. The "Philadelphia Plan" will also undoubtedly be hampered by the Administration's decision to cut back by 75 percent new contracts for Government construction.

Under increasing pressure from the N.A.A.C.P.—which has begun suits to suspend work on several Government-financed projects until qualified Negroes are able to find work on them—and the Justice Department, several unions have fought back by adopting difficult written admission examinations for apprentices. The validity of such tests is being challenged in the courts.

Meanwhile an ingenious counterattack has been mounted by the Workers Defense League, which with the A. Philip Randolph Institute has been conducting in Harlem and Brooklyn tutorial programs for black would-be apprentices. Classes are held four

nights a week and on Saturdays and include intensive training in mathematics, mechanical skills, verbal comprehension and union red tape. The project, which has received financial support from the Labor Department and the Ford Foundation, is directed by Ernest Green, the first Negro graduated from Little Rock High School. He reports that the classes have enabled 700 black and Puerto Rican youths to gain admission to apprenticeship programs in the last four years.

These men—who are generally young, bright and aggressive—are challenging a labor aristocracy and have encountered much more overt hostility than blacks who enter construction in the lowlier, traditionally "Negro" jobs. The handful who have battered their way into Local 28 of the sheet-metal workers' union, for example, say that they have had to endure four years of virtual ostracism on the job. This is the union that was forced by law to remove the "Caucasian only" clause from its constitution in 1948 and that this year was finally compelled to accept eight Negroes among its 3,000 members. Through a policy of nepotism, the union has managed to maintain one of the tightest monopolies in the labor market—to the detriment not merely of Negroes but also of white men who don't happen to be the sons of sheet-metal workers. So scarce are qualified journeymen in this field that contractors must frequently pay a premium of 50 cents an hour over the union scale, \$6.20.

James McNamara, special assistant to the commissioner of New York City's Manpower and Career Development Agency agrees with Haughton that the possibilities of apprenticeship training are severely limited. Only the young are eligible. And, though such programs are necessary in a few highly skilled mechanical crafts, only one-fifth of the 100,000 white workers who entered the construction trades in 1967 had served apprenticeships. The remaining 80,000 learned on the job—a logical practice as construction techniques become increasingly routine and repetitive.

McNamara sees the one-the-job training program written into the specifications for the state office building as the most hopeful pattern for the future. "It's a real breakthrough," he says. "Otherwise we just keep on shuffling around the same black men who already belong to the union." A practical test for the program is still in the future because the construction of the state office building has been postponed. Militant squatters have occupied the site of the project to demand that it be used for a school, a public-housing development or some other structure more relevant to Harlem's needs. Haughton has stayed aloof from the controversy, but continues to press for on-the-job training. A provision for such training is one of the prime demands in negotiations he is conducting with Gimbel's about a new store to be built at 86th Street and Lexington Avenue.

Haughton is somewhat skeptical about an effort supported by Ford funds that supplies financing and technical aid to minority-group building contractors. To date a \$300,000 grant has been used to set up the General and Specialty Contractors Association in Oakland, Calif. The association is made up of small concerns—most of them owned by Negroes, Orientals and Mexican-Americans—which, by joining together, can bid on substantial projects and in the process employ and train large numbers of minority workers. According to Douglas Pugh, who runs the program for Ford, construction unions in the Oakland area have been more amenable than their East Coast counterparts to the prospect of admitting minority workers. Ford has recently joined with the Urban Coalition in setting up a revolving fund to assist similar groups of Negro contractors in New York. Still another effort to encourage black con-

struction concerns is sponsored by the Turner Construction Company and Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland.

Haughton's doubts about these and other attempts to foster "black capitalism" are based in part on the dearth of entrepreneurial talent and tradition in the ghettos. He fears, too, that the black contractor will remain a small-time operator who will undercut union scales. "The black worker needs to get in on the really big stuff," he argues. He also sees little promise in the Black Workers Alliance recently announced by Ben Howard, vice chairman of the Western region of the Congress of Racial Equality. Active mainly in California, the alliance plans to lure members away from the conventional unions and enroll them in all-Negro groups.

In fact, Haughton deplores as impractical all separatist goals—a position that sharply divides him from the more nihilistic black militants. Although he counts such radicals as Jesse Gray, William Epton and numerous black Muslims among his friends, he finds many of their postures absurd. "What good's it going to do a guy to know Swahili when he's looking for work?" he asks. And though he is an ardent collaborator of far-left peace agitators, he is not a man of the New Left. In a guest appearance on a news program last year he proved himself an engaging TV personality and he was subsequently invited to spell out his philosophy in weekly talks on Channel 13, New York's educational TV station.

"As long as the white revolution on the New Left is unable to provide a realistic challenge to the existing system," he said recently, "the black man—constituting but 11 per cent of the population—has only one course of action: the hard, unromantic road of reform. He must have a legislative program and a political strategy for putting it across. He must grit his teeth and politely testify before hostile Congressional committees. He must make alliances of convenience with people he doesn't like. He must learn that awful business of compromise. Finally, he must master the art of defeating his political enemies—within the existing political structure."

"This is hard, particularly for the young. But the black man, young or old, has no other choice. Whites on the New Left can afford the luxury of revolutionary rhetoric, knowing that the system will forgive and forget when the time comes and that their sisters and brothers will always enjoy the rich fruits of their American citizenship. But for blacks there is no time to fool around. Their brothers and sisters are wasting away. Whites have reformed the system in the past; blacks must reform it now."

The Channel 13 broadcasts have attracted white supporters to Haughton's cause. Lately a group of businessmen have begun supplying funds to the center, making it possible to hire a badly needed part-time secretary and to open a Brooklyn headquarters at 572 Nostrand Avenue, in the heart of Bedford-Stuyvesant. Others have supplied expert help in accounting and business procedures. A majority of these men are Jewish, and Haughton's companionable relationship with them is an agreeable contrast to the widely publicized phenomenon of black anti-Semitism.

"White and black people can work together," Haughton says, "if the white brother has a real assignment, something practical to do. He lost his assignment in the movement because there weren't enough practical goals. We still need his help—more than ever, maybe."

According to the National Home Builders Association, there is a nationwide shortage of such skilled workers as carpenters, plumbers, bricklayers and roofers. New York contractors describe the labor situation as "moderately tight." Said one (who, like virtually everyone else in the building business will

not jeopardize his relationship with the powerful craft unions by allowing the use of his name): "I'd say things are just about the way the unions want them to be. If I call the union for a carpenter, they'll send me one. Probably not a very good one. But they can still produce a man—a white man—with a union card." Haughton agrees that there are shortages in some trades. But the problem is not nearly acute enough, he points out, to encourage a major effort to recruit and train black men. This is why he continues to press for a massive publicly supported housing program that would create a huge demand for labor and at the same time rebuild the nation's festering ghettos.

Haughton believes that there will not be justice for the black man until there is genuinely full employment for all workers. In the construction field, he contends, this can come about only through a massive infusion of Federal funds.

"You don't hear me hollering 'Kill the honkies! 'Hate whitey!'" he says. "What I'm asking for is very moderate. You forget that it's the tax dollar that keeps white America affluent. Thousands of kids are graduating from Harvard and M.I.T. with their engineering degrees every year. So we put them to work in the NASA program and they can make top dollars there. Same thing with defense work and highway construction and the oil-depletion allowance and the farm subsidies. That's all tax money. Only the white folks don't look at their hustle that way. They don't see that the multi-million-dollar programs that pay their rent and send their kids to school and buy their homes in suburbia are really a welfare program on the grandest scale. Now if white folks could see our jobs-in-housing program as a small Government program for black folk who need it most desperately, then maybe they wouldn't feel threatened by it, maybe they'd even support it because this may be a way to work out of the racial mess this country is in."

AIN'T INFLATION WONDERFUL?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, for those who have trouble making their money cover their bills and still lay up a little bit for old age, the economics of inflation may be plainly brought home by an editorial which appeared in the *Seattle Times*, Sunday, July 15, 1951. The editorial follows:

IF YOU FIND YOURSELF CONFUSED BY INFLATION

For anyone who finds the economics of inflation just too complicated to fathom, one King County philosopher-economist has a handy simplification. He is W. Frank Horne, editor and publisher of *The Community Civic News*, a semi-monthly publication which serves the countryside around Black Diamond, Hobart, Maple Valley, Morgantown, Ravensdale and Lake Sawyer.

In the most recent issue of this journal, Horne expounds the why and wherefore of present economic trends under the heading: "Ain't Inflation Wonderful." The reader can only conclude that it is, indeed.

"It," says Horne, "you find yourself mixed up occasionally about inflation, the following article may clear things up a bit for you."

"Once there was a farmer who raised corn and a man who raised hens, but no corn. The hens said: No corn, no eggs. So the man agreed to work for the farmer for one day

a week for \$5 a day. And the farmer agreed to sell corn to the man for \$1 a bushel.

"They paid each other off every time with the long green. The farmer paid the man \$5 and the man paid the farmer back \$5 for the five bushels of corn which he wheeled home in his wheelbarrow. After a while, the man said to the farmer: 'Everything's gone up, and I regret intensely to inform you that I can't work for less than \$6 a day.'

"The farmer said: 'I understand. But you must understand that everything's gone up with me, too, and I regret intensely to inform you that I can't sell my corn for less than \$1.20 a bushel.' The man said he understood. So the man got \$6 a day and at \$1.20 a bushel paid the farmer \$6 for five bushels of corn. Both of them said: 'Happy days are here again.'

"By and by, the man said to the farmer, 'Things have gone up still more and I can't work for less than \$7.50 a day.' The farmer agreed that was fair, but told the man things were going up still higher with him. He would have to get \$1.50 a bushel for corn. The man agreed that was fair, and both said: 'Prosperity is here.'

"After all, the man was getting \$7.50 a day. The farmer was getting \$1.50 a bushel for corn, and the hens were getting five bushels as usual. And so things went until the man was getting \$10 a day and the farmer got \$2 a bushel—and the man gave the farmer \$10 for five bushels. . . . And the man told his wife: 'Ain't it wonderful—\$10 a day!' And the farmer told his wife: 'Ain't it wonderful—\$2 a bushel.' And the hens kept on clucking away on five bushels of corn.

"And the statisticians down Washington way said: 'Ain't it wonderful—national income at record levels.' And the politicians said: 'Ain't it wonderful,' and bragged that they had done it. And everybody felt so good and prosperous that the man and the farmer voted for the politicians.

"The man got three times as much for the eggs, but paid three times as much for his shoes and everything else he bought. And the music went round and round and is still going that way."

Maybe it all sounds a little corny, but as our philosopher-economist concludes: "That's the way it was, eggactly."

AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE
THEODORE R. MCKELDIN TO THE
ROTARY CLUB OF LAUREL, MD.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I place in the *RECORD* an address by a distinguished American and one of Maryland's best-loved public figures—Theodore R. McKeldin, who has served as Governor of my State and mayor of Baltimore. From the perspective of his extensive experience in public life, Governor McKeldin passes on to us his cogent observations about the Presidency and, in particular, the conduct of President Nixon during the first months of his tenure in office. I believe that Governor McKeldin's analysis sheds considerable light on the high office and the man who occupies it. I recommend it to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN

The toughest job ever conceived by the mind of man has to be the Presidency of the United States. Nowhere else is there the

collection of responsibilities, demands, tensions, decisions and grueling hours. One often speaks of the loneliness of the Presidency, for here is a job in which, more than in any other mortal job, the man who holds it is alone with the fate of his decisions and the responsibilities of his actions. As the sign on President Truman's desk read—"The buck stops here."

Each man who holds the Presidency must be measured by how he carries the burdens of his office. How wise and firm are his decisions? How does he handle the tensions of his job? How easily does he fulfill his responsibilities?

President Richard Nixon's performance in the Presidency must be weighed against each of these measurements. When done so, his performance bears out remarkably well.

Nine months ago President Nixon entered office with troubles and violence on the home front, a vicious war in Asia, dissension among the races, and inflation ravishing the economy. What would have ruined this country would have been a President who did not move decisively to solve these problems; a President who failed to make new decisions for old problems, who ignored his responsibility to fit the temper of his time.

One thing certainly marks the first nine months of Richard Nixon's Presidency—uncanny understanding of what had sent America into an emotional tailspin. We had indeed been a country too often shouting instead of being heard; a country that needed to lower its voice to be understood.

President Nixon, by his own actions, by the calculated posture of his Administration moved immediately to stamp out the fire of our emotions, to take some of the heat out of the charged air. After the sustained violence in our cities and the summers of racial rioting, America needed more than anything else this decompression of the emotional atmosphere. Thus, Richard Nixon met the responsibility of his office. His success can easily be weighed by a look at this past summer in the American cities. We can now see that the long, hot summer of race relations that was anticipated never came to be; that riots in our big cities were no longer the painful eventuality that we all came to expect. President Nixon had indeed sensed the temper of his time and has made what must be called brilliant decisions to ease, to pacify, to smooth these troubled times. Now, with this foundation to work upon, President Nixon can move to formulate policy and carry out legislation which will capitalize on this surcease and build a strong tomorrow. Indeed, the President has already started to do this. He has come forward with a much needed and long overdue reform of welfare, a program to aid cities, the building or improving of mass transit system, and he has carried a "big stick" on the problem to carry out a crackdown on drugs and crime.

As for inflation, he has "bitten the bullet" as President and instituted a number of necessary directives to slow down our economy and get it back to a more even level. Once again, he has shown his willingness to take unpopular action to bring about what he sees to be in the vast public interest.

President Nixon has also moved to bring an honorable peace to Vietnam, thus removing another sore on the body of this country. Realizing that the past course of action in Vietnam was not bearing fruit, the President has again made a necessary decision—the gradual withdrawal of troops to get peace negotiations off dead center. To have shirked such a decision would have been to fail in his job. President Nixon showed in the Vietnam question—as he is showing in other areas of our economy and our society—that he embraces the opportunity for decision and is using it to shape and to mold a better America.

PROGRAM TO ASSIST STUDENTS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey in Harford County, Md., showed that approximately 200 students in the June 1969 high school graduating classes want to attend college but are unable to do so without financial assistance. I am delighted to learn that a new program of cooperation among members of the Harford County banking community, the Harford County Educational Foundation, and the Harford Junior College will enable students to borrow money for tuition, fees, and books. I would like to commend these Harford County citizens for their interest in higher education by including the following article in the RECORD:

SEVEN BANKS AGREE TO LOANS FOR NEEDY HJC STUDENTS—WILL PERMIT BORROWING FOR BOOKS, FEES, TUITION

A new program, the product of cooperation among members of the Harford county banking community, the Harford County Educational Foundation, and Harford Junior College, is aimed at encouraging those who otherwise would be unable to afford to attend college to do so by borrowing the money for tuition, fees, and books.

According to a state survey approximately 200 students in the June, 1969, graduating high school classes of Harford county indicated that they wished to continue their education in an institution of higher learning, but that they were unable to do so without a scholarship or loan or both.

Following three meetings among representatives of Harford county banks, the Harford Junior College Advisory Board Sub-Committee on Financial Assistance, and College officials, individual meetings of the bank boards, and a meeting of the Harford County Educational Foundation, all held over a period of four months, it was announced Thursday that seven Harford county banks would provide a total of \$10,000 to the Harford County Educational Foundation for the purpose of

providing financial assistance in the form of loans up to \$400 per year (or \$200 per semester) to needy students wishing to attend Harford Junior College.

The banks are: Aberdeen National Bank, Citizens National Bank, Commercial and Savings Bank, The Equitable Trust Company, First National Bank and Trust Company, First National Bank of Harford County, and Forest Hill State Bank.

Those interested in applying may receive the appropriate application forms by calling the Harford Junior College Office of Financial Assistance at 734-7171.

In addition to executives of the banks, noted above, those involved in the planning of this program include: Cornelius Cronin of the Harford Junior College Board of Trustees; the members of the Harford Junior College Advisory Board Sub-Committee on Financial Assistance; John Clark, Mrs. Jacob Hecht, Charles Reed, Jesse Rhoads, Pershing Volkart, and Mrs. John D. Worthington, III; and the members of the newly-appointed Harford County Educational Foundation: John Clark, chairman, Melvin Bosely, Brodnax Cameron, Jr., G. Howlett Cobourn, Philip Golbin, Dr. Joseph N. Hankin, Joseph Hinder, Edmund Schwanne, and I. Dale Snodgrass.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 16, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, most holy, wise, and powerful Preserver and Governor of all Thy creatures and all their actions, keep us this day in health of body and soundness of mind, in purity of heart and cheerfulness of spirit, in contentment of heart and in charity with our neighbor; and further all our undertakings with Thy blessing. In our labor strengthen us; in our pleasure purify us; in our difficulties direct us; in our perils defend us; in our troubles comfort us; and supply all our needs, according to the riches of Thy grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 15, 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 submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted, but the Chair must say it is probably out of order, under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that unanimous-consent agreement be amended so that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 11:20 a.m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the Senate, in a body, will leave the Chamber at 12:13 p.m. to proceed to the House of Representatives for the purpose of a joint meeting which will be addressed by the astronauts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be cognizant of that statement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 2315) to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1686. An act relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; and

S. 1766. An act to provide for the disposition of a judgment recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraph 11, docket numbered 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 4869. An act to further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona;

H.R. 7066. An act to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site;

H.R. 12979. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise, clarify, and extend the provisions relating to court leave for employees of the United States and the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 13194. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated: