

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MILITARY PRAISED FOR AID TO
CAMILLE VICTIMS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues another valiant effort on the part of those who came to the assistance of distressed people in the wake of Hurricane Camille.

This letter which I insert pinpoints the expression of gratitude which the people of my congressional district have for the military for their untiring efforts. It is one of many which I have received praising the military who were ever present to help.

This is significant, I believe, because there are others today who are attempting to downgrade the man who wears the uniform of his country.

But once again, as so many times in the past, the military has demonstrated it is close to the people and is there in time of need, regardless of the occasion.

Having spent many days in the areas of my district which were devastated by Hurricane Camille, I know what a tremendous job the military did in aiding hundreds of people who were in desperate need of assistance.

I am reflecting the thoughts of my constituents when I praise the military leaders who directed their men in these operations, but I also want to add my commendations.

Rear Adm. R. A. Macpherson, Commandant of the Eighth Naval District; Col. William Beach, Commandant of the Marines at that installation; Comdr. Jack Evans at Alvin Callender Field; and Adm. Ross Bullard of the Coast Guard and their men deserve the plaudits of all of us.

I insert the letter at this point in the RECORD which tells the story and which is a typical example of expression by those people who benefited from the military's efforts:

ASSOCIATED BRANCH PILOTS,
September 15, 1969.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: It has occurred to me that you will be interested in knowing of the generous and effective assistance that men of the U.S. Navy gave to the people of Pilottown, Louisiana in the awful aftermath of Hurricane Camille.

The Navy Submarine Tender U.S.S. *Bushnell* (AS-15) was in New Orleans, Louisiana in mid-August for a visit. After Camille passed the *Bushnell*, under the command of Capt. David F. Purinton, called at Pilottown to give emergency relief to the residents who returned to Pilottown on August 19. When Capt. Purinton saw the extent of the damage to Pilottown, he arranged for a longer stay than originally planned.

The assistance given during the stay was real and genuine. Not limited to such essentials as food, water and inoculations, it included even the disposal of dead animals

and the rebuilding of a walkway from pilot stations to pilot boats. The men of the *Bushnell* literally swarmed over Pilottown doing any and everything that was in need of doing.

Their assistance, in no small way, helped put the Port of New Orleans, and particularly the pilots, back in business less than twenty-four hours after Hurricane Camille passed.

I have written a letter of appreciation to Rear Admiral R. A. Macpherson, Commandant of the Eighth Naval District and to the ship.

We, the pilots, would appreciate very much any recognition that you may see fit to give to Captain Purinton and his men of the *Bushnell*. The people of Pilottown will be forever grateful for the aid given by these men.

Most sincerely,
ASSOCIATED BRANCH PILOTS,
GEORGE S. THOMPSON,
President.

PILOTTOWN, LA.

THE ARMS TRADE—PART VI

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 1969, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 24987, a tentative assessment of the recent coup in Libya. It was clear then, as it still is now, that one of the major reasons for the coup stemmed from the combined United States-British force-feeding of Libya with approximately \$500 million worth of military equipment—a quantity of arms nearly 36 times Libya's entire 1966 defense budget. This enormous quantity of arms aid boosted the prestige of the Libyan military to such an extent that it encouraged a group of radical officers to throw out a pro-West and moderately progressive government.

What was not clear last week was the orientation of the country's new leaders. However, their direction has now become clear. According to U.S. News & World Report of September 15, 1969:

The Libyan coup is regarded by many as bringing into power leaders who—if not actually anti-Western—are at best "neutralist" toward the West. This at a time when radical Arabs are selling the idea that America is as much the enemy of the Arabs as is Israel.

The new Premier, Dr. Mahmoud Soleiman el Moughrebi, emphasized Libya's new alignment when he was quoted elsewhere as saying:

We shall . . . bring about an unlimited cooperation with other Arab states in the struggle with Israel.

The same U.S. News & World Report article also noted that:

What makes the Libyan coup a threat to U.S. interests in the Middle East is its timing. It comes in a period of growing resentment in the Arab world over American policy toward Israel.

This Arab anger has been building up with particular force since the announcement that the U.S. would begin delivery of 50 Phantom jet aircraft to Israel. It has been reflected in such recent anti-American actions as the hijacking of a Trans World Airlines plane and the blowing up of an American-owned oil pipeline. Palestinian commando spokesmen, in particular, have called for an intensification of attacks on U.S. property in the Mideast. . . .

In the long run, observers see the coup as leading to a setback for America's strategic role in the Mediterranean area—where Soviet Russia has been steadily building up its sea forces and political sway.

The change may come gradually, rather than overnight. But the signs are that, in the end, Libya's new rulers will shift another important segment of the Middle East away from United States influence.

So far as I am concerned, and I believe that the facts will bear me out, this shift away from the United States and the West is, and will continue to be, due primarily to our misguided arms aid program which, in the end, usually produces results directly detrimental to our own vital interests. The case of Libya is the latest example in a long string of arms sales disasters dating back to the end of World War II when the United States first revived the arms trade.

It is for this reason that, once again, I ask that our Government take the initiative and seek to have included on the agenda of the forthcoming strategic arms limitation talks in Geneva the question of conventional arms control.

How many Libyas must there be in the future before we, and the other arms merchants in the world, realize that the massive infusion of arms into an area is of no lasting benefit to anyone?

STUDENT LOAN LEGISLATION

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing this student loan legislation by unanimous vote and thus demonstrate to the youth of our country that we intend to keep faith with them in providing ever-wider opportunities to obtain an education.

We are concerned here today with an investment, not a gift. Every dollar we invest in higher education opportunities is a dollar invested in a better America. It is shameful in this richest of countries that students who qualify in every way for admission to colleges and universities should be stopped at the door for lack of funds. And this is particularly true of those students who are seeking loans— which they are obligated to repay— rather than a grant or gift.

In New Mexico we have been forced to adopt temporary emergency measures to meet this crisis. We have done this. Loans for New Mexico students are

virtually assured. The crisis has been temporarily averted. But, Mr. Speaker, the basis for this crisis—the situation that created it—is not a state matter. This crisis was brought on by the Federal tightening of credit resulting in higher interest rates on the one hand and by the Federal Student Loan Act being pegged to lower interest rates on the other. This is a Federal problem, brought on by Federal action, and we must act here and now in this body to effect a Federal solution. This legislation provides that solution. Let us pass it in resounding unanimity.

FARM CROSSROADS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary concerns of the vast area of mid-America is the farm program. Our countryside, our rural towns as well as our agriculturists themselves, are dependent upon the prices our producers receive for their crops and livestock.

In the central part of our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, speaking with the voice of long editorial experience, O. B. Augustson, editor of the West-Central Daily Tribune, recently wrote on this subject.

Because of the interest of the American people and my colleagues in the farm program, I place herewith in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Augustson's editorial from the West-Central Daily Tribune:

FARM CROSSROADS

In this issue of The Tribune will be found a special story. It deals with the farm problem. The article is timely and comes from two sources. One is the Farmers Union and the other hails from the office of the governor of our state. Both of the sources cited in the article, as you will note, cite the fact that there are problems in rural America today. Not only on the farms themselves but the effects of what is wrong on the farm showing up in the urban areas and what are commonly referred to as the main streets.

One is glad to see these intentions of bringing the farm problem to the nation's capitol. For it could be that the final answer lies there. It could be the last answer for we feel that at this moment agriculture is at a crossroads more than ever. If it is the job of the Congress to do something, this could be the zero hour. If it does something constructive and something that will be of major value it could result in programs that should raise farm income and halt the trend towards elimination of what are left of our family farms. If the Congress continues its present weaker programs or even cut out those we have or further water them down one can only look forward to more denuding of our rural American scene.

The present trend must be checked. If the farmers and main street assistance cannot be mobilized for a high income and the preservation of family farms then one can only look to government to give the helping hand. Frankly speaking, at times, we wish that all the farmers would get together just like business and industry does and demand—and get their price, the cost of production, plus so that they can stay on the land and farm youth will also be encouraged to remain on the farm and step into their fathers shoes.

What a tragedy we have always felt when a boy decides not to follow his dad on the farm because he sees no future in it at all—in fact, a discouraging struggle. So he hikes to the big city for more pay and only 40 hour weeks.

We would like to see collective bargaining at the market place taking a leaf from organized labor in this respect. Taking a leaf from other business and industry—for farming today is more of a business and an industry than ever before. Some of those farm operations are far bigger than a lot of two by four shops on our main streets or minor plants. But it is difficult to marshal farmers together. Habits of independence and individualism of the past. The young farmer to stay on the land is interested in any program that will achieve this. Then there are farmers soon to retire perhaps and they may be inclined to sell out to the larger operation close by. Then the big one who expects to survive the demise of the smaller operation and be the big frog in the pond. In the above picture we can envision the bigger and bigger farmer or more of the present trend or corporate farming which some would like to minimize as a possibility. The latter may come sooner than one thinks and will capitalize on the death of the small operator.

The present Congress will have the agricultural problem in its lap according to the stories aforementioned. One will see what will happen. There will be something of course but one fears too little to do the job which should be done. Back to the highest possible parity program, perhaps a national farm board like labor has or some real punch to a collective bargaining approach.

Unless some of these measures are taken, the farmers may be left on their own and then the one answer seems to be that thru organization and plenty of it the battle will have to be fought at the market place thru self managed collective bargaining and all the power of rural America behind it. And when we say all—we would enlist our main streets in the same cause for when everything is said and done the agricultural dollar is still our basic dollar and the one that will bring about more prosperity on our main streets. Especially as it relates to the family farm. Ten family farmers will buy more things on main street than the one who may have gobbled them up.

Rural America can well wait and see what will come out of the nation's capitol in the coming months.

BILLY GAINES, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, SAVES GIRL'S LIFE AT SOMERVILLE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the fast action by a member of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers narrowly averted a double tragedy. Billy Gaines, resident engineer at Somerville Reservoir, saved the life of a young Mexican national in the same accident that claimed the life of her cousin.

Within 5 minutes of receiving the call for help, Billy was on the spot applying the lifesaving methods to the nearly lifeless Modesta Almanza of Matchula, Mexico. He kept his head and used the training he had received—and he saved her life under what appeared to be hopeless odds.

Many times I have felt I was blessed to

have a capable engineer like Billy Gaines in charge of the new Somerville Reservoir. I knew he could stretch the meager dollars in his meager budget to unbelievable proportions; I knew he was concerned for the welfare and safety of the visitors to Somerville; now he has proven it. Billy Gaines has proven that he is a great and courageous public servant.

I submit the following article which describes Billy's successful reaction to crisis:

PRETTY NATIVE OF MEXICO THANKS ENGINEER FOR SAVING HER LIFE

A pretty 14-year-old girl, a native of Mexico, will return to her homeland in a few days forever grateful to Billy Gaines, project engineer of Lake Somerville who saved her life from drowning in a tragic swimming accident that claimed the life of her cousin, on Aug. 18.

She is Miss Modesta Almanza, of Matchula, Mexico, who with her cousin, Jose Antonio Almanza of Bryan was enjoying a swimming party at Lake Somerville, along with other members of the family.

While wading near the Lake's shore, Miss Almanza, who cannot swim was carried into deep water by her cousin and he apparently slipped into a deep spot where the water was over their heads.

She was recovered from the water by members of the family at the scene, while her cousin was removed by Jimmie York of Somerville.

Both were given artificial respiration for some 30 minutes, however her cousin failed to respond.

Gaines reached the scene within five minutes after being notified, but some 17 minutes had elapsed before Miss Almanza was removed from the water.

He used three types of artificial respiration including two sharp blows with the knees on the back rib section which seemed to clear her air passage and allowed back press respiration to be applied. Gaines said he could not detect a heart beat or pulse and the girl's eyes were completely dilated, but she finally responded and was brought to St. Jude Hospital here. She was at first listed in serious condition and in a hysterical state from the frightening experience, but responded quickly to treatment and was released in four days.

Miss Almanza's first visit when released from the hospital was to Mr. Gaines and while she does not speak English, she expressed her gratitude in the charming smile of thanks of a happy 14-year-old girl.

JEWISH NEW YEAR—5730

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the Jewish people throughout the world, September 12 marked the beginning of Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year of 5730.

Rosh Hashana heralds the beginning of the 10-day period of penitence which is climaxed on the Day of Atonement, Yom Kippur, the most holy day of the year.

The sounding of the ram's horn, or shofar, in ancient times served to beckon Jews to the synagogue. Now, the blowing of the shofar in synagogues throughout the world symbolizes this ancient calling

and serves to refresh man's awareness and faith in God.

At the culmination of the high holiday period, Yom Kippur, when man's belief in God has been reaffirmed, he then begins to examine his own personal actions and deeds of the past and devotes the entire day to fasting and solemn prayer for the atonement of the evils he has committed against God and his fellow man.

Not only is it his hope to wipe clean the slate of the past by asking God's forgiveness, but also to be inscribed in the Book of Life for health, strength, and good fortune in the coming year.

And, to receive God's blessing, it is understood that his past misdeeds must have been rectified and that future deeds toward his fellow man will be just and honorable.

While the high holiday season is indeed a time of deep reflection and penitence on the past, moreover, it is a hopeful beginning.

I extend my hope that the blowing of the shofar will herald the realization of peace and tranquillity among the peoples and the nations of the world.

In these times, it is most essential that we join with the people of the Jewish faith in seeking this most noble aspiration of mankind.

PAYBACK MONEYS IN MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the August 1969 issue of Reclamation Era, a water review quarterly published by the Department of Interior, contained a notable statement by Mr. James R. Smith, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development, relating to the development of our land and water resources.

Jim Smith, a pioneer in water and power development long before his entrance into the public service, stated:

Throughout its 67-year history of water resources development, the Bureau of Reclamation has become a highly respected working tool to help develop and expand the economy of the West and the Nation. Land areas that were once dry and hostile are now green, hospitable and productive, supporting the fastest growing population centers in America.

Regarding the future of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Assistant Secretary said:

Reclamationists must be innovative and creative. If we are to meet the needs of the long-range future we must begin now with a bold "Reclamation for the Seventies" program. Reclamation's program in the next decade must contain two elements: (1) to get on with authorized projects as rapidly as this Nation's fiscal circumstances permit and (2) to develop a creative and carefully coordinated program for the future.

I agree with and applaud Assistant Secretary Smith's ideas for the future

development of our land and water resources. Projects must continue to be developed, not only to improve our Nation's resources, but to prepare an alternative for our citizens who would prefer developed open spaces to crowded cities. Increasingly, the development of the West and Midwest is an urban concern.

The development described in two other articles contained in the August issue of Reclamation Era are typical of the widespread benefits of Bureau of Reclamation projects. It is a pleasure to include them for your consideration:

[From Reclamation Era, August 1969]

PAYBACK MONEYS IN MISSOURI RIVER BASIN (By Harold E. Aldrich)

Creating dependable water supplies and related resources conservation efforts are the principal endeavors of the Bureau of Reclamation.

When studied, such programs have shown far-reaching benefits extending throughout the Nation. However, a study made recently in the northern plains States points out how Bureau programs highly benefit a region and the Montana community of Billings.

About 90 percent of the monies to build Reclamation water control structures are reimbursable to the U.S. Treasury. This means that the people who use the water and power developed through Reclamation projects repay it to Uncle Sam—and a large part is returned with interest.

Bureau operation in the upper plains area of the Missouri River Basin is called Region 6, headquartered in Billings.

Region 6 covers that part of Montana east of the continental divide, north-central Wyoming east of the continental divide, and the States of North and South Dakota. For electric power purposes, the responsibilities of this region include parts of Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Minnesota.

The financial phase of Reclamation in this region is significant. During the last fiscal year, the gross income was \$48 million. That amount of money undoubtedly was helpful to the economy of a sizeable population.

Of that total, \$15 million were spent in the region for operation and maintenance of structures already built. This not only included the expenses for the Bureau of Reclamation, but operation and maintenance charges for the main-stem Missouri River dams constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

\$20 MILLION INTEREST

Interest on Reclamation's power investment in the region—which included all construction of transmission lines, power generating facilities, and the allocated portions of the multipurposes works—total \$20 million.

Payments of \$13 million were on the principal—which is the total investment in constructed works minus the cost for nonreimbursable flood control works and for certain parts of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities.

Someone always asks the question: "How are these dams, other structures, and developments paid for?" In brief, the criteria is that power facility costs must be repaid in 50 years with interest. Irrigation works are also partly paid for through revenues from commercial power. Irrigators pay the balance over a 50-year period, but without interest. This is the only subsidy provided for irrigation payout.

Water for municipal and industrial purposes is also repayable with interest to the U.S. Treasury over 50 years.

The overall payout is much longer for the

entire Missouri River Basin Project than for any single part of the total investment. This is because all investments are not made at one time, but are extended over a long period.

PEOPLE TO OWN THEM

The end result of this huge basin construction development plan insures that investments made for various units of the basin project and the revenues from power sales are the means of paying for the project. The people of the United States are not losing, because they will own the power facility, completely paid for, including interest on the investment, and producing net revenues on the order of \$40 million to \$50 million annually.

In other words, the people own the facilities, and the users pay for them.

In Region 6, 28 projects or units have been constructed. The Yellowtail Unit is the latest to reach operational stage. The largest project that the region now has in the construction stage is the Garrison Diversion Unit in North Dakota.

At 21 of the projects in this region, the Bureau has constructed irrigation facilities to serve a total of about 712,500 acres of land. Our crop census for 1968 shows that from 626,800 irrigated acres, these developments produced crops worth \$47.5 million at a value of \$75.8 per acre. These are benefits over and beyond the Bureau's income.

The total Bureau construction costs for authorized projects in this region is an estimated \$1.1 billion. Completed facilities and work in progress as of December 31, 1968, cost \$555 million. During 1968 there was an increase of \$20.5 million in completed works.

CONTRACTS WITH TOWNS

Reservoirs in Region 6 serve the municipal water requirements of more than 100,000 people. Seventeen contracts are in effect with towns in areas which would have water supply problems if it were not for service from Bureau facilities.

Eight contracts are in effect in the region to supply water for industrial and miscellaneous purposes. Four contracts have been executed for industrial water from Yellowtail Reservoir, and although these uses are not underway yet, the water is producing an option revenue.

Revenues for electric power also are significant. During fiscal year 1968 power revenues were a record \$44.2 million. This was an increase of \$6.2 million over the previous high received in 1967. It was revenue from the sale of power to municipalities at \$7.1 million; private utilities at \$7.8 million; rural cooperatives at \$18.1 million; and other (wheeling, interproject sales, other revenues, and State agencies) at \$11.2 million. Total was \$44.2 million.

SUPPORTS 10,000 MONTANANS

In Montana, 17 Reclamation projects have been built on which more than one-third of a million acres of land has been irrigated, and they are producing about \$21 million worth of crops annually. There are more than 2,500 farm families on these farms. From this productivity, about 10,000 people in Montana are supported directly, and another 17,000 to 18,000 indirectly. This results in a fair measure of stability to Montana's agricultural economy.

HUNTLEY RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Huntley Irrigation Project near Billings is a good example of how payback from a Reclamation project can cause an influx of dollars to a community.

Built by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1908, the total irrigated acreage of 24,500 acres supports 199 farm families. This means that there are about 800 members of those families circulating in the surrounding com-

munities, including Billings, spending the income from their farm operations.

The annual value of the crops produced on the Huntley Project amounts to \$1.9 million. The average annual Federal taxes paid by each of these families is \$830.

The Huntley Project cost \$1.8 million to develop. To date, the farmers on the project have repaid to the U.S. Government \$1.4 million of this cost, and the balance is being repaid in accordance to terms of their contract.

EMPLOYEES AT BILLINGS

It also is noteworthy that the Reclamation employees who direct and take care of the upper Missouri River Basin program from the Billings headquarters do something for that city.

At present there are 162 employees in the Billings office who supervise, advise, and provide assistance to other basin field offices. Most of these are trained professional personnel such as civil, electrical, hydrological, and general engineers. There are natural resources specialists, economists, realty men, soil scientists, public utility specialists, computer specialists, accountants, property specialists, procurement specialists, and staff helpers.

The payroll to Bureau families living in Billings is \$1.8 million per year. Seventy-five percent of the employees own their own homes and these are valued at over \$2½ million. The annual property tax they pay on these homes comes to over \$50,000. All the employees pay annual income taxes to the State of \$57,000, and to the Federal Government \$307,000.

Reclamation employees average about three children per family, and many of these have already completed or are now in the educational system of Montana.

Many of the babies from the early 1940's, when the office was first established at Billings, are now lawyers, doctors, engineers, school teachers, or journalists who have remained in Montana to help build for the future.

The employees have been active in the social and civic groups which are a part of a well-balanced community. And they are in elective positions of the organizations that are an important part of the cultural life of Billings.

Local banking and business also receives benefit, for example, from the \$48 million gross income for the region in the sale of water and power. More than \$40 million of this income was deposited temporarily in local Billings banks on its way to the Treasury in Washington, D.C. These banks are reimbursed for this service by maintenance of a minimum balance. In one case a bank now has been authorized by the Treasury Department to maintain a minimum balance of \$165,000.

The present income in this region in excess of \$48 million is more than double the revenues received in 1964. This happened regardless of the fact that at the same time this increase was occurring, a reduction of over 35 percent of the employees took place.

These are some ways communities benefit from Reclamation, and are the reasons water development efforts in America move forward.

RECLAMATION SPURS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY (By Aldon D. Nielsen)

Reclamation's water developments are often, at first, not close to thriving communities. But such essential community resources as water supplies, power, and opportunities for people are the results of Reclamation projects.

The vital water projects transform rich land areas of the West from "worthless," as some have termed them, to "blossoming."

Included in the multiple opportunities that new water projects bring is the extension of transportation.

Beginning with construction, the water project requires freighting of large and small quantities of materials and equipment from industrial firms, near and far, by train, truck, ship, and plane.

In the construction of Glen Canyon Dam and Powerplant, located in the canyon area of northern Arizona, for example, \$10.4 million worth of business was done with the transportation industry. This amounted to 4.3 cents of each construction dollar, and hauling the required equipment and materials benefited nearly every State.

The economic impact of constructing Yellowstone Dam and Powerplant also was studied recently. A Reclamation water storage facility in a gorge of the Bighorn River in south central Montana, Yellowstone's total freight bill was \$2.3 million, or 3.1 cents of each construction dollar.

On each of these jobs, more than half of the total materials and equipment used in construction was supplied from regions outside that in which the features were being built.

FROM SOUTHWEST

Building materials, equipment, and freight, utilized for the construction of the two dams, was valued at \$50.8 million from the Southwest region of the United States. The Rocky Mountain region supplied \$31.1 million; the Far West, \$25.5 million; the Midwest, \$24.6 million; the Great Lakes region, \$9.1 million; the Plains States, \$4.0 million; the Southeast, \$3.1 million; and the far Northeast, \$0.7 million.

Another \$4.8 million was supplied by foreign countries which, of course, also required extensive transportation after the construction items arrived at our U.S. ports.

The above distribution of purchases is based upon the point of origin for shipment to the contractor at the construction site.

Other significant items were purchased within the immediate area of construction and shipped from warehouse and distribution centers. If these warehoused items were traced back to their manufactured source, it would be noted that many originated, or had been manufactured in the Eastern half of the Nation. Such moving of products which ultimately are used by the contractor at a Reclamation construction site is a considerable item.

REGULAR BENEFITS

Once construction is completed and water projects go into service they generate a steady stream of annual recurring benefits to a number of industries.

An example is in the Columbia Basin Project in Washington where Reclamation completed an economic study in 1966 in cooperation with Washington State University. The irrigated project area and an adjacent dry-farm area were studied for their economic impact.

Shipments from the irrigated project area increased more than threefold from 1950 to 1962. The principal commodities presently being shipped out of the project consists of perishable and semiperishable crops such as potatoes, both fresh and frozen, dry onions, and melons. Freight out of the adjacent comparison area consists almost entirely of grains that are consigned to coastal points for export.

Wholesale value of inbound shipments to the irrigated Columbia Basin Project area in 1962 totaled \$86.4 million. Of this \$40.3 million came from the Far West, Rocky Mountain, Southwest, and Plains regions and \$46.1 million came from the Great Lakes, Southwest, Midwest, New England States, and Canada. Outbound shipments totaled \$63.7 million, of which \$39.8 million went to the West-

ern regions and \$23.9 million to the Eastern regions.

Inbound shipments to the comparison dry land area totaled only \$12.8 million in wholesale value, of which \$6.9 million came from the West and \$5.9 million came from the East. Outbound shipments from the comparison area totaled \$21.5 million and were consigned entirely to the Far West and Rocky Mountain regions.

20-TO-1 RATIO

A comparison of the two areas indicates that the irrigated area has provided a substantial impetus to growth in the regional transportation industry. Inbound carloads, gross freight revenues and transportation employees per 10,000 acres of cropland in the project area exceeded those of the comparison dry land area by ratios in excess of 20 to 1. Outbound shipments favored the irrigated areas by a ratio of 8 to 1.

The larger ratio of inbound shipments is due to the fact that the expanding farm and business economy in the project area is drawing investment capital to it.

The Columbia Basin Project in Washington provides an excellent example of industrial expansion as the water project grew. Approximately 6 miles of branch rail line was completed 2 years ago from the connecting point on the main line to the fertile Royal Slope area of the project. This area has about 86,800 irrigable acres for which water service is now available to 76,900 acres.

Another example in the Columbia Basin is about 55 miles of railroad being built from Mesa, across the Wahluke Slope to Mattawa. Again, this line will greatly enhance the development of the project and the economic environment of the area.

CROP SHIPMENTS

A major transportation industry function is the movement of food crops from Federal Reclamation projects and the Western States in general to consumers in other far-distant regions of the Nation. The 17 Western States as a whole, including both Federal and private irrigation development, produce about 60 percent of the Nation's supply of vegetables, fruits, and nuts and supply substantial amounts of such produce for the major eastern metropolitan markets of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. Federal Reclamation projects alone produce about 20 percent of the Nation's supply of these crops.

About 50 percent of the total fresh fruits and vegetables for 37 major city markets in the United States are supplied by producers in the 17 Western States. In 1967 the West supplied about 31 percent of the fruits and vegetables at nine eastern cities; 45 percent at 11 southern cities; 43 percent at 11 mid-eastern cities; and 82 percent at six major western cities.

California alone provided about 34 percent of the total unloads at Houston, Tex., for example; 25 percent at Chicago and 20 percent at such far-distant cities as New York and Philadelphia.

In addition to the vast transportation requirements generated by agricultural production on all Federal Reclamation projects, another major transportation requirement is in moving all the equipment and supplies necessary both by the Bureau of Reclamation and the local water user organizations in the annual operation and maintenance of the water projects.

Another major development is the increased industrial expansion in the West as a result of municipal and industrial water service becoming available. Municipal and industrial water deliveries from 54 Bureau of Reclamation projects during 1967 totaled 543.2 billion gallons, to help meet the requirements of 13.7 million people. This represents a tenfold increase in water deliveries since 1956 when 25 projects supplied 53.9 billion gallons for 1.1 million people.

HERE WE GO AGAIN

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Nation is focused on the sharp debate now being waged over the budget of the Department of Defense.

We all agree, that the fat should be eliminated from the budget of any department, but sometimes, hasty and imprudent cutting can gut important items.

Recently the Joplin Globe newspaper printed a thoughtful and succinct editorial on this very subject. It is indeed timely and most enlightening.

I herewith include it in the RECORD so that its content can be made available for others to read:

HERE WE GO AGAIN

As the pressure mounts this year for ever-deeper slashes in defense spending, it may be worth recalling that the United States has been led down this primrose path before.

When Woodrow Wilson scrapped his campaign slogans and took this country into World War I our armed forces, after long years of fiscal starvation, were of the skeleton variety. With war once declared, of course, a tremendous buildup began, and when the Kaiser finally threw in the sponge the United States had acquired a very respectable military establishment.

But it was speedily junked, since World War I had been "the war to end wars," and most of our people were naive enough to believe it.

Some 20 years later, as we were being drawn irresistibly into World War II, the price of unpreparedness had to be paid once again. Franklin Roosevelt had seen what was coming, and had made some tentative moves to prepare for it. But he soon backed off in the face of the know-nothings in Congress and the unwillingness of the American people to pay the price for being ready. Thus, when Pearl Harbor blasted us out of our slumber, we repeated the same frantic—and needlessly expensive—drive to build an army, navy and air force upon which our national life depended.

One would think that we might have learned something from this second unhappy experience. But not at all. After the enemy had been crushed in 1945 there was a great rush to "bring the boys home" and to dismantle with reckless haste what then was the world's most powerful military machine.

Five years later we paid the price of this sort of rashness all over again. On the eve of the Korean war our defense budget had been cut to around \$12 billion. We were lulled by the cozy assurance that it was the fat, not the muscle, which was being pared out of the budget. And of course we were unready when the North Koreans struck; for the third time in living memory billions of dollars were wasted on hasty military spending to compensate for our earlier neglect.

Are we going to stumble blindly down the same old path all over again in 1969? It looks like it. The wise men on Capitol Hill, who have led us astray so often in former years, are sharpening their knives. As soon as they get into full action again after their summer recess they will be hacking away at defense spending. The watchword is "economy at any price." The Nixon administration, and Defense Secretary Laird in particular, seem to be beating a strategic retreat.

Laird now proposes an additional \$3 billion cut in the defense budget for fiscal 1970. He says he would rather make his own cuts at this time than to be forced to make deeper

cuts which he says would result in a "chaotic" situation. But the Defense Secretary, in announcing his intention, warned not once but several times that even his own cuts will impair our military readiness "and reduce our capability to meet our current defense commitments." This at a time when the Soviet Union is spending substantially more money on its military establishment and significantly increasing its worldwide military power.

To put this matter in some perspective, our defense budget, even after the Laird cuts, would be \$77 billion. That is a great deal of money. But it is not enough in a dangerous world if it means that the United States in terms of military power is going to become a second-best nation, unable to meet its commitments and incapable of insuring its own security.

Secretary Laird and President Nixon must have an informed opinion as to whether or not this is so. If they think it is so, then it seems to us that instead of retreating they should take their case over the head of Congress to the American people. They will find plenty of ammunition in the dismal record of the past 50 years.

CHEERS FOR OUR BAPTIST FRIENDS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 16, 1969]

AN AUTHENTIC VOICE

Amidst the tumult and the shouting of this sometimes bitter hour, when the hands of so many Americans seem turned against one another, it is too easy to forget that common sense and good will are still to be found in the great mass of our countrymen, black and white. There should be some expression of appreciation to the Reverend Joseph H. Jackson, leader for the past seventeen years of the 6.3-million-member National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., this nation's largest all-black Protestant denomination, for reminding us of this fact.

In his re-election acceptance speech to 14,000 delegates at Kansas City, Missouri, last week, Dr. Jackson firmly rejected the notion that America's churches owe James Forman's Black Economic Development Conference \$3 billion in "reparations" for past injustices to Negroes. And he called for an end to the fratricidal "campaign of color" which pits "Negro Americans against white Americans."

In Dr. Jackson's view, the goals of the civil rights movement should be "not Negro rights alone, but the rights of all Americans." "The emphasis," he continued, "must be as much on civil responsibility as on civil rights."

Those are words that needed saying, and needed saying by a black man. They needed saying not as a means of getting the white community off the hook, but because they are in the best interest of the black community, the principal victim of lawlessness and extremism.

Militants of all kinds are killers of the American dream of "a more perfect union" under which all men, equally created, will enjoy their "unalienable Rights." It is at least doubtful that paying off blackmailers who employ threats of violence will help to achieve such a union.

Dr. Jackson feels it will not. He is of the

opinion that there is no room for the "doctrine of separatism" in our national life and asserts that the future of Americans, black and white, "is with America."

This, one may trust, is the authentic voice of the silent, moderate majority of Negro Americans. It should be heard—and listened to—more frequently. The George Wallaces and James Formans will win the war for America's soul only if each of us, through our words and acts, concedes defeat.

IMPRESSIVE RECORD OF LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS FIGHTING STREAM POLLUTION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in its typically thorough and responsible fashion the League of Women Voters is focusing attention on a major problem of the Nation's physical environment through the league's Water Resources Committee. In Maryland, county units as well as the State league have played a large role in alerting the public and the public officials to the importance of preservation of our water resources.

The following article describes the active role of the Howard County, Md., League of Women Voters and league efforts all across the Nation in fighting the causes of water pollution and for enlightening the citizenry on a matter of growing importance. I commend to your attention this article from the Howard County Times of August 28, 1969:

LWV HAS IMPRESSIVE RECORD IN FIELD OF STREAM POLLUTION

America is in the midst of a water pollution crisis, according to Mrs. Charles Higgins, president of the League of Women Voters of Howard County.

"Although many people are aware of the situation," Mrs. Higgins points out, "the League feels that there is a big job to be done in learning the causes of pollution and other water problems, in informing the public and in correcting what could be a national tragedy."

Mrs. Higgins sees progress being made, however, and she notes that individuals, civic groups, communities and industries are becoming increasingly aware of what is happening—and should not be allowed to happen—with one of the nation's most valuable natural resources.

Locally, the League has worked with the Soil Conservation District in its efforts to protect the watersheds of the Little and Middle Patuxent Rivers.

League representatives attend all hearings, meetings and conferences pertaining to water resources in the Baltimore Metropolitan Area, and then report to members so as to keep Howard County Leaguers aware of the region's problems and progress.

Moving into the battle for clean and better waterways in 1956, the League of Women Voters, working with other organizations on all levels, has become a widely respected leader in the field.

Perseverance is a byword in the fights for good water waged by Leagues around the country. The Tryon, North Carolina League led the way in a 12-year campaign which culminated in passage of a \$450,000 bond issue in 1967. Tryon Leaguers admit that they didn't realize the extent of the pollution crisis in their community until they read

the study which they themselves had put together. What they discovered was enough to shock anyone into action: raw, untreated sewage was being dumped directly into the region's streams.

As a first-step, the League organized a tour for a high school civics class and brought local newsmen along for a first-hand look at the contaminated waters.

This provided an initial spark, but there was still a long road ahead. The League next set about trying to convince the Town Council that a bond issue was needed to reverse the pollution situation, and it offered recommendations after studying sewage treatment facilities in neighboring communities. It took several years of convincing, but, as one Tryon Leaguer put it, "We nudged the Council every now and then." The "nudging" paid off, and the bond issue was carried by an overwhelming majority in 1967. Tryon is now on the road to reclaiming its streams and waterways through sewage treatment facility construction.

The problem of pollution is by no means the only one relating to water that concerns the League of Women Voters. Leagues work on projects involving water supply, river basin planning, flood control, and many others. In California, the League of Orange County supported a \$46-million bond issue to continue long-range flood protection works and a water management program, in order to prevent the area from being inundated in the rainy season and parched in the dry season.

The League of the Lower Connecticut Valley is helping to save that region's coastal wetlands by working for the designation of areas as recreational sites, and by working to cut off plans by developers to fill in the marshlands.

Around the country similar League projects have been and are being repeated:

The Vermont League has worked to have Lake Champlain designated as suitable for swimming and water skiing.

The Alabama League directed its efforts toward keeping the Tallapoosa and Alabama Rivers standards high enough to allow fishing, shell-fish harvesting, and recreation along the riversides to continue.

The Wisconsin League has taken an active role in projects involving the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers and tributaries, as well as Lake Michigan.

Out west the Washington League's State Chairman, Mrs. Mortimer Thomas, because of her long-standing interest and activity in water conservation, was asked by Governor Dan Evans to become co-chairman of the statewide Washington Committee for Clean Water. She is now working on passage in November of a \$25-million bond issue which would match federal funds allocated from the Sewage Treatment Facility Construction Grant Program. This would make Washington one of the first states to match federal funds with state money on such a project.

And the Washington League is already setting its sights on the future, aiming at further improvement of pollution control laws and at legislation which would attempt to cut down oil spills in Puget Sound.

State and local Leagues do not always act on an individual basis. When the situation warrants it, Leagues band together and tackle common problems through inter-League group action.

One such group, concerned with the Susquehanna Basin, includes League representatives from Pennsylvania and Maryland. The current problem receiving this group's attention is the serious pollution being caused by acid washing into the Susquehanna Basin from strip mines and abandoned coal mines, resulting in large areas of "dead water."

The Lake Erie Basin Inter-League group—with representatives from Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York has been involved in the massive undertak-

ing of cleaning up Lake Erie. The study they published on the Lake "Requiem or Re-trieve?" has been widely used.

And, a tri-state League group of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut is studying the water resources they share and the problems of New York Bay and Long Island Sound.

The National League has by no means left all the work up to the local Leagues. The League's national headquarters has been in the forefront of movements resulting in the passage of much significant federal legislation, including the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 and the expansion of the Federal Pollution Control Act.

When President Johnson signed the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, standing at his side at the White House ceremony was Mrs. Donald Clusen, Chairman of the National League's Water Resources Committee. The pen used to sign the Act and then presented to Mrs. Clusen by the President was testimony to the contribution toward good water made by the National League and Leagues throughout the country.

Mrs. Clusen, who has testified repeatedly before Senate and House Public Works and Pollution Committee hearings in Washington, believes that getting the money to back up the legislation now on the books is a top priority job. A great deal of the testimony she gives in Washington is before various committees on appropriations.

Much financial help has come from foundation contributions to the League's non-profit arm, the Education Fund. Contributions are earmarked for specific water projects. Among the Fund's major endeavors: a series of seminars to focus attention on regional water and land problems and to show community leaders how to clean up their area's waterways. The seminars were held from New England to the South, Mid-West, and Pacific Coast. And more are in the works. Plans are now underway for a Western Water Conference which will bring together representatives from a dozen states to explore the past, present, and future of the Western water picture.

TIMES CHRONICLE TO MARK 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the role of the community newspaper in communicating news of importance to readers has expanded rapidly in the last decade. This has been especially true in fast-growing suburban areas such as my congressional district.

In addition to the major role played by three fine daily newspapers in Montgomery County, Pa., the community newspapers' development has demonstrated the important function this media performs. Although recent times have witnessed an amazing growth, community newspapers have been serving their areas for many years.

I am pleased to salute one of these newspapers, the Times Chronicle, published in Jenkintown, Pa., which marks its 75th anniversary with a special edition on October 2, 1969. The Times Chronicle was formed from a merger of two newspapers, both started in Jenkintown in 1894. The Jenkintown Chronicle, first published on March 28, 1894, and

the Jenkintown Times, first published on April 7, 1894, were merged to form the Times Chronicle. The new publication printed its first edition on December 29, 1894.

Still published in Jenkintown, the Times Chronicle has served that borough and neighboring communities each week since. In 1959, the Times Chronicle was purchased by the Montgomery Publishing Co. and is now one of a group of community newspapers that circulate in Montgomery, Bucks, and Philadelphia Counties.

In recent years, the Times Chronicle has been distinguished by the performance of its staff. It has received awards for editorial work, production quality, and community service.

Numerous awards were earned in the statewide Keystone Press Contest sponsored annually by the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association. Last May, the Times Chronicle won the 1969 Sweepstakes Award, the top prize among all weekly newspapers in the PNPA contest.

The Times Chronicle also received several top awards in the National Newspaper Association's annual competition. Twice in recent years, these awards recognized general excellence of the overall newspaper. Other citations were awarded for individual writing.

This year, the Times Chronicle won second place in the weekly division of the national Edmund C. Arnold Awards competition in typography.

Besides a number of local citations, the newspaper and its staff have been recipients of awards from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge and the Chapel of the Four Chaplains in Philadelphia.

On the occasion of the Times Chronicle's 75th anniversary, I am happy to pay tribute to the newspaper and to the people who write, edit, and produce it. I think that Montgomery County is blessed both in the quality and the number of its news media, and am glad that the Times Chronicle is one of my "constituents."

ADM. JOHN HARLLEE RETIRES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, Rear Adm. John Harlee stepped down as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. He is undoubtedly one of the very best men we could have ever had for that demanding job.

Admiral Harlee built his expertise from a solid 37½ years in Government service. He knows the shipping industry only as a man who has been to sea can know it; his outstanding military career made him qualified for the administrative functions of that office.

Admiral Harlee was a personal friend of President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson. President Kennedy appointed Admiral Harlee to the Federal Maritime Commission in August of 1961 and, on August 26, 1963, named

him Chairman. He was sworn in by President Johnson on July 20, 1965, for his second term; that was the first 5-year term granted on the Commission. No man deserved recognition more.

During the time of the attack, Admiral Harlee was stationed at Pearl Harbor. During World War II, he commanded a motor torpedo boat squadron and served as chief staff officer of the PT organization in the South Pacific. Among his many distinguished awards were the Silver Star and the Legion of Merit with Combat V. His squadron received the Presidential Unit Citation for 6 months of action during his command.

After the war, he served with the Navy's congressional liaison unit; commanded the destroyer U.S.S. *Dyess*; and graduated with grade of excellent from the senior course at the Naval War College.

During the Korean conflict, Admiral Harlee again chose active duty. He was executive officer for the cruiser *Manchester* and was awarded the Commendation Ribbon for conduct in action. He commanded a destroyer division, which included a tour as commander of the surface ships on the Formosa patrol. He served as chief of staff of Destroyer Flotilla Three and commanded the attack cargo ship U.S.S. *Rankin*, which won more awards than any other naval vessel during the 1957-58 period under his command.

During his leadership at the Federal Maritime Commission, Admiral Harlee was honored many times by the shipping industry. He received the "Man of the Year" award by the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, the Golden Quill award by the Rudder Club of New York, the Order of Maritime Merit by the San Francisco Port Authority, the Honorary Port Pilot Award of the Port of Long Beach, and was cited by the Federal Bar Association for his work in maritime law. The shipping industry is a tough-minded, strong segment of our economy. Obviously, they admired and respected the strength and the determination instilled in the Federal Maritime Commission by Admiral Harlee. His years in the Navy gave Admiral Harlee the savvy and the grit necessary to chart the progress of the Maritime Commission. He has served us very well in this, his latest Government activity.

Mr. Speaker, the above is the official record. It speaks well for this outstanding public servant.

What is not always apparent in the printed word, however, is the strength of the character that is instilled in this man. Those of us who have worked with him know that Admiral Harlee is a capable administrator, as is shown by his record, but we also know that he is a tremendously warm and kindly man who is loyal to his friends. He is one of the most thoughtful men, in Government, and his roots in Texas history go far back to the early days when Texas was first being settled. His great uncle, Judge Zachary Taylor Fulmore was one of Austin's first leaders; he served as county judge and head of the school board. The Fulmore school in south Austin is named after him.

George Childress, great uncle of Admiral Harlee, played a vital role in Texas history—he is the drafter of the Texas constitution.

Mrs. Harlee's ancestors were strong characters in shaping Texas history, too. Her great grandfather, Sterling C. Robertson, was one of the signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence. He founded one of the largest colonies in our fledgling republic, later incorporated as Salado.

Altogether, the spirit of Texas history courses through the veins of Admiral and Mrs. Harlee in a lively and pulsating manner.

We bid them goodbye for the moment, and it is with a warm feeling that we also extend the thanks and respects of the entire Congress.

THE URBAN PROBLEM AND THE GOP

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the crises which American society today faces transcend party boundaries and petty politics and demand of each of us a dedication to a concerted effort to raise the quality of life in every corner of the Nation.

Certainly any organized program to meet this objective ought to be recognized and promoted. In this vein I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the activity of one of the great women of Michigan and of the Republican Party.

Elly Peterson has long been involved in the struggle to bring the Republican Party to the people. Her success in the State of Michigan during the last few years has brought her national attention as one who is genuinely concerned about the problems of the cities. In the announcement of her appointment to be assistant chairman of the Republican Party, her activity in organizing and promoting the "Metropolitan Action Committee" to serve those in need of help and to explore community problems in the city of Detroit is noted as one of her major achievements.

A member of numerous civic and service organizations, Elly continues to witness to her desire to improve the quality of life in the cities and to provide methods for the continuing solutions of the massive urban problems which face us today. In doing so she contributes immeasurably both to providing avenues for meeting today's problems and to showing the Republican Party's genuine concern for the people of the cities. In this regard I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the *Washington Star*, September 15, 1969:

ELLY PETERSON BUILDS URBAN GOP

(By Paul Hope)

Other women may get more glamorous assignments in the Nixon administration, but Elly Peterson is likely to have a more

lasting effect on the Republican party than any of them.

Mrs. Peterson, one-third of a triumvirate that built the Republican organization in Michigan a decade ago, has been given the job of building the party in the cities.

Her office is not in a plush town house, and she won't be hostess at fancy parties for world dignitaries. Her desk is in a partitioned section of the Republican National Committee headquarters that presently is half white and half blue because workmen have finished only half of a repainting job. Many of the parties she gives are likely to be in the ghetto, attended by people who never thought they would see the inside of a Republican precinct headquarters.

She doesn't believe for a minute the many reports that the Nixon strategy for reelection is a Southern-oriented one that largely writes off the Negro vote and the industrial states of the Northeast.

"That idea came from a book by a young man I'd never even heard of—Kevin Phillips," she said the other day. "I just don't buy the concept, and neither does Rogers Morton."

Morton is Rep. Rogers C. B. Morton of Maryland, who was handpicked by President Nixon to be chairman of the Republican National Committee. He talked Mrs. Peterson into coming to Washington to give him a hand as assistant chairman.

Phillips was a worker in the Nixon campaign and now is an aide in the Justice Department, which is headed by Nixon's 1968 campaign manager, John N. Mitchell. Phillips' recent book suggesting a Republican strategy for building a majority party has received widespread attention.

"I don't believe any party can really be successful unless it appeals to all people," Mrs. Peterson said. "And let's face it, the Republicans have ignored the cities all these years. We're going to do something about it."

The heart of her program is the "community action center," a concept pioneered in Detroit by the Michigan Republican party. It's long on public service, but short on blatant party promotion.

"Instead of a woman and a phone and piles of literature, this operation will take on the coloration of the community and try to solve its problems," she said.

The Detroit center, for instance, discovered that older citizens of the Negro section complained frequently of getting brushed off at the Social Security office. An investigation showed the complaints were justified and that all that was needed was a single change in personnel. An appeal to Sen. Robert P. Griffin accomplished that.

The Detroit center also found that an insurance company was taking money from ghetto citizens but not delivering the policies. Through the center's efforts, the company was finally closed down.

The center sponsors Christmas parties for children and sends kids to camp. It sponsors programs in schools showing high school seniors how to apply for jobs. It runs a Little League program.

Before long, Mrs. Peterson hopes to have action centers in all the big cities sending out the message: "What's on your mind? An abandoned car in front of your house—dirty streets—or a broken street light—whatever's bothering you, call us! We can make things happen."

Says Mrs. Peterson: "We are trying to relate community service to the Republican party. This is not a campaign gimmick: We may not get results for years. We want to get across to the people of an area that we're not going to pick up and leave as soon as a campaign is over."

Exuberant, gray-haired and in her mid-50s, Elly Peterson has been a Republican volunteer and organizer all her adult life. After every new assignment, she figured she would retire from politics and take it easy. A good time would have been after the 1966

elections, when she was state chairman and Michigan Republicans had an outstanding year.

She says that when her husband, Col. William M. Peterson, U.S. Army property and fiscal officer stationed in Lansing, retires in 1971, she plans to hang up her political running shoes, too.

But hardly anyone believes it, for as Elly Peterson once said: "I get more fun out of a precinct organization than six no trump, doubled."

THE REAL HARM OF MARIHUANA

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the arguments on marihuana that one usually hears are centered around personal harm. Yet the real harm is social.

This is the belief of Judge Albert J. Yencopal, a justice of the peace at Richland, Wash., and I would like to share with my colleagues the text of a judgment by Justice Yencopal on this subject.

I should explain that the Washington State Legislature recently passed a law permitting cases on the illegal use of marihuana to be heard in justice courts. Judge Yencopal is a highly respected justice of the peace who is considered to have an impressive insight into social problems, particularly those involving young people. Because Judge Yencopal's recent ruling was his first since the State legislature acted, he has elaborated at considerable depth in order to make known his policy and reasons thereto. I believe his judgment is sound and therefore, in order to share it with my colleagues, insert it at this point in the RECORD:

IN JUSTICE COURT, RICHLAND PRECINCT BENTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON—No. 2183-5

JUDGMENT

This is the first case on the illegal use of marihuana that has come before me since the Legislature has passed the law permitting the same to be heard in courts of this jurisdiction. Thus, I have elaborated at considerable depth and length in order to make known my policy and the reasons thereto. Also, because of the number of youth involved, I direct this opinion to them.

Marijuana is a dangerous drug. It is much more dangerous to the non-user than to those who resort to it. It is the hard-working, responsible citizen who suffers by the cult that it creates. For it is he, the responsible citizen, who is called upon not only to support himself and his family, but also to carry the burden of the drug-oriented, anti-social user. If he fails to provide for both, the culture in which he lives will surely deteriorate and be less than desired, and possibly may even fail to meet the needs for a good existence. The impact of the "lark" attitude that some have toward the drug may not really be felt until the next generation—when it comes to light that the smoker of it is neither physically nor mentally fit to shoulder the burdens that society imposes upon him. In short, he is incapable of caring for himself and those in his trust at a level necessary to maintain the culture through which he receives his present beneficial needs.

As mentioned above, the 1969 Legislature classified marijuana as a dangerous drug, whereas formerly it was considered a narcotic. The penalty for use and possession was

drastically revised. It is a misdemeanor for the first offense, a gross misdemeanor for the second offense, and a third charge is a felony.

No better contrast comes to my mind to demonstrate this warning than appears in the area of the University of Washington. The contrast developed there is the surest stinging indictment for the total prohibition of marijuana and other such drugs. It is an indictment of a drug-oriented cult. For, on the one hand, we see thousands of good students preparing to improve on our highly technological society. It is highly technological of necessity for how else can we feed, clothe, shelter, educate, transport, and meet the needs of over 200-million Americans and many other millions of other countries. We see the vast majority of students who, with clear heads, get involved in society and its problems. We see reality faced and conquered. What a blessing it is to see these fine minds preparing for the future so that we will be able to analyze present agricultural methods and improve on them to feed a hungry world—diagnosing the causes of mental, physical, and social ills, and then coming forth with solutions to eradicate them—making the pains of dentistry a little less—seeking new and improved ways to reach our children and provide them with means to satisfy their thirst for knowledge—unpolluting the water and purifying the air to make them fit for human consumption—learning, studying, working to improve the lot of all mankind in his quest for life, liberty, and happiness. Through his tireless efforts, he prepares for the future—a preparation that is tedious and laborious. I think that this can best be illustrated in the remarks made by Professor Frederic A. Harris, University of Washington, who is also an active jazz pianist. (Drugs: Escape to a Dead End; Sunday, November 3, 1968; Seattle P.I., Northwest Today.)

"I admit that it must be intimidating to be young nowadays, to look at the almost unbelievable accomplishments of the establishment—heart transplants, rockets to the moon, sewing machines that wind their own bobbin, etc.—and then realize that before you can make your dent—before you can make your presence felt in the world—you will have to go through years and years of apprenticeship. You will have to work, study, and learn before you can do; and, until you've put in your time, you really aren't worth much in comparison to the others who have already achieved something, who have already contributed something of obvious value. How much simpler it is to deny the worth of these achievements, to denounce the complexity as inhuman, artificial, undesirable, and to advocate regression to a world where everything is simple—where we sit on the grass and love each other, in our drug-induced stupor, regardless of any personal merit or demerits we might have."

These fine ladies and gentlemen are preparing, with clear minds, to look reality right in the eye so that they can shoulder the burden of society—which burden is to meet the needs of millions of people.

On the other hand, on grounds located adjacent to that great University (known as the U District), we see the habitat of drug users, the advocates of legalizing mind-altering drugs, including marijuana. Their demonstration of a culture is the most solid indictment that I know of for the prohibition of these drugs. For during their formative years (the vast majority of them being youngsters), they have chosen to cloud their thinking. Through drugs, they seek instant happiness and instant solutions to complex problems. They acquire neither. They neither work, learn, nor study. They contribute nothing to the improvement of society—do nothing to realistically meet the needs of millions of people. They seek not to purify the air or water—nor improve the productivity of the

availability of food—nor improve the manufacture of clothing—nothing to the construction of shelters—nothing toward the eradication of disease—nothing to eliminate ignorance—all of these being so essential for liberty and for life—all of these being the very reason why society exists.

Instead of maintaining a rational mind, they deliberately seek a state of intoxication. Instead of facing reality, they hide from it. Instead of associating with people, they prefer to substitute drugs for people and withdraw from them; and finally, they use people in order to obtain their drug supply (and the people they now include are those in junior high and elementary schools as well). In the name of and for the sake of mankind, what are they doing?

They protest against society for some reason or another and, thus, allegedly withdraw from it. This is a half-truth. The term society means that people are working together to achieve the necessities of life. The key word is "working." Let me demonstrate why I say their so called "withdrawal" is only a half-truth—only half right. Also, I wish to dispel the argument that they have the freedom to act as they are now doing. Nothing is free. They drink the water which is taken from its source by pumps, channelled in pipes, chlorinated to make it fit for human consumption—all done by society, all of it at a cost. To this extent they have not withdrawn from society—but they contributed nothing to it—and, yes, to that extent they have withdrawn. They eat the food that is grown, developed, transported, preserved, and marketed by us, as members of society, making it fit for consumption, and at a price. To this point they have not withdrawn from society—but they contribute nothing to it—and, yes, to this point they have withdrawn from society. They shelter themselves in clothing which has been developed in our society, from the shearing of the sheep or picking of the cotton to the finished product. They use the public parks and streets made by society, and all of these at a considerable price—to this extent they have not withdrawn from society—but they contribute nothing to acquire these—and, yes, to that extent they have withdrawn from it. They, by their music, by their conversation, communicate with other inhabitants of society through a system of communication which has its foundation and is developed in our school system—the product of society, at a price—yet they contribute nothing to it—and to that extent they have withdrawn from society. In short, under the banner of rights, they are taking the fruits of society without making any contributions thereto.

At this point I wish to quote from Professor Harris.

"How can artificially altering the function of the brain possibly improve one's relation to the world and to other people? How can hallucinations and distortions be preferable to the real world? I get my kicks looking down from Mt. Constitution on Orcas Island. How can there be any joy in disorganizing what it has taken evolution eons to create and organize, in substituting neural chaos for neural order? Don't tell me to take drugs to find out; I don't have to hold a stick of dynamite in my hand to find out what will happen to me when it goes off. One can learn from the experiences of others; and as a musician, I have had ample opportunity to observe the effects of psychedelic drugs.

"Over long periods of time (much longer than the usual period of laboratory study of the effects of drugs), I have watched people deteriorate under the influence of marijuana, amphetamines, LSD, and the like. I have watched their talents wither, their minds cloud, their bodies deteriorate, their paranoia grow. I have watched them become non-contributing individuals—doing nothing for themselves—nothing for society. They merely take up space and continue to absorb drugs and stand still."

Such is the drug-oriented culture that inhabits the University District of Seattle and, I am sure, other areas throughout the country.

It appears to me that there is too much discussion centered around the effects that marijuana has on the individual who uses it and not enough on the harm done to society. For on that point, the authorities may not be in total agreement on the harm its use may have to the individual; but they are in perfect accord that such a drug-oriented culture is destructive to society because it creates far too many individuals who contribute nothing. As long as the user feasts from society and contributes nothing to it, then society has the right—in fact the duty—to prohibit its use. This is why it is prohibited in every civilized nation in the world.

At this point I wish to direct the following to these young people who continue to argue favorably to marijuana's legalization—that to use it is a lark.

(1) In the first place, whether he realizes it or not, he is the idol—or I should say the excuse—given by high school, junior high, and elementary students as to why they experiment with it.

(2) He has fattened the pocket of the pusher—however slight—that same pusher whose ultimate aim is to get him dependent on the use of illicit drugs.

(3) He has given legitimacy to a drug which his fellow man, who may not be as mentally capable as he, and is apt to become dependent upon its use to face reality.

(4) He has made it easier for drug dependents to gather in environments which make them easier prey to physically addictive drugs.

(5) He must ask himself the question: To what degree has he contributed to the thinking which governs those who seek to sell him or anyone else—and regardless of age, be they 10 or 60 years of age—a mind-altering drug.

(6) He must ask himself the question: Whether it is good that youngsters turn to drugs to "turn-off" society.

(7) He should ask himself who is going to provide the public and private necessities for those homeless youngsters occupying the U District.

(8) Finally, he should ask himself: Will he be able to support the drug dependent and also protect himself and his family from the challenges of mental and physical health disorders.

The young are normally accusing the older sect of having a double standard of morality—especially by some being able to smoke cigarettes, but at the same time, denying the young the desire to smoke marijuana—that both are harmful to the individual. In that respect, the prolonged use of either may very well tend to be injurious to the individual's health. But where the contrast really lies is in the effects of each on the social order. As I watch a carpenter construct my homes, I prefer to wish that the weed he is smoking is a cigarette rather than marijuana. As I am talking to my lawyer who represents me in serious litigation, I prefer to believe that the weed he has in his mouth is a cigarette rather than marijuana. As I watch the pharmacist fill a prescription for my child, I prefer to have the weed that he has just set down be a cigarette rather than marijuana. I prefer this because he is still with us, and he maintains a sound mind. With marijuana, the mind loses its stability for hours at a time.

So too we hear this same argument with respect to alcohol. The only similarity rests with the intoxicating effects of each. The marijuana user indulges in its use for the purpose—the sole purpose—of getting intoxicated. That is its only purpose. The same may be said for the abuse of alcohol—not the use of it—but the abuse of it.

Thus, the use of one and the abuse of the other are similar; and each is a violation of the law. The vast majority of persons who use alcohol do not do so for the purpose of getting intoxicated—to impair their judgment or to alter their thinking processes. It is ridiculous to contend that the champagne toast to the astronauts at Los Angeles was for the purpose of getting intoxicated.

Thus, in résumé, the real danger of marijuana is the effect it has on the non-user, productive, and contributing member of society. For it has demonstrated in other countries that if legalized, it can deteriorate a society so that it hampers its very reason for existence—to furnish the needs of those it embraces. It has no beneficial use. The only evidence is to the contrary—that it is destructive of society—evidence that is substantial, visible, and time tested. Thus it is my duty as a judge, first and foremost, to preserve society so that it can provide its members with the essential ingredients of life. It is also my duty to perpetuate it by reducing the numbers within it who may become leaches and whose care will have to be provided by the contributing members. The evidence is overwhelming that marijuana, in this sense, is a real social evil from which the majority are entitled to protection.

Those who seek to create a drug-oriented culture, contrary to the wishes of society's majority, should be dealt with harshly—especially when the purpose of establishing such a cult is for private financial gain—for the pusher. For it is he who benefits most from a person becoming a drug dependent. He works hard to achieve this desired result. He cares not what age are using the drugs—and in fact, the younger the better because of their innocent ignorance. This is his livelihood—to get children, adolescents, and adults to be drug dependent—so that drugs replace people and people rely upon him for their supply. This is his goal—to get them in his clutches, surely and firmly. It is he who must be stopped.

Therefore, I am taking this opportunity to suggest the following:

(1) That parents who suspect their children with using drugs, may contact the proper authorities without fear of prosecution of their child, unless the parents so desire, and that the authorities, parent, and child shall strive to attain the identity of the source of the drugs.

(2) That those courts having jurisdiction over the pushers gain the universal reputation that sentences on pushers who do so for a financial gain shall be swift, sure, and harsh.

(3) That the Parole Board set the maximum to be the minimum for pushers who do so for a financial gain.

(4) That the courts impose such sentences and grant suspension of jail and fines so as to discourage the trafficking of drugs.

(5) That when the name of some individual becomes evident as being a pusher for economic gain, that not only he be subject to prosecution for such offense, but also to determine whether there has been a violation of the Internal Revenue Code.

I do not consider the use of marijuana to be a lark. It is a terrible social evil. I do not enjoy supporting someone else who deliberately distorts his mind to the extent that he is worthless as a contributing member to society. I am convinced it creates a new and young breed of leaches on society. The young energetic good citizen is seriously penalized by its use for he has the task of caring for himself, his family, and also the drug derelict. This is patently and grossly unfair. For the reasons that I have stated herein, I am levying the maximum jail sentence, which is six months and the maximum fine, which is \$500. Any suspension of a part of the jail sentence or fine will be dependent upon the defendant—whether he chooses to

contribute to the protection and the preservation of society that has been so good or does he choose to be a burden to his fellow man and, thus, be truly withdrawn from it. This is up to the defendants.

Done in open court this 26 day of August, 1969.

ALBERT J. YENCOPAL, Judge.

OUR CRITICAL FISHERIES CRISIS

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives, I am personally aware and personally concerned with the crisis facing our fishing industry.

I think most of the Members of this body share that awareness and the recognition that the problem is of such magnitude that it cries out for immediate action—before we have lost not only an entire industry, but also one of our major sources of nourishment.

To illustrate this magnitude, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the cover story of the August 17, 1969, edition of Today, the Sunday magazine of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

This story, entitled "Fishing for a Living Off New Jersey," was written by a young free-lance writer, Nicholas Kazan, and accompanied by a series of most spectacular photographs by Anthony Riccardi, a staff photographer of the Inquirer. It is unfortunate that through the medium of the RECORD we cannot appreciate these photographs which tell a story which cannot be put into words.

But the text is most cogent and enlightening. Perhaps it will explain to the housewife why seafood prices are so high; perhaps it will help convince the public that action is necessary, and necessary now.

The article points out what we have known here for some time—that the United States, once the second largest fish producer, is now sixth. That food fish, which once abounded off our Atlantic shore, is rapidly disappearing, being replaced either by "junk" fish or a void.

You do not have to tell the housewife where the price of fish is; she knows she is getting less and less fish for more and more money.

I urge each Member of this House to read this article and join with me in promoting urgent and meaningful legislation toward correcting this dangerous trend which affects, in some manner, every citizen of the United States:

FISHING FOR A LIVING OFF NEW JERSEY

(By Nicholas Kazan)

Everyone knows what the oldest profession is. Fishing. It is older than man. Or woman.

Figure it this way. Man evolved from lower orders: One day a monkey spoke, another understood, and man was created. But before monkeys existed, before dinosaurs and pterodactyls, before the first venturesome creature crept onto land, everything that lived lived in the ocean. And most things that lived there made their living by opening their mouths and going fishing.

It's not so easy for man. Before he can taste fish, an anachronistic process must bring it to him. Fishermen today use radios and charts, depth meters and fish scoops, but the basic elements of their art remain: a sea, a man, a boat, a net (or a hook, or a harpoon) and, somewhere, a fish. These are the rules, and they have not changed for thousands of years.

Men who live and work by these rules are scattered on a 50-mile radius from Philadelphia—in inlets, bays, and harbors along the southern New Jersey coast. Half a mile from the beaches and the Ferris wheels and the Spin-Inn Drive-In Hamburger joints are secreted half a dozen dock areas that send fresh fish to Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York.

Some docks are old and healthy, others old and dying, but the state of the industry is best described by the scene at one of them: Oteen's Harbor in Wildwood.

There, behind the 30-odd boats that were built to trawl for fish and now dredge for clams because that's what's left, behind the dock that has rotted under foot and collapsed overhead, looms the huge rusted hull of a ship—a fishing boat that was begun and never finished.

The lines of the boat are clean and sleek, and promise to guide easily through water. But today it sits helplessly grounded, awkward and anomalous among the cars and trucks that come and park beside it and then shift away in jerky, graceless spurts, the way motor boats move on the ocean.

Those that work in its shadow—the men who clam or pack clams or cut fillets out of fish sent down from Massachusetts—ignore this most pristine of vessels, this wreck untouched by seawater. But they all understand its unfulfilled promise. They know it is a monument to the times. It is as if the God of fishermen had commanded Noah to build, and Noah had begun, and then Noah climbed down from his ark and picked his way slowly along the pier, avoiding the holes, and hopped into the pretty, vinyl-blue tourist vessel that floats at the end of the harbor, next to the sidewalk along Park Boulevard; as if Noah had chatted with the other tourists eating popcorn and hot dogs and sipped gin, and then gone out for a spin on the waters.

Fishing is a dilapidated, retarded industry in New Jersey, and it needs a flood. If the vast cleansing waters do not descend, if there is no new world created, the present industry will splinter and rot until nothing remains—not docks, boats, fish or fishermen.

The decline in available fish has been appalling. John Shaw, a lobster pot fisherman from Atlantic City, recalls that in the old days "the problem wasn't catching fish; it was selling them. We caught too many." Today the situation is reversed. All edible fish are sold, and rising prices help to compensate for diminished fish stocks. But the time may come, regardless of price, when there is nothing left to sell.

Last year New Jersey fishermen landed 126 million pounds of fish, slightly more than their fathers and grandfathers caught in 1901. But last year more than half the fish landed were inedible—caught for industrial use. The 1901 catch, made with the most rudimentary equipment, included at least 12 million more pounds of edible fish than the 1968 catch.

So it goes. The New Jersey fishery reached its peak level, 540 million pounds, in 1956. But almost 90 percent of that catch was menhaden, a fish caught for processing into such products as animal feed, lipstick and linoleum. By 1956, most edible fish were becoming scarce.

That trend has become precipitous in the past seven years, following the heavy storm of 1962. Since then virtually every species of finfish, including menhaden, has declined drastically. Porgy and fluke (a kind of flounder), which have been the mainstays

of the local industry for the past decade, are being caught at less than a third of their former levels. Only higher prices and an increase in available shellfish—lobsters, surf clams and scallops—have allowed the industry to survive.

Fishermen regard the depletion of the seas with alternating moods of indignation ("Why doesn't the government help? It pays the farmers not to plant, but it doesn't pay us not to fish.") and equanimity ("It's a fading life like anything else.") Fishermen accept whatever fish come into their nets, whatever money comes to their pockets. The sea, the work, is always there, beckoning; and it's like a boxer missing his opponent, it's just as much work to catch nothing. Besides, as one dock owner says, "Many fishermen think like I do. Fishing may be dead here in 20 years—but so will I."

As docks are old, as boats are old (more afloat today were built before 1925 than since 1960) so are the fishermen. They look like the backbone of the Social Security system, these old men of the sea, and they walk on land with the easy rocking rhythm of the water. They will haul in a net on the day they die; and those that won't, the ones who come ashore first, do not retire to their homes and wives; you see them packing fish on the dock or running the pulley that unloads the catch. When they get too old for that, they stand and watch. They say it gets in your blood.

Most have had it in their blood all their lives. They started fishing because they went to sea in the Navy and liked it, or because they lived in the neighborhood and watched, or because their fathers handed them a mop and said to swab the deck.

They've fished ever since. It shows in the clear blue eyes, the skin thick and wrinkled like a turtle's, the testy sinuous strength that gives a man of 60 the vigor of someone 30 years younger.

It shows too in their language, which is rough, and in their use of it, which is simple and direct. A fish can't be sweet-talked or hustled. You can swear at him if you want to make yourself feel better, but there's no use lying or prevaricating. The only truth a fish understands is your net.

The truths of fish and net are primitive ones, without a visible financial future. They have nothing to do with tax benefits or stock transfers, with health insurance or early retirement plans. It is not hard to see why most "younger" fishermen turn out to be 40, and why young men who used to go to sea, today go to college. A few still move from the Navy to the fishing boats, but there is a shortage of men on the docks, and sometimes a captain has to wait a week to gather a crew. The eager boys from the neighborhood are gone, and today when a captain takes his son on board, he hopes the boy will get seasick—and sea-weary. Only in small towns like Wildwood does the old familiar pattern hold true. There you can still see a 12-year-old boy scrubbing the deck after the boats come in. You ask him about the day's catch and he frowns: "I don't know. Ask my father; he's the captain."

But even most old-timers say they wouldn't go into the business today. And then they glance toward the water, shrug, and smile—as if to say that it's not a business, it's a way of life, and they're glad they had the chance to live it.

As much as the financial prospects, that way of life may discourage younger men. Sig Hansen, a big ruddy Norwegian who worked at sea for 52 years and now manages a fishing cooperative at Point Pleasant, says: "Some young men still come and say they want to go fishing, but one trip out and you don't see them any more. They get seasick. Besides, the younger generation wants to sleep."

A fisherman does his sleeping on shore. As soon as his boat leaves land, he tows his net

24 hours a day as long as he's out there—three to ten days. At night he tries to sneak three or four hours sleep while one of the nets is in the water—and while the rest of the crew checks the last tow for "trash," fish that can't be sold and have to be thrown back.

Of course not all fishermen go out for a week at a time. Most clam dredgers work on "day boats" that come in every night, but they stay out for 13 hours—from four in the morning until five in the afternoon.

Nobody says the life is easy. They say it's strenuous. They say it's hazardous, too, both physically and financially. Every time out you run the risk of being rammed at night by a larger vessel, or being caught in rough seas that may throw a man overboard or sink a boat. Seven boats from southern New Jersey were lost in the 1962 storm.

As if these worries weren't enough, you never know when you may snag your net and wire and lose both (value—\$1000). Or when your technical equipment may break down and send you home early. Or when you'll have a "broker," a trip that doesn't pay for supplies. And when you come home with a boat full of fish, sure of your fortune, you may find that the price has dropped from 30 cents a pound to 10.

For all the uncertainty, fishermen still make what they call, simply, "a living." In a very good year a captain can clear around \$18,000, and a member of his crew about half that. But the rewards, the fishermen say, are largely intangible—the beauty of the sea in the summer, three months out of 12; the sense that each trip is a mystery, a bout with fortune; and the firm self-respect that comes from working for yourself (every crew member gets a percentage) and yet being part of a crew.

Fishermen are among the last of the hardy, independent Americans—the last frontiersmen. The captain of a boat in Atlantic City explains: "You take a guy on my crew and put him behind a desk, and nine times out of ten he'll get fired. When he's out there he doesn't have to punch a clock, to get here at nine and leave there at five. He's working for himself. He's more his own boss. Of course, the skipper makes the decisions, but he consults the crew. And everybody on board knows that the better the gear is, the more fish he'll catch and the more money he'll make."

The interdependence of a fishing crew acts as a powerful communal force. It molds the men into a unit that has much of the cohesion and the spirit of a Navy boot camp or a high school locker room. The men rag each other with the same raucous enthusiasm:

"Look sharp? You couldn't look sharp if you had your face lifted. I feel good because as long as you're alive I know I'm not the ugliest guy in the world."

And out on the water the communal feeling increases; it extends beyond the limits of any single boat. Fishermen lend each other equipment, assistance, and advice on where to fish. If you need something, it's a long way—often a hundred miles—back to shore.

This spirit even encompasses the foreign boats that have moved into our coastal waters during the past ten years. Much has been written about resentment toward these boats, especially toward the most numerous ones, the Russian trawlers. But the fishermen themselves—American or Soviet—are more likely to wave than to curse at each other. Our fishermen say, "They're trying to make a living just like we are. They're catching fish to feed people."

At times the Russian boats also have been blamed for the decline in available fish, so much so that an agreement recently was reached which prevents Soviet vessels from fishing for the most valuable edible finfish.

But the Soviets made the agreement because they weren't interested in these fish. They knew that such species were on the

decline, and they brought their large vessels here to fish for plentiful varieties, like herring and hake, that can't be sold in this country. Russian boats may be retarding the recovery of the best species, but they are not responsible for the present depletion.

Probably no single factor is responsible, but every man in the business looks for a primary cause. This is the ten-million-dollar question—the industry's present value; and every man comes up with his own answer. Vernon Rise, manager of a menhaden plant in Wildwood, said, "The decline started in 1963, right after the big storm. I still say that had something to do with it. The storm changed the bottom out there."

Sig Hansen, Point Pleasant fisherman: "I lay it to overfishing. We've been doing it for 20 years. The Russians will leave soon. You can bet they won't come 4000 miles for nothing."

Warren Lund, former fisherman, now a Cape May dock owner: "Fishing's not dying out. It's changing like any other small business. Fish protect themselves. When they start getting caught, they move. The porgies and the fluke are leaving, so we'll have to create a demand for something else. Like mackerel. We have more mackerel now than I've ever seen."

Alfred Jones, Atlantic City dock owner: "We're killing all the young. The government should pass laws requiring a certain mesh size on the nets and prohibiting sale of anything smaller. What would happen to human population if we destroyed all the young males?"

"Captain Jack" Lawson, itinerant fisherman: "You used to be able to get croakers here all day long—now they're down off Mississippi. We're catching scallops here that used to be off Nantucket, and they're getting Boston mackerel in the Chesapeake Bay. Either the water's getting colder or the equator's moved."

The government laboratory in Woods Hole, Mass., reports that ocean temperatures have been dropping for 15 years, but they say the trend may have stopped. The cooler waters here account for the increase in available shellfish.

If New Jersey alone were registering declines, some local cause (foreign boats, the storm, colder waters) might be held accountable. But decreasing fish stocks is a national problem. The United States now supplies less than a fourth of the fish she consumes. Once second in the world in total poundage, she is now sixth.

So as our primary cause we must look for a national problem, and the one explanation most often cited by fishermen is that ubiquitous and invisible destroyer, pollution—industrial, detergent, human, and agricultural (pesticide) pollution.

Captain Dave Hart, who had his own commercial boat for 18 years and now works for various government agencies, documents a persuasive case against pollution: "The species that don't use the inland estuaries for spawning—herring, hake, whiting—all seem to be in good shape. The porgies, the fluke, the sea bass, all the ones that use the estuaries, are declining. Of course there has to be an exception: Striped bass spawn in the estuaries and they're more abundant than ever. But the overwhelming patterns points to some sort of pollution."

A possible solution to this problem comes from Harry McGarrigle, dean of the Atlantic City dock. ("Me and my father before me. We've been on the street since 1911.") Harry is a heavy, friendly man. As he sorts fish on his dock he looks like the owner of a New York delicatessen, but his friends note with pride that he went to Washington to help negotiate the treaty with the Russians. Harry McGarrigle says, "All we need is \$35 million dollars to pipe all that waste out to sea and then things will be straightened out, after about ten years. It'll take that long for the water to clear up."

However long it would take for the waters to clear—and ten years probably is an extreme prognosis—the fishermen need someone to begin the process. That someone probably will have to be the Federal Government. States take little interest in fishing—they don't even collect statistics; and what interest they do take varies. New Jersey has a law, poorly enforced, prohibiting sale of small fish; most Southern States have no such statute.

Compared to other nations, even our Federal Government pays negligible attention to its fishery. Foreign countries build and man enormous fleets complete with the most modern equipment; our country authorizes Small Business loans. Beside the loans, the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries confines its activities to periodical bulletins on fish sightings and prices, and to research. Thus far the predominant product of the research has been expensive new equipment that small fishing boats cannot afford. But recently the government has been developing a new product that may help revitalize the industry.

Fish Protein Concentrate (FPC) is an odorless, tasteless fish flour made by reducing six pounds of whole fish into a pound of fine powder. Because FPC converts the whole fish, it retains every one of the 30-odd amino acids that are the main components of protein. The result is a product that is 75 percent protein—and that could do much toward relieving under-nourishment throughout the world.

Other countries, like Norway and Sweden, already have begun to produce FPC. The United States is now building its first plant. Although the Food and Drug Administration has approved only hake-like species for the pilot project, all signs indicate that it will soon approve all species.

If so, this would mean that the great mass of trash (sea robins, dogfish, sharks) as well as the abundant species the Russians are catching (herring, hake, mackerel) could be harvested. The boats that would go for such fish would have to be enormous company vessels, too large to be owned by the captain, too expensive and mechanized to hunt for fish in the old, romantic and desultory fashion. The men who worked these boats would live something like today's clambers or menhaden fishermen. Their work would be more routine, more like drudgery and less like sport, than the life of today's finfishermen. The sea is full of trash.

But there is a possibility that the small boats may linger on. Captain Dave Hart from Cape May explains, "Up to now we've done our damndest to destroy the natural ecology of the sea. We've taken the good fish and let the weeds flourish. If we start to fish for trash we may restore the natural balance."

He goes on to describe what may happen then: "If the finfish do come back, they may do so very suddenly. Fish can reproduce like insects. Scientists opened up one striped bass and found three million eggs."

If the finfish return in vast numbers, large vessels probably will be constructed to fish for them. Such boats already operate out of enormous fishing ports like New Bedford, Mass. If comparable boats come to New Jersey, then the small independent boats, like the local grocery store, will die out. But if the valuable finfish increase in limited numbers, if catching them remains an uncertain and speculative venture, construction of larger boats would be too risky. Then the small boats might survive.

No one can be certain what will happen. It seems that fishing's future is largely in the hands of the Federal Government. If it demonstrates that FPC is a feasible product, it may help create a new industry. But the real problem probably is the estuaries. The government must weigh America's traditional agricultural-industrial perspective—the one that ultimately leads to contaminated estuaries—against a future in which

man may have to depend on his marine resources for food.

But the sea is a mystery. Next year, the year after, the fish may return. They've done it before. "Captain Jack" Lawson says, "Anyone who thinks he knows anything about the sea is a damn fool." The fishermen have a saying to express this. Ask one of them anything about fish and he'll answer, as often as not, with a shrug—and then he'll add: "They have tails, and they swim."

But every fisherman changes the expression a little to suit his personality. "Captain Jack" is 67 years old, a lithe, spunky little Virginian who speaks with a Boston twang from fishing there for many years. He says, "Fishing's deteriorating just as fast as you can push it down the hill. Don't ask me why. They have fins and tails; they go where nobody knows."

Will the fisherman go, too? Probably in one guise or another, he will remain. The captain of a boat in Atlantic City says: "Today I'm a bum because I make a living from the sea. People hear I'm a commercial fisherman and they turn up their noses. They're snobs. Some day—I may not live to see it—the man of the sea will be respected. He'll provide the food that the world will subsist on."

AMERICA'S WAR VETERANS PAY TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday morning, September 10, in the rotunda of the Capitol, I was privileged to participate in a special and impressive memorial service for the late Senator Everett M. Dirksen. The participants were distinguished representatives of approximately 17 veterans' organizations who had gathered to pay their last tribute to this great American who had been a loyal and faithful friend of veterans and their dependents.

I suppose Senator Dirksen belonged to several of these great organizations, but I am proud to record that he was a distinguished member and past district commander of the American Legion.

I should like to commend to my colleagues the eulogy which was delivered on that occasion by another distinguished Legionnaire, and past national commander, the Honorable Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DONALD E. JOHNSON, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, AT COMBINED VETERANS ORGANIZATION MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR SENATOR EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Everett McKinley Dirksen will be remembered gratefully and always by America's veterans as a patriot who greatly loved our country . . . and as a man who lived the creed bequeathed him and all of us by another great citizen of his beloved Illinois . . . Abraham Lincoln . . . "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

As a combat, overseas veteran of World War I, he knew personally the holocaust and the cost of war. His concern for veterans, his compassion for the disabled and the widowed and the orphaned was expressed most eloquently—not alone in the remembered oratory of this gifted speaker, but also in the rewarding benefits which he helped to write into law.

A quarter of a century ago . . . 11 years after he first entered the House of Repre-

sentatives . . . he helped enact the G.I. Bill . . . one of the most enlightened laws ever passed by any government in history.

But his accomplishments on behalf of our nation's veterans, their dependents and survivors were not limited to this program. Far from it. His greatest service to veterans was in the leadership which he gave to the Senate as it considered the many veteran benefit programs to come before it during the more than five terms in which he served as Minority Leader of the Senate.

Beyond this, of course, was his dedicated, able service on the Senate Finance Committee, which monitors legislation benefitting the millions of veterans, widows and children receiving Veterans Administration compensation and pension and G.I. Insurance assistance.

The veterans organizations to which he proudly belonged know well how much this great American contributed to their growth and progress since World War I. The others, whose meetings and conventions he often addressed, will remember the inspiration and renewed strength he brought to them.

With grieving hearts, America's veterans say farewell to a loved and admired comrade.

We are sure he would understand that the only lasting and worthwhile tribute we can pay him is to carry on his great work and to share his true compassion for those who have borne the battle and for their widows and their orphans.

This we will do . . . Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Rest in peace.

SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, there will never be another like him. There have been great leaders before, astute politicians, men of flamboyant style, patriots of the highest order. But it is difficult to imagine that this Nation will be graced again with a man whose character and rhetorical skill even closely resemble that of the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.

It was with great sadness that I learned of the death of the distinguished Senate minority leader. A man whose advice was sought by four Presidents of the United States, Senator Dirksen served his State and Nation with full devotion. His ability and his humanity, his wisdom and his patriotism, were well known and universally respected.

I know the members of his party will miss his leadership as will we, of the opposite party, miss his unique style of debate and urbane opposition. To those who disagreed with his views, Senator Dirksen was a feared adversary, who yet remained a friend. An astute legislative leader devoted to his party's programs, he had the capacity to put aside partisan considerations when required by the needs of the Nation. He earned the affection of much of the American public.

We shall miss his wisdom and ability as well as his oratorical skill and his penetrating wit. Everett Dirksen was a legend in his own time, and he will long be remembered as a truly great American.

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the loss of our distinguished minority leader in the Senate. Many tributes have been paid to the Senator, but an editorial appearing in the September 9 issue of the Davenport Times-Democrat does an excellent job of summarizing these tributes, as follows:

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

Across the United States, Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen is being mourned as an outstanding legislator and political leader. It generally is reserved for the people of Illinois—and some of Iowa—to know that he served the state and the nation in a great Illinois tradition.

He shares participation distinction with: James Hamilton Lewis, a Chicago Democrat, who served with President Woodrow Wilson from 1913 to 1919 as conscientiously as he did with President Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1931 to 1939; Scott W. Lucas, also a Democrat, from Havana, 1939-1951, a Senate leader of the Roosevelt and Harry S Truman years;

And C. Wayland Brooks, Chicago Republican, of a comparable vintage, 1940-1949.

Like Senator Dirksen, they were members of a race of orators. They were not just small town or big city politicians. They were dramatic in their projection of the legislative process. When they spoke the Senate—and others—listened.

Of far greater consequence in Senator Dirksen's performance, he had a highly developed sense of political accommodation. While it irked some Republicans, the Dirksen technique gave the party a strong role as the loyal opposition. It won respect and applause not only for him but for the GOP.

He was not only a party leader, but a patriotic American, who saw that his high office was fulfilled responsibly. As has been set forth in news accounts of his passing from the national scene, his influence and accomplishments helped translate purposes and ideals into sound, significant and far-reaching legislation.

Some of his colleagues put it well. Said Sen. Mike Mansfield, majority leader of the Senate: "He was an old pro. His word was good. Everything was on the table." Observed Sen. Jack Miller of Iowa: "There has never been a minority leader his equal, and few majority leaders . . . could match his effectiveness."

In his consummate political skill and in the flaunting of a colorful personality, he captured the attention and interest—even affection—of people who never had met or even seen him personally.

The Dirksen success is the more impressive in the fact that he had such a humble beginning as the son of German immigrants with a background of the picturesque Frisian Islands off the coasts of Germany and the Netherlands. His father having died when he was five, he learned early how to work; his application to unpromising jobs continued through college as he worked his way.

This is the stuff of which American legends are composed and Everett McKinley Dirksen lived up to the tradition.

As has been set forth by hundreds of writers and commentators, his sonorous voice is stilled. Only the echoes of his grandiloquent delivery linger and fade. His influence will live, though, to the nation's benefit and Illinois pride.

LEGISLATION TO CLARIFY INTENTION OF CONGRESS RELATING TO EXEMPTION FROM FUEL TAXES OF VEHICLES IMMOBILIZED AND USED OFF OF HIGHWAYS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 13815, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status of motor vehicles under section 4041. The need for this legislation is self-evident. Its purpose is to clarify the law and make certain that the Internal Revenue Service conforms with the intention of the Congress. An explanation for the need for the enactment of this measure follows:

LEGISLATION TO CLARIFY INTENTION OF CONGRESS IN EXEMPTING FROM FUEL TAXES IMMOBILIZED VEHICLES WHEN UTILIZED OFF OF HIGHWAYS

Section 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 imposes taxes of 4¢ per gallon upon the retail sale or use of diesel fuel and certain special fuels for highway vehicles and certain other methods of transportation. Regulations § 48.4041-7(c) (2) provide that under certain circumstances a motor vehicle may be so used as to lose its essential characteristics as a motor vehicle. This is the case the the vehicle performs a function other than propulsion or loading or unloading and that function is powered by the same fuel used to propel the vehicle at other times. This distinction applies when the vehicle is off the highways and has been immobilized. In particular, this rule applies in situations where a motor vehicle is driven to a well-head and sets up equipment to service the well. The equipment may consist of tubes which, when fully joined and extended, may be inserted one or more miles into the earth. The vehicle must be made as completely immobile as possible, for even the slightest movement could cause an enormous shift in the direction of the equipment powered by the vehicle. In effect, the vehicle must be made into a piece of immobile machinery. In such a case, typically, several man-hours are required both to set up the vehicle and, after the vehicle has performed its immobilized function, to break it down.

Although this appropriate approach is in the regulations, it appears that Internal Revenue agents apply these regulations grudgingly. For example, the regulations illustrate an instance where the setting up process takes 6 man-hours and the breaking down process takes 4½ man-hours. In one case where the setting up process takes between 2 and 4 man-hours and the breaking down process takes a similar period, agents have ruled that the regulations were not complied with.

It is intended by this amendment to section 4041 to codify the regulations and to make clear that the shorter periods of time that have been described are sufficient to constitute "the expenditure of a substantial amount of time and effort" to set up and break down the equipment and cause it to lose the essential characteristics of a motor vehicle.

It is clear that the fuels in question are not used in this circumstance for the purpose of propelling a motor vehicle on the highway or elsewhere. As to diesel fuel, the Code makes no distinction between fuel used for propulsion and fuel used for other purposes. However, where the vehicle has been immobilized (not merely parked), then the

major factual problem would be in allocating the fuel between propulsion and mere use in non-highway equipment. Where such allocation may be made it seems inappropriate to impose the tax. It is intended that technology that strives for greater efficiency and flexibility will not be unreasonably inhibited by the provisions of the tax laws and the interpretations given to those provisions.

THE THIRD MOST DANGEROUS OCCUPATION

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, everyone seems to be alarmed, and rightly so, concerning the death and maiming resulting from automobile accidents. Although 1,000 persons per year are killed and many more are severely injured and the deaths per mile traveled are twice as high, few seem to be concerned about farm tractor accidents. Some may be surprised to learn that a substantial portion of these tractor accidents also occur on the highways. The whole matter of farm tractor accidents has been almost ignored by the Congress and the Federal Government until recently.

In 1966 Congress passed the National Motor Vehicle and Traffic Safety Act and I think it can take part of the credit for the fact that there has been a reduction since that time in the automobile highway death rate in terms of fatalities per miles traveled. I am not certain what should be done to make a like reduction in farm tractor accidents but I am convinced that we should be moving rapidly to better inform ourselves concerning the causes and to attempt to find some answers.

There was one death for 14.3 million miles traveled by automobile in 1966 compared to one death per 14.9 million miles traveled in 1968; and the fatality rate for farm tractors is one death for 7.3 million miles traveled.

I believe considerable information is available from State agricultural engineering schools and some studies that have been made but the information has not been adequately pulled together and prepared in a usable form by an independent source. At least it has not been prepared to the extent that some Members would feel it necessary before taking affirmative action.

The material from some of these reports and from independent sources has been recently pulled together and set forth in the form of a report by Mr. James Williams of St. Louis, Mo., who has been working this summer as an intern for Ralph Nader. I think that it is worth reading for those who are interested in the subject matter and I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it will be available to all. Of course, the recommendations in the report represent the views of Mr. Williams. I believe it provides about as comprehensive and well written a summary of the problem as I have seen.

While some may have different opinions as to what should be done, at least a considerable number do have some opinion and I note that the National Safety Council in its 1969 edition of Accident Facts claims that 93 of the overturned fatalities in 100 particular farm tractor accidents which they studied could have been prevented by the use of mechanical devices that were not available on the tractors. I also note that at least two States have passed laws requiring tractors on the highways to be equipped with a slow-moving vehicle sign which is readily viewable by another oncoming vehicle and that those two States report a reduction in tractor fatalities on the highways since the passage of that legislation.

I want to make it clear that I have not formed a definite opinion as to what devices should be encouraged or how; and I also believe that if certain devices are to be required on farm tractors, the requirement should apply at the point of delivery rather than at the point where it left the factory. I reached this conclusion because I know there are so many devices made by manufacturers other than those who manufacture tractors that to exclude these other manufacturers from the market would be excluding needed innovation and competition. These and other reasons were behind my decision to ask for the House legislation leading to a report. This legislation was adopted on September 3 of this year as an amendment to the Auto Safety Act and provides that the Department of Transportation make the study and report back to Congress by April 1 of next year, and the entire amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to prepare and to submit to the Congress no later than April 1, 1970, a report on the extent, causes and means of prevention of agricultural tractor accidents on both public roads and farms. In addition to such other information as he deems appropriate, the Secretary shall include in the report—

- (1) an estimate, based on the best statistical information available, of the number of deaths and injuries resulting annually from agricultural tractor accidents;
- (2) an identification of the primary causes of agricultural tractor accidents, including consideration of the hazards most likely to cause death or injury; and
- (3) specific recommendations on means of preventing the occurrence of, and reducing the severity of injuries resulting from, agricultural tractor accidents, including such legislative proposals as the Secretary determines are needed.

(b) In formulating the recommendations to be submitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall give careful consideration to the advisability of establishing uniform Federal safety standards in the design and manufacture of all agricultural tractors sold in interstate commerce, requiring the installation on such tractors of safety devices, and providing assistance to the States in developing accurate reporting procedures for accidents involving such tractors.

(c) In order to facilitate the prompt completion of this report, officials of other Federal departments or agencies shall make available to the Secretary, upon his request, any data or information in their possession relating to agricultural tractor accidents and shall otherwise provide assistance.

I hope this provision will remain in the bill as it emerges from the conference with the Senate and that the Department will provide the report as soon as possible together with recommendations made so that action can be taken next year.

Upon reading of my interest and efforts in this regard, one of my constituents, Mrs. Phyllis Brierty of Boone, Iowa, communicated with me and indicated not only her concern but also that she had been so interested that she had been collecting newspaper clippings of farm tractor deaths in Iowa. While this may not be all of the accidents that were in Iowa, it surely is representative of those that have occurred and would be of value in indicating the gravity of the problem. I commend Mrs. Brierty for her effort and her interest and include these clippings as an indication of the extent of the problem and that it involves persons of all ages:

THE THIRD MOST DANGEROUS OCCUPATION: A REPORT ON FARM TRACTOR HAZARDS

INTRODUCTION

On the average, three American farmers are killed by their tractors every day. Most of these deaths are due to a tractor overturning and crushing the driver; indeed, the possibility of a tractor overturning is so great that most West European nations require by law that their farm tractors be equipped with either a safety frame or cab, which have been shown to be extremely influential in reducing the number of fatalities and injuries associated with an overturning tractor accident. The United States, although taking a strong interest in the safety of the drivers of automobiles, has neglected to insure any type of protection for the drivers of farm vehicles.

Machines have become an integral part of an agricultural occupation. As more agricultural machines are introduced into the market, and as existing machines are designed to accomplish numerous and varied extra jobs, the dangers associated with the use of these machines continue to multiply. Until recently, these hazards have been thought of as unimportant and have been, for the most part, neglected by both farmers and the farm machine industries; legislation pertaining to safe farm equipment is practically nonexistent. Dangerous machines, combined with the independent, improvisational nature of an agricultural occupation, have caused the per capita number of farm fatalities and serious farm injuries to increase steadily from year to year.

Legislation pertaining to the operation of a farm is impractical, since there is no adequate way to enforce such laws on every individual farm. However, agricultural machines, particularly the tractor, are the major causes of farm accidents, and technology has advanced to the point where many of these safety hazards could be eliminated. What is now needed is an extra push to insure that safe farm equipment is standard farm equipment. To insure this result, increased farmer education programs must be combined with more technological advances by the farm machinery industries. Legislation in the realm of the manufacture of safe farm vehicles is also a necessity.

PART I: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

Because of the independent, individualistic nature of an agricultural occupation, farm safety encompasses more than merely extra-safe farm vehicles or a rigid code of manufacture restrictions. Many farm accidents occur because a farmer improvises numerous jobs for his tools and implements of

husbandry, jobs which the manufacturers of farm machinery and legislative officials could never have envisioned. Perhaps this is one of the reasons that the area of farm safety has been practically ignored by both federal and state legislatures.

Nevertheless, recent statistics show that some action must be taken to curb the continuing rise in farm accidents. In 1962, there were 15.7 fatalities per 100,000 farm people, and this figure climbed steadily to 20.1 fatalities per 100,000 farm people by 1967; an increase of 28% in five years. Machinery, particularly tractors, was responsible for the death in 42% of the farm accidents in 1967 (1). In fact, in 1964,² 45% of all United States fatalities resulting from accidents involving machinery (transportation accidents excluded) occurred in agricultural occupations (2).

When highway accidents are included, farm tractors alone have resulted in over 1000 fatalities annually for the past eight years. Although the total number of fatalities from accidents involving tractors has remained essentially constant for the past few years, it should be noted that the total number of people engaged in an agricultural occupation has been steadily declining; thus, the percentage of farm tractor fatalities per number of workers has been increasing at a much more rapid rate than shown by statistics of the total number of tractor accident fatalities.

Fatalities, however, represent less than twenty per cent of the total number of accidents involving farm tractors, and some of these other accidents, ranging from crushed ribs to the loss of limbs, can seriously handicap the farmer involved, financially as well as physically.

This report will consider specifically the safety hazards inherent in the average tractor design, but will also consider problems which indirectly affect the safety of the farmer.

I-A: Tractor design

Of the more than 1000 yearly fatalities involving tractors, over 60 per cent result from a tractor overturning, either 90 degrees to the side or 180 degrees backwards, and crushing the driver or passengers. In another some 4000 to 5000 accidents (many involving overturning tractors), the victim may suffer broken bones, peeled away flesh, or the loss of his legs or arms.

The high number of overturning tractors is directly attributable to one of the basic efficiency designs of a farm tractor; namely, the main mass of the machine is located well above the ground (the center of gravity of a tractor is generally 2 to 2½ feet above the roadway), to protect the underside of the tractor from bumpy terrain, to give the driver a longer visibility range, and to protect crops during harvesting. However, this high clearance efficiency can become a dangerous problem when the tractor is used on the sides of a steep hill, when too large a load is attached to the rear of the tractor or the load is improperly attached (causing the tractor mass to rotate around the rear axle), when one of the rear wheels descends unexpectedly into a ditch and momentum carries the tractor over onto its side, when a sharp turn is attempted at too high a speed (again causing the tractor to continue over onto its side), or when the rear wheels be-

come immobile for some reason (striking a log, becoming imbedded in mud) and the powerful tractor motor continues to force the tractor backwards around the rear axle. The danger associated with tractor overturns is magnified by the fact that should the tractor overturn, the driver is left totally unprotected; unless he is extremely quick and agile, he is crushed under the tremendous weight of his machine.³

However, the problem is composed of more than just a high center of gravity allowing the tractor to overturn easily, or no devices for protecting the exposed farmer. Many of the features of the average tractor design contribute directly to the probability of a tractor overturning. A few of the design factors follow:

1. Tractors, especially the older models, are equipped only with a separate brake for each side of the vehicle. This separate brake design is again an efficiency consideration, for the farmer uses the brakes to facilitate turning while working out in the field (for example, while turning to the left, the driver steps on the left brake, and thus can make a sharper turn than if he had to depend merely on the steering). When run at low speeds in the field, this separate braking system is no doubt an advantage; however, if a turn is attempted at too high a speed, the danger of overturn is greatly increased—and when trying to stop on a straight stretch, particularly when driving at higher speeds (up to 25 mph) on public roadways, the driver must be extremely careful to apply equal pressure to both brakes in order to make a smooth stop.

2. There are no adequate provisions for a passenger to ride along on a tractor, although passengers often find precarious ways to "hang on." Although not contributing to tractor overturn accidents, the absence of a passenger seat is responsible for many tractor accidents; the passenger falls off and is run over by the tractor. It may be argued that a tractor is not meant to carry passengers, but there are times, such as when moving from one field to another, when it is simply easier for a second person to accompany the driver of the tractor.

3. Another oversight on tractor design is the absence of a rear-view mirror; tractor accidents sometimes occur because a farmer is watching the area behind him and fails to notice a hazard (such as an open ditch) directly in front of him.

4. There are no directional signals or flashing lights on tractors; thus, while driving on a public road, the tractor operator has no simple way to notify the driver behind him when he wishes to turn or when he is in distress.

5. The exhaust pipe on a tractor is located on top of the main chassis of the tractor, directly in front of the operator. Although this placement keeps the hot exhaust pipe from coming in contact with dry hay and thus decreases the possibility of fire, it results in the exhaust fumes blowing directly into the tractor operator's face. Exhaust fumes, inhalation of dust, and extreme hot and cold effects all pose long term health hazards to the farmer.

6. The measured noise emission from tractors exceeds the hearing damage risk criteria established by the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology. This noise level is generally higher than the noise level that would be tolerated in industry, and the tractor is the most likely source of a farmer's deafness (4).

7. The suspension design of tractors is extremely inadequate. In most cases, the tractor tires, rather than springs, are expected

to absorb ground shock. The continued effect of noise, smoke, and gasoline fumes, not only impair the driver's visibility and hearing, but also have the psychological effect of dulling the driver's senses, making him oblivious to possible dangers and slowing down his reaction time. The continued vibrations can also produce long-term health problems.

8. The driver seat on a tractor is usually non-adjustable, and many of the tractor controls, particularly the clutch and brakes, require a great amount of strength to be operated correctly. It is a well-known fact that a farmer's wife or children often help with the farm operations, even with the driving of the tractor—although they may not possess the strength or stature to operate the vehicle adequately.

9. As the tractor continues to become an all-purpose machine, an increasing number and variety of levers and switches are added to the machine. Often these are positioned somewhat at random on the machine, confusing the farmer in hurried situations as much as they help during average daily work.

In addition to tractor overturn, another serious type of tractor injury is the power-take-off injury. Tractors have long been equipped with a PTO device to supply some of the tractor's power to other, unpowered implements of husbandry (particularly those implements attached to the rear of the tractor during planting and harvesting). This power is supplied by means of a rotating shaft, rotating at speeds faster than 1000 rpm on some of the more powerful tractors. PTO devices are not always adequately covered, or the protective covering falls off after long usage, leaving this rapidly revolving shaft exposed and dangerous. Loose clothing can become entangled in the PTO device, and results in injuries ranging from burns and scrapes as the clothing is torn off, to complete mutilation of the person whose clothing unfortunately fails to yield.

The list of possible and known causes of tractor accidents is long, and these accidents occur even when the tractor is operated according to the manual. Add to this list the many extra feats which a farmer may expect his tractor to perform, and one has a very dangerous machine.

I-B: Accident reporting

One of the basic reasons that the tractor industry has taken so long to correct the safety problems associated with tractor design is that adequate knowledge of the hazards has not been known, since there is no truly informative method used to report farm vehicle accidents. Accidents involving farm vehicles are only reported when they result in fatalities or when they occur on public roadways; thus, the majority of accidents, the non-fatal on-farm accidents, remain unreported, and the causes of these accidents go unnoticed. In addition, even those which are reported are reported in scanty detail, and the causes of the reported accidents are difficult or impossible to determine accurately.

The recent interest in developing a safer tractor design has been prompted by the advances made by European countries in investigating tractor safety and by recent (within the last five years) reports from universities in our own country. The charts in some of these university reports are based heavily on statistics obtained from newspaper clippings, since no other method of obtaining statistics was available. An interest in farm vehicle safety could have been begun a long time ago, had there been informative reports of farm vehicle accidents.

With little or no knowledge of all the factors which figure into a farm vehicle accident, it is extremely difficult to make intelligence recommendations for improvement right

¹ These statistics are based on the entire U.S. farm population, 10,875,000 people in 1967; however, the number of agricultural workers was only 4,000,000 in 1967, and statistics based on this number show that there were 68 deaths per 100,000 workers in 1967 making agriculture the third most dangerous occupation in America (ranking behind mining and construction work).

² The most recent statistics available in this category.

³ The average weight of 15 tractors tested for performance at the University of Nebraska was 8950 pounds (including ballast and the weight of the operator).

now, many of the safety hazards are known; but what will happen in future years, as tractors are modified and perhaps even drastically changed—will it again take European advances and university reports to discover the safety hazards of the new farm vehicles?

I-C: Present legislation

Federal legislation covering farm vehicles is practically nonexistent. Public Law 89-563 (The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966) does state, in Section 301:

"The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to make a complete investigation and study of the need for a facility or facilities to conduct research, development, and testing . . . relating to the safety of machinery used on highways or in connection with the maintenance of highways (with particular emphasis on tractor safety) as he deems appropriate and necessary."

This language authorizing a study of safety in the realm of highway maintenance tractors might have been used to include farm tractors, but when the report authorized under Section 301 was submitted to Congress in October, 1968, it did not mention tractors at all (5). And in July of 1969, when the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee approved legislation amending Public Law 89-563, the bill as reported by the Committee proposed to remove Section 301 from the law. If Congress approves the bill as recommended by the Committee, there would no longer be any language at all in the law which could be used as the basis for a tractor safety study by the Federal government and farm vehicle safety, as in the past, would be left up to the individual state legislatures.

In state laws, farm vehicles are often specifically not included in the safety laws pertaining to motor vehicles. The state laws are merely concerned with operating farm vehicles safely on public roadways, and at that, the only requirements are as to the type of lighting to be used during night driving. In the 1968 recommendations of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws, the use of a Slow-Moving-Vehicle emblem for daytime driving was urged. Only six states (as of December, 1968) have made this emblem a requirement. There are no provisions for any type of design safety, such as a protective frame or safety cab to prevent injury in the event of a tractor overturn.

Another factor which compounds the problem of legislation pertaining to safe farm vehicles is that in many states tractors, or any vehicle used exclusively on the farm, need not even be registered and certainly never inspected. The farmer is truly independent and responsible for his own safety, whether he knows the inherent safety hazards of his machinery or not.

I-D: The age factor

The Department of Labor became interested in the area of farm vehicle safety in the early 1960's, because of the high percentage of children who were dying in tractor accidents. As a result of reports and statistics published by the Department of Labor, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was amended in 1966, to include restrictions on the use of child labor on farms.

But it is not easy to enforce laws which apply to the way a farmer runs his farm, for, unlike in industry, it would be impossible to have an overseer frequently inspect the operation of every farm. In a 1967 tractor study by the North Carolina State University, it was shown that the largest percentage of fatalities from tractor overturns in that state occurred in the age group of 10-19 years of age. Other, more recent reports continue to point out the same statistics. Although the state and federal laws prohibit the use of

farm vehicles by children under 16 years of age, in all cases the farmer's children are exempt from this regulation. Children are also exempt if they are working for a person in place of the parents, or if they are taking a course in farm vehicle safety. And even though the laws exist, because of the unrestricted nature of the farming community there is no adequate way to insure that these laws will not be ignored when the farmer is in need of a few extra field hands.

Young children are expected to adequately control this dangerous machine, although tractor seats are non-adjustable and it is difficult for a child to reach the instrument panel or depress the brakes or clutch far enough to do their jobs; inexperience and immature judgment greatly increase the possibilities of a tractor accident.

PART II: WHAT IS BEING DONE

II-A: Other countries

The interest in safer farm tractors began in European countries, particularly Sweden. In 1954, the Swedish National Testing Institute for Agricultural Machinery (NTIAM) began running tests on crush-resistant cabs for protection during a tractor overturn. By 1959, the recommendations of the Swedish NTIAM had become a national standard, enforced by means of legislation. The Swedish studies led other countries, such as Norway, Denmark, Finland, West Germany, France, New Zealand, and Great Britain to begin making their own studies of protective frames and crush-proof cabs, and also brought about legislation in most of these countries. The most recent such law was that passed by the British in 1967, to become effective in 1970:

"The Agriculture (Tractor Cabs) Regulations in 1967 have been approved by both houses in Parliament. They apply to England, Wales, and Scotland, and will require new tractors sold or let on hire on or after September 1, 1970, to be fitted with safety cabs or safety frames. They will prohibit the use of a new tractor unless it is so fitted. On September 1, 1977, this prohibition will be extended to tractors which have first been sold for use by the purchaser in agriculture before September 1, 1970.

"The Regulations will provide for exemption from requirements to use a safety cab when this would be impracticable in hop gardens, orchards and buildings.

"Provision is made for the use of certificates of approval for safety cabs and frames jointly by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and the Secretary of State for Scotland, and for the marking of approved cabs and frames in a specified manner. These parts of the regulations will come into force immediately so as to enable cabs and frames to be approved and properly marked before September 1, 1970." (6)

Since Sweden has had the law in existence for the longest time, the results of legislative action in this area can best be seen by looking at Sweden's tractor fatality rate. For a few years after this law was enacted, the number of fatalities due to overturning tractors remained approximately the same as before the crush-proof cabs had become a standard piece of equipment; however, after this initial period, the number of fatalities and injuries began to drop rapidly, and the crush-proof cabs were shown to be directly responsible for reducing (and perhaps eventually eliminating) death resulting from a tractor overturn.

The initial period of increasing accidents is possible due to the fact that the legislation initially provided that only new tractors be equipped with this safety device, and it took some time before the devices were actually in circulation. The Swedish laws were then amended to provide that crush-proof cabs would be mandatory not only on the new farm vehicles, but also on those tractors already in use.

II-B: Reports in the United States

In 1961, the Injury Control Program of the U.S. Public Health Service provided funds to the University of Iowa to begin research on farm vehicle safety; in 1967, PHS-ICP also provided funds to the University of North Carolina (\$22,500) and Purdue University (\$48,000) for the same purpose. The Purdue report will not be complete until 1970, but the other two have been finished.

Altogether, 26 states have prepared reports on the farm accident problem, in addition to a report by Metropolitan Life Insurance. The Department of Labor developed extensive statistics on farm vehicle accidents while studying accidents involving farm children, the National Safety Council has published reports, statistics, and an extensive educational program, and the Department of Agriculture has put out numerous pamphlets on tractor safety, with the information in these pamphlets coming from the various state reports. Most of these reports deal specifically with one area of farm vehicle safety—PTO injuries (University of Iowa), the dynamic stability of tractors and a farmer's reaction times (Purdue University), and a uniform method of compiling tractor accident statistics (Michigan State University)—but all are unanimous in their plea for safety frames.

In 1968, the Farm and Industrial Equipment Institute (FIEI) proposed safety frame standards to the American Society of Agricultural Engineers (ASAE), who made this proposal a recommendation to the tractor manufacturing industry in their specifications ASAE R305 and ASAE R306. In addition to the provision for safety frame standards, the ASAE has recommended in ASAE S297 that new shielding standards be used for the shields for PTO devices. However, "Compliance with the recommendations is strictly voluntary insofar as the manufacturer and the purchaser are concerned." (7)

II-C: Industry in the United States

In the United States, tractor safety has long been a topic of discussion and testing, but of little direct application. The recent, increased pressure by agricultural organizations for protective frames or enclosing cabs to protect the farmer in case of a tractor overturn has no doubt been prompted by the European interest in tractor safety and by the recent reports by American universities.

In industry, John Deere and International Harvester were the first tractor companies to begin testing protective frames and to equip some of their tractors with these frames; numerous other tractor companies are following this example. However, these frames are included merely as optional equipment, and there is presently no vigorous attempt by industry to promote sale of these extra safety devices, outside of the promotion campaign by the John Deere Company. Spending approximately one million dollars for research, John Deere developed safety frame standards (which later became the basis for standards of other tractor companies), equipped some of their tractors with such frames, and promoted use of such frames by spending another million dollars in giving these frames as prizes at community tractor demonstrations. But although the safety frames are offered, few farmers consider them worth purchasing. The poorer farmer is especially apt to pass up the chance for this apparent "luxury;" and yet, he is the person who is most likely to let his children operate the machinery, or to use the machinery for purposes for which it was not designed, thus increasing the risk of an overturn.

Besides the protective frames, other advances for safety made by the tractor industries include a 3-point hitch to prevent rear tractor overturn when an instrument is attached, hand holds and a skid resistant platform for mounting the vehicle, and a neutral start switch with a safety interlock to prevent starting while in gear. Also, the Univer-

⁴ This duty was transferred to the Secretary of Transportation under the Department of Transportation Act of 1967.

sity of Iowa has developed an acceptable rear-view mirror for tractors which was enthusiastically endorsed by those farmers who tested it in their everyday work. Again, most of these safety features are merely optional equipment, and there is no requirement for either the manufacturers to provide these features or for the farmer to purchase them.

Since legislation is absent in the realm of the design of these safety features, tractor companies are left to develop their own standards and testing facilities. The recommendations of the FIEI concerning protective frames were based on tests run by tractor manufacturers (particularly John Deere) and they are more than adequate in providing overturn safety; but there is no assurance that industry will comply to these standards in all cases. In some instances in the past, tractors have been equipped with a structure which resembles a safety frame, but which is not nearly strong enough to sustain the tractor in case of an overturn, thus giving the farmer an unfounded sense of security. In addition, there is the very real danger of a conscientious but poor farmer building his own protective frame in order to save money, even though he may have no idea of the necessary standards for such a frame.

The inclusion of a safety frame is no assurance that the farmer will be protected; if the tractor does not also include a seat belt or some other type of restraining device, or if the farmer, for personal reasons, fails to use such a restraining device, in the event of an overturn the farmer would well be crushed by his safety frame as well as the tractor itself; if easily removed, the frame might be removed by a farmer in order to move it inside a building with a low ceiling, and the farmer could then simply not go to the trouble of re-attaching the frame. Although this latter problem would not be present if the tractor was equipped with an enclosing cab, and although the cabs also protect the farmer from heat, cold, exhaust and gasoline fumes, and dust particles, many of the crush-proof cabs increase the impairment of visibility and hearing.

Thus, while safety features have been added to tractors, they are merely optional equipment, and there is no assurance (other than the recommendations of the ASAE) that the safety features will be adequate and that they will not continue to develop in a haphazard manner, resulting in a cure worse than the disease.

II-D: Trials with safety frames in North Dakota and Illinois

Due to the large number of overturns of tractors used for highway maintenance, by 1961 both N. Dakota and Illinois made safety frames standard equipment on their highway maintenance tractors. In North Dakota, from 1960 to 1966 there were no permanent disabilities or fatalities, even though the maintenance tractors continued to overturn at the same rate as they had before the safety frames were included. And in Illinois, a comparison was made between some tractors equipped with the frames and others not equipped, which showed without a doubt that the frames were extremely influential in preventing death or serious injury resulting from tractor overturn accidents. However, these state standards have not been expanded to include farm tractors.

II-E: Farmer education

A portion of the farm vehicle accident problem results from either farmers' ignorance of safety procedures or farmers ignoring accepted safety practices. For this reason, numerous farm safety programs have been established throughout the United States.

For example, most high schools and primary schools in farming communities have courses in farm safety. 4-H clubs are particularly concerned with teaching the hazards associated with operating farm machinery (to the extent that student learners un-

der the 4-H program are exempt from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act).

However, unlike an industrial worker, who is reminded of safety procedures every day, the farmer is expected to remember the safety training of his youth for the rest of his life. There are ways of reminding the farmer of safety, such as safety demonstrations at annual farm community fairs. For example, at Lincoln, Nebraska, there is a Tractor Power and Safety Day held near the end of July every year. The activities of this day include a showing of the tractors of the future, plowing contests between various types of tractors, etc.—and a special time slot is allotted to a demonstration of safety in tractor operation. In the 1950's, however, this safety demonstration was always the last item on the program, following such things as the state champion 4-H tractor driver, and thus probably taking place after most of the observers had left. In 1966, the tractor tipping demonstration and discussion was the first item on the program, still taking place in an obscure time slot, considering that those people who felt that this demonstration was unimportant could easily arrive late and miss it completely.

More encouraging in the realm of farm safety education is the recent Tractor Overturn Prevention and Protection Program (TOPP) begun in 1968 by the National Safety Council in Chicago, Ill. The Safety Council has specifically established a department for investigating farm safety hazards and possible corrective measures. The information gained from these investigations and from state university reports will be written up in pamphlet form and sent to farm organizations which ask for them. It is also planned to send circulars to farmers throughout the country, reminding and warning them of the safety hazards associated with their farm machinery. Local radio and television stations will be used in addition to printed material, and it is hoped that farmers can thus be educated as to safe methods of operating their machinery, and also be made aware of the importance of equipping their tractors with safety devices, particularly protective frames and cabs.

PART III: RECOMMENDATIONS

Many of the safety hazards of farm vehicles are known, and technology has advanced to the point where these hazards can be eliminated. It is possible that with the advances made by the tractor industry, with increasing pressure from the various agricultural organizations, and with farmers becoming more aware of these hazards through the TOPP Program, farm injuries and fatalities, especially those from overturned tractors, will be reduced. However, this is an extremely optimistic proposition; the idea of protective frames could easily backfire if farmers decide that it is easier and cheaper to build these frames themselves, or if some of the tractor industries take "short cuts" and manufacture protective frames or cabs which have not been adequately tested and which could ultimately be more of a safety hazard than a safety device. Also, if the idea of farm safety should not catch on in the farming communities, safety devices will merely remain optional and unpromoted as they are today, because of economic pressure from lower-priced, unequipped tractors.

Solving the problem of unsafe tractors involves compiling all of the available information on tractor safety into one organized analysis in order to determine which safety features are most pressing, and then applying this information to the areas of farmer education, industrial promotion campaigns, and ultimately to federal legislative action.

III-A: Compiling a report

Aside from the unanimous agreement on the need for protective frames, the state

reports on farm safety give reasons for the high number of farm accidents ranging from old age of some farmers to the basic design of the farm tractor. A detailed report should be made on the national level to determine which factors are the primary causes of farm accidents and which are minor causes. The available state reports should be of great help in developing statistical tables and shedding light on which hazards are common problems from state to state.

In addition to determining the primary causes of tractor and farm machinery accidents, such a report should also:

1. develop an accurate and informative accident report form, and suggest ways in which such a form will become accepted and used.

2. suggest technological improvements for tractor design which have not already been considered by the tractor industries (ideas should come from the study of the causes of tractor accidents).

3. recommend certain minimum standards for tractor safety, in addition to the protective frame and PTO standards of the ASAE.

4. recommend not only facilities for research and development of new tractor safety devices on a uniform, national level, but also facilities for insuring adequate testing of new developments (the tractor industry itself could be extremely helpful in this area).

5. suggest methods of interesting farmers in purchasing the standard safety equipment, and methods of convincing them that farm safety is a very real problem.

Some of these proposals are the stated goals of the National Safety Council;⁵ however, the urgency of the farm vehicle safety problem suggests that an independent study, under the direction of the federal government, is of great importance. In addition, an independent study would be extremely helpful in causing the TOPP Program to realize its goals of farmer education.

III-B: Industrial promotion campaign

The tractor industry has developed adequate safety devices, but promotion of these devices has been largely ineffective, in spite of the extreme importance of these devices toward decreasing tractor overturn fatalities. It may be that approaching agricultural workers through fear, i.e. by pointing out tractor fatality statistics, is ineffective to those who feel that "it will never happen to me."

Realizing this, a few of the tractor companies have attempted to promote sale of their safety frames by adding a sunshade, thus making the frame a luxury item as well as a safety device. While this approach may be effective in promoting sale of the safety cabs (which provide air conditioning as

⁵ The National Safety Council has proposed a program for obtaining farm accident statistics, in which volunteer workers in various farming communities are used to gather information on farm accidents in those areas. A complete accident report form is used, with a special, thorough section for description of a tractor accident. So far, this information gathering program has resulted in state reports in both Ohio and Michigan, and \$2000 grants have been given to Wisconsin, Minnesota, Wyoming, Illinois, Nebraska, and Louisiana, to conduct research of their own; however, the \$2000 grant is not nearly enough to pay for the research put into such a report, and the individual state legislatures or farm organizations within the state must furnish the rest of the money. For this reason (and the fact that the National Safety Council has only two more \$2000 grants to offer), the final survey will be a random sample of farm communities throughout the United States, and it may be quite a while before the final compilation is complete.

well as protection from dust and exhaust fumes), it has not been effective in promoting the sale of the basic safety frame.

Nevertheless, while appeal to a farmer's sense of personal safety or desire for comfort might prove futile, appeal to his sense of economics would probably prove fruitful. The largest deterrent to the purchase of protective frames is the cost; whereas the cost of one of the new, powerful tractors (the kind purchased by most farmers) is about \$8000 to \$9000, the cost of a protective frame runs from \$180 to \$250. However, the economics of protective frames does not end with the purchase, for if all tractors were equipped with this safety equipment, it is quite conceivable that insurance rates would be substantially lowered; and since tractors give many years of service (over 50 per cent of the tractors now in service in the United States are over 11 years of age), over a long time span the frame could virtually pay for itself.

The appeal to a farmer's economic sense could easily be the type of campaign to be used by the tractor industry to promote the sale of these urgently needed safety devices. Another suggestion is that the tractor companies make use of advertisements to familiarize farmers with the protective frames. In recent issues of the Farmer's Quarterly, many advertisements use pictures of tractors, but a large majority of these pictures are old and show tractors without the protective frames. If the tractor industry is truly interested in promoting sale of these safety devices, it would be a simple matter to replace these pictures with pictures of the newer, safely designed tractors (the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service is willing to provide the pictures) and thus subtly acquaint the farmer with the opportunities for safety available to him.

III-C: Federal legislation

Federal legislation pertaining to safety equipment for farm vehicles could provide the necessary push to make safety devices a standard for farm vehicles, provide uniform, tested standards for these vehicles, and also guard against unsafe "do-it-yourself" devices. An argument which may be used against such legislation is that acceptable safety equipment is already offered to the farmer; he is aware of the dangers associated with his farm vehicles (or at least, will soon be made aware through the TOPP Program), and thus, the final choice of whether to spend the extra money for safety or not should be left up to the farmer.

However, considering the strongly individualistic nature of an agricultural occupation, many farmers no doubt feel that the extra expense for safety equipment is unnecessary for themselves; yet, farm accidents (at the rate of over 1000 fatalities involving tractors per year) can happen to even the most careful driver during times of extreme physical stress or concentration lapses: "Statement by operators, such as 'It was a stupid mistake,' 'I knew better,' 'I didn't see it,' or 'I just don't know what happened,' are all indications of such lapses and as such need design protection, rather than education, for reduction." (8)

The situation here parallels that of the automobile industry. Safety devices, such as seat belts, were offered to motorists, but it was not until federal legislation was enacted that widespread use of these devices began. As an example of the result of farm safety requirements, Swedish farmers at first resisted legislation requiring the safety cabs; but most Swedish farmers now feel that such protection is "necessary."

It may also be argued that if legislation is to be enacted, states should have the right to make such legislation rather than the federal government, since the terrain and climatic conditions in different parts of the country would call for different safety stand-

ards. This may be a valid argument, but may be unrealistic since tractors are often made and sold in different states, and thus are regulated by laws applying to interstate commerce. In any case, the federal government should take the initial action to insure that certain minimum safety standards will be nationwide, and to insure that these minimum standards will be uniform.

(An example where legislative action may fall due to the absence of uniformity is that of the restrictions on the Slow-Moving-Vehicle emblem. There is no assurance that as more and more states require this emblem, the design of the emblem will not vary from state to state, thus confusing a motorist driving through more than one state. Also, the states now requiring this emblem have specified it for vehicles which are not "normally" operated at speeds greater than 25 mph, and Vermont has no restrictions at all on the attainable speeds of the vehicle to which such an emblem is attached. With some of the more powerful tractors now being able to move as fast as the regular traffic on country roads, it is quite conceivable that such emblems attached to the rear of faster moving vehicles will lead motorists to believe that such emblems really mean nothing, that they are merely a "wolf cry.")

The recommendations of this report for legislative action are as follow:

1. The federal government should enact legislation requiring certain minimum standards in tractor design (particularly the inclusion of a protective frame or safety cab, and any other necessary standards revealed by the proposed report of Section III-A).

2. These minimum standards should be made in conjunction with agricultural organizations and the tractor industry, since many of the devices have already been perfected and tested.

3. All farm vehicle accidents should be reported, whether they result in a fatality or not, and should be reported in greater detail than they are at the present time, so that as new hazards become evident, they may be detected immediately.

4. A recurring (perhaps annual) inspection should be made of the farm vehicles in use, to check for any hazards of which the farmer is unaware. (Note: this would also require the registering of farm vehicles in those states in which they are presently not registered.)

5. Legislation should be retroactive, allowing the farmer perhaps five years to comply with the standards, since tractors sometimes give adequate service for over twenty years; also, the tractor industry has developed safety frames which can be attached to older tractor designs.

6. If new tractor designs are developed, particularly designs with an unusually low center of gravity or extremely lightweight tractors (such as those used to an increasing extent by suburban families) and these tractors are tested and proven to be extremely safe without the specified standard safety equipment requirements, they should be exempt from these requirements. Thus, the tractor and farm vehicle industries would be continually inspired to make their machines safer.

The combination of legislation requiring safe farm vehicles with an adequate educational program for farmers and increased promotion of safety by industry could make farming one of the safest machine-oriented occupations in the country.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. From unpublished statistics of the National Center for Health Statistics of the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.
2. Walter E. Sellers, Jr., "Farm Accidents and Workmen's Compensation," published in *Farm Labor Developments* by the U.S. Dept. of Labor (1966)
3. *Accident Facts*, 1968 Edition, published

by the National Safety Council, Statistics Division, Chicago, Ill. (1968)

4. Herbert H. Jones and James L. Oser, "Farm Equipment Noise Exposure Levels," printed in *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal*, Vol. 29, March-April, 1968

5. *Requirements for Motor Vehicle and Highway Safety Research and Test Facilities*, a report to the Congress from the Secretary of Transportation, October, 1968

6. Knapp, L. W. and Terry, C. W., "A Tractor Tipping Demonstration", New York State College of Agriculture, Dept. of Agricultural Engineering, Cornell University Bulletin No. 316—verified in the British Agriculture (Tractor Cabs) Regulations of 1967; Statutory Instruments (1967) No. 1072

7. E. C. Carlson, "Tractor Roll-over Protection Frames," printed in *National Safety News*, (March, 1968)

8. L. W. Knapp, Jr., *The Farm Tractor: Overturn and Power Take-off Accident Problem*, Bulletin No. 11 of the University of Iowa, Institute of Agricultural Medicine, Department of Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health, College of Medicine (1968)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. L. W. Knapp, Jr., *The Farm Tractor: Overturn and Power Take-off Accident Problem*, Bulletin No. 11 of the University of Iowa, Institute of Agricultural Medicine, Department of Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health, College of Medicine (1968).
2. Graham F. Donaldson, *Farm Machinery Safety*, Study No. I of the Royal Commission on Farm Safety, (Canada, 1968).
3. C. W. Suggs and D. L. Roberts, a synopsis of a North Carolina State University Study on Stability of Tractors (May, 1968).
4. Prof. J. B. Liljedahl, a synopsis of a Purdue University Tractor Study (1968).
5. Kenneth M. Hofmeister and Richard G. Pfister, *Michigan Farm Accident Study*, Report No. 14 of the Rural Manpower Center, Michigan State University (Nov., 1968).
6. T. David McFarland, "Analysis of Farm Tractor Accidents to Determine Corrective Measures," put out by the National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill. (1969).
7. "Tractor Overturn Prevention and Protection Program," documentation and sample circulars put out by the National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill. (1969).
8. E. C. Carlson, "Tractor Roll-over Protection Frames," printed in *National Safety News*, (March 1968).
9. Rollin D. Schnieder, "Farm Tractor Upset Accident Survey," put out by Extension Service, University of Nebraska (1966).
10. Dr. Norval J. Wardle, "A Report of Injury Control Programs in Regard to Farm Tractor Operation, With a Proposal for an Intensive Farm Tractor Injury Control Program in a Specified Area of Iowa," prepared for Dr. Richard E. Marland, PHS; National Center for Urban and Industrial Health, Cincinnati, Ohio (1967).
11. Henry Brown, "Traffic Law Commentary: Slow Moving Vehicles," put out by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, (1969).
12. Walter E. Sellers, Jr., "Farm Accidents and Workmen's Compensation," published in *Farm Labor Developments*, by the United States Department of Labor (1966).
13. *Accident Facts*, 1968 Edition, published by the National Safety Council, Statistics Division, Chicago, Ill. (1968).
14. "Farm Safety Review", edited by Jack Burke (May-June, 1969).
15. *Tractor Fatalities; Characteristics of 789 Cases*, data collected and tabulated by the Farm Department of the National Safety Council.

Previously referred to press reports—partial collection—on tractor accidents in Iowa for May through August 1969 follow:

(The Register's Iowa News Service)

PINNED DEAD UNDER TRACTOR

LE MARS, IOWA.—The body of Lawrence Jochum, 70, who farmed about five miles north of here, was found pinned by a wheel of his overturned tractor Thursday, the Plymouth County sheriff's office said.

Sheriff Jim Mertes said Mr. Jochum apparently had been dead since late Tuesday, when he was last seen by a neighbor.

Mertes said Mr. Jochum, who lived alone, had been driving a tractor with a payload filled with chunks of concrete, apparently to be used to combat erosion from the nearby Floyd River.

It appeared that the tractor tipped over on an embankment, the sheriff said.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

FARMER KILLED IN TRACTOR MISHAP

CASCADE, IOWA.—Wilfred Paul Staner, 68, a Cascade area farmer, was fatally injured in a tractor accident in a farm field Wednesday night.

Staner was dead on arrival at Mercy Medical Center in Dubuque.

Details of the accident were not known.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

TRACTOR ROLLS OVER HEAD; DIES

BUCKINGHAM, IOWA.—Roy E. Perry, 80, of rural Buckingham was dead on arrival Wednesday afternoon at a Waterloo hospital after he was injured in a tractor accident on his farm.

Dr. Paul O'Keffe, Black Hawk County medical examiner, said Perry died of skull injuries after the rear wheels of a small tractor ran over him.

Perry was hauling lumber at the time and apparently fell off the tractor under the wheels, he said.

OCHHEYEDAN MAN DIES IN UPSET

OCHHEYEDAN, IOWA.—Albert John Rehborg, 61, of Ocheyedan was killed Friday when the tractor he was driving overturned, pinning him beneath it a half mile east of here on a gravel road.

The tractor caught fire after it overturned. The Ocheyedan Fire Department was summoned to put out the fire.

His wife and six children survive.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

MAN, 72, DIES WHILE PLOWING

RICKARDSVILLE, IOWA.—Matt Schmitt, 72, of Durango died Thursday when he fell off a tractor while plowing a field at the farm of a son near this Dubuque County town, officers said.

An autopsy was to be performed to determine whether Mr. Schmitt suffered a heart attack before falling off the tractor, which ran over him.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

WOMAN IS KILLED AS TRACTOR SLIPS

STRAWBERRY POINT, IOWA.—Mrs. Doris Marie Batchelder, 47, of rural Strawberry Point, was killed Friday afternoon when the tractor she was driving slipped over a bank on the edge of a field and crushed her to death.

RETIRED CRESTON FARMER KILLED BY TRACTOR

KENT (AP).—An elderly retired farmer, 77-year-old Louis Moore of Creston, was killed Wednesday when the tractor he was driving overturned on him on a gravel county road near Kent in southwest Iowa.

Authorities said Moore was pulling a harrow with the tractor when it went out of control on a hill and curve three miles southeast of Kent. They said Moore had moved to Creston about nine months ago and was helping with the work at his son's farm home near Kent.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

TRACTOR ACCIDENT KILLS MILFORD BOY

MILFORD, IOWA.—Paul Kaiser, 14, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kaiser of rural Milford; was killed in a tractor accident on a county road Tuesday.

Dr. Donald F. Rodawig, Jr., Dickinson County medical examiner, said the tractor young Kaiser was driving ran off the roadway and rolled down an embankment. He was pinned beneath it.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

TRACTOR UPSET KILLS FARMER

VOLGA, IOWA.—John McTaggart, 67, of rural Volga was killed about 5:30 p.m. Thursday when the tractor he was operating overturned in a field on his farm, Clayton County authorities said.

The body was taken to Feeney-Knutson Funeral Home at Strawberry Point.

FATAL TRACTOR INJURY

IOWA CITY (AP).—Dale Vavroch of rural Tama has died in University Hospital here from injuries received last Friday in a tractor accident at his parent's farm.

Vavroch suffered a ruptured spleen and a broken arm as the tractor overturned on him, authorities said.

He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Wesley Vavroch, who farm about eight miles south of Tama.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

TRACTOR ACCIDENT KILLS LORIMOR BOY

LORIMOR, IOWA.—Randy Stephens, 13, whose parents farm south of here, was killed Tuesday when a tractor-spreader rig he was operating overturned, pinning him.

Officers said the boy, son of Mr. and Mrs. Larry Stephens, was dead on arrival at an Osceola hospital.

His father was working in another part of the field when the rig overturned on an embankment.

In addition to his parents, the boy is survived by two brothers, Rusty and Todd, at home, and his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. William Orwan and Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Stephens of Lorimor.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

FINDS HUSBAND DEAD IN FIELD

NEVADA, IOWA.—The body of LeVerne Jacobson, 52, was found by his wife Wednesday night after a disking accident in a field on their farm five miles north of here.

Authorities said Jacobson apparently fell off his tractor before being dragged several hundred yards by the disk until the tractor stalled.

His wife, Virginia, went to look for him when he failed to return home.

Also surviving are two daughters, Mrs. Max Lowe of Waterloo and Mrs. Steven Fuller of Marion; a brother, Curtis of Roland, and two grandchildren.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Saturday at the Bergen Lutheran Church in Roland.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

TRACTOR FLIPS, FARMER KILLED

GARNAVILLO, IOWA.—Marvin Possehl, 35, who farmed three miles north of here, was found dead Friday afternoon under his overturned tractor.

Officers said Possehl apparently was dead for some time before he was discovered by his wife, Beverly, when she returned home with their daughter, Diane, 14, from a 4-H tour. The accident occurred in their farm yard.

OSKALOOSA BOY KILLED BY TRACTOR

OSKALOOSA (AP).—A Mahaska County teenager was killed early Tuesday when a tractor he was driving flipped over into a ditch on a county road about a quarter of a mile from his home.

Authorities identified the victim as Claire VanderWilt, 14, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dick VanderWilt of rural Oskaloosa.

The youth was pinned beneath the tractor.

[From the Register's Iowa News Service]

ACCIDENT KILLS ODEBOLT FARMER

ODEBOLT, IOWA.—Melvin Rabe, 49, who farms three miles north of here, was killed Friday when a tractor overturned in a field on his farm, pinning him.

His body was discovered by a neighbor, Wilbert Mohr, who was driving by and saw the tractor on its side about 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Rabe is survived by his wife, Mae; a daughter, Janet, at home; a son, Leon of Rochester, Minn.; and his mother, Mrs. Lettie Rabe of Odebolt.

TRACTOR ACCIDENT

Robert Merriam, route, 3, Ogden, was admitted to the Boone County Hospital, Thursday, July 17, following a tractor accident. He is being treated for three broken ribs and a crushed vertebra.

TRACTOR UPSET KILLS WORKER

NEOLA, IOWA (AP).—Lynn Shelley, 53, was killed Tuesday when the tractor he was driving ran off a Pottawattamie County gravel road south of here.

Mr. Shelley, who worked on the Edward Fischer farm near Neola, was pinned beneath the tractor.

TRACTOR ACCIDENT KILLS CASCADE MAN

CASCADE, IOWA (AP).—Francis Supple, 73, of rural Cascade, was killed in a farming accident about 11 a.m. Saturday. Authorities said Supple was mowing hay on his farm when his tractor tipped over, killing him instantly.

PFC. DENNIS D. DAVIS DIES IN VIETNAM**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Dennis D. Davis, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed in Vietnam recently. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

DENNIS D. DAVIS DIES IN VIETNAM; PRINCE GEORGES MARINE HIT BY ENEMY GRENADE

A 20-year-old marine from Prince Georges county has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

He was identified as Pfc. Dennis D. Davis, son of Mrs. Marion C. Davis, of Capitol Heights. Private Davis was killed Thursday by an enemy hand grenade while on patrol about 30 miles south of Da Nang, the Defense Department said.

Private Davis was born in Washington and moved to Capitol Heights with his family in 1958. He attended Maryland Park High School until 1965.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps last December. Private Davis was sent to Vietnam in June, following basic training at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and further training at Camp Pendleton, Calif.

In a recent letter to his mother, Private Davis said he had narrowly escaped death a few weeks ago in an incident similar to the one in which he was killed. The letter was received only a day before the telegram telling of his death, a family spokesman said yesterday.

Besides his mother, Private Davis is survived by his father, Willard Davis, of North

Carolina; three brothers, Kenneth J. Davis, of Clinton, Md., John L. Davis and Willard Dale Davis, both of Capitol Heights, and a sister, Miss Deborah E. Davis, of Capitol Heights.

S. 2577—SAVINGS BANKS
REGULATIONS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a statement I recently submitted to the distinguished Banking and Currency Committee of the other body on S. 2577, a bill which under section 2a thereof, would impose far-reaching discriminatory Federal regulations on Massachusetts savings banks:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J.
PHILBIN

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members of the Committee: Various people in Massachusetts including the Savings Banks Association and other interested parties have asked me to present my views and their views to you concerning the pending bill, S. 2577 which, in effect, proposes to bring state chartered and state supervised mutual savings banks under federal interest rate controls. I am grateful to all of you for this privilege.

As you may know, savings banks in Massachusetts occupy a unique and exceptional status among institutions of their kind throughout the nation, since Massachusetts is the only state where deposits in mutual savings banks are insured in full by a non-deposit insurance fund created as long ago as 1934 under state law.

Section 2 of your Senate Bill 2577 would impose upon financial institutions, not insured by FDIC or not members of the Federal Home Loan Banking System, the same maximum deposit rates that are applicable to banks that are controlled by those federal agencies.

It should be pointed out, as the extensive statement of the Savings Banks Association of Massachusetts, already submitted to the Committee has done, the position taken by our Massachusetts Savings Banks and their Association which is that competitive quality can best be served by modifying the maximum rate for all Massachusetts thrift institutions now under federal control, not by subjecting all banks, including savings banks, to maximum deposit interest rates.

Very appropriately, it is suggested that FDIC has already adopted this course of action by permitting Massachusetts Savings Bank members to pay competitive rates on special notice accounts on grounds that the Massachusetts Savings Bank situation is unique, as indeed it is, in so many respects that differentiate it from all other banks in basic respects pertinent to this bill.

As this learned Committee well understands, the uniqueness of the Massachusetts Savings Bank System goes back a considerable way in the banking history of our state, which has grown throughout the years since savings banks were established in a very sound manner to the point where they now constitute a much larger, statewide part of the banking business than the banks in the federal system in our state, and now have total deposits of more than 10 billion dollars and, as mentioned by the statement of the Association, have prudently and safely functioned under state supervision for a century and a half.

I will not here recite the history of this great savings bank system, but many famous financial, political, and even judicial, leaders have participated in the founding, perfecting, development and safeguarding of this great system, until it is now in its uniqueness, one of the great banking systems of the nation and the world.

I am proud to suggest, as the Association does, that only in Massachusetts, not in any of the other 49 states, are depositors in mutual savings banks insured in full by a nonprofit deposit insurance fund created by state law.

To regulate all savings banks in Massachusetts would be to use a handful of banks in the federal system as a pretext for regulating a successful and much larger state banking industry in a manner which would undoubtedly be very harmful to savings banks, and not necessary in any sense to insure soundness and stability of the savings bank system, or indeed to do anything more than create a grossly preferential and discriminatory system which might well militate against our fine, thrift banking institutions the state of Massachusetts throughout the years has so carefully and successfully regulated that the system stands out strikingly by itself from all other thrift institutions in the country.

In the light of these facts, and the general situation, as well as in the interest of the banks and their depositors and the public, and fairness to them, it strikes me that this type of federal regulation would serve no possible, useful purpose of any kind, and it would do much to penalize, set-back and project injurious preferential competition from other banking systems in our state and, as suggested by the Association, undermine an important part of the dual state and federal banking system, whose preservation constitutes such an important principle and desideratum of the American banking structure, since, if duality is to exist, there must be some segment of the banking industry operating under state supervision independent of federal control in the state of Massachusetts.

It would be destructive to our savings banks to impose maximum rates anytime to be sure, but to impose them at the present time in the midst of this distorted economic cycle of bounding, inflated prices and inordinately high, swollen interest rates would be to impose them at the worst possible time of all.

To go into this kind of a change with our eyes wide open at this time, I suggest would be to knowingly disregard danger signs as to the consequences that would be in a sense acting with our eyes closed, and I am sure this great Committee, and none of us here in the Congress, would want to assume responsibility for taking such a step.

I hope that the Committee will carefully read the excellent statement of the Savings Banks Association, which contains full information concerning its organization, scope, service, duties and the uniqueness of its existence, functions and responsibilities, in the banking systems of the country, particularly of our state.

If such a proposal takes effect, it would threaten these Massachusetts banks with a chaotic confrontation that would impose upon them conditions different than any banking system in the country, and that it could well direly threaten their very existence, and the savings bank liquidity, which is the pride of members of the system and our State, and which has been preserved throughout the years by the application of astute management, sound expert judgment and common sense.

In a word, this proposal could well deal a body blow to this admirably sound, stable, well managed system, which has functioned so well throughout the years and which is functioning well now. The change could cause a serious cutback in mortgage loans

which is the very result which S. 2577, taken as a whole, seeks so commendably to prevent, and is indeed of urgent importance to the economy at the earliest moment.

The Massachusetts Savings Banks form the foundation of the home mortgage and real estate industry for millions of citizens of Massachusetts. With over 6.5 billion in mortgages, 4.8 billion in conventional mortgage loans, \$787 million in FHA mortgage loans; and \$907 million in VA mortgage loans all being administered on a sound, solvent, practical basis.

It is interesting to note that these banks have \$1.4 billion dollars invested in out of state VA and FHA home mortgage loans, thus channeling funds in excess of local needs to other areas of the country where capital deficiencies exist.

Above all, and this is exceedingly interesting to me and I am sure to you, in the light of our special interest in low-cost housing programs for the people, the savings banks of Massachusetts are committed to continue their vital support of all these programs and already have substantial investments in the Roxbury section of Boston to mention one area, where low-cost housing has a special urgency to provide for the crying needs of the people of the area that have only recently been recognized as they should have been long ago as worthy and entitled, constitutionally and every other way in our social and economic progress and in every other respect.

If maximum rates are imposed and rates rolled back at this time with reductions in deposits, all this valuable work, which has such a helpful impact on our current social and economic problems would be threatened and its benefits lost or greatly reduced.

Not only the building industry, but the fast growing number of potential, home owners, who are finding mortgage funds scarce would be hurt, handicapped and frustrated, many of them no doubt in irreparable ways, not to speak of deplorable social setbacks.

I will not further comment on maximum interest rates. We all know that these rates are higher than they should be at this time and this is no fault of the savings banks of Massachusetts, or indeed of many other banks, but due rather, to what I believe is exceedingly poor judgment, inept management and incredibly unsound, unwise policies of the Federal Reserve Board and certain national leaders so unwisely approving its unsound policies and actions.

Unlike many other banks, savings banks are paying dividends to their depositors, only from net earnings, after $\frac{1}{4}$ of deposit liability per year is added to surplus. Under such circumstances, it is totally impossible for these banks to pay dividends out of surplus, and certainly that is a sound feasible rule that deserves more widespread application.

These savings banks in Massachusetts are typically and exclusively Massachusetts thrift institutions, and only a small fraction of total deposits stem from out of state sources. If anyone is interested in securing higher rates, they are far more likely to invest in government bonds, now yielding as much as 7% rather than move deposits to Massachusetts.

Notwithstanding the long successful history of Massachusetts Savings Banks, other banks have had a competitive advantage over them for the past ten years, in regard to the growth in size of deposits, and this advantage can be traced largely to more generous laws regarding borrowing, mortgages and the location of branches, and the fact that until recently, savings and loan associations did not have to pay state taxes.

It is stated by the Savings Banks Association of my state that to impose far-reaching, federal regulations on savings banks under section 2A of this pending bill, S. 2577,

in order to correct temporary, competitive imbalance is short-sighted indeed.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board can and should, as FDIC has, create geographical rate relief to its member thrift institutions until present inflationary conditions ease throughout the economy.

And, I may say, gentlemen, that unless something is done to ease the interest rates without further delay this economy, yes, and this social structure of ours will be inviting additional, dangerous, chaotic conditions in this country that will only serve to add to our serious problems and deep concerns.

I urge this fine Committee to give very careful consideration to the views that have been expressed by our unique and successful Savings Banks Association of Massachusetts, to take effective action before it is too late, to avert a most serious threat and immeasurable damage that could be visited upon the savings banks systems in our state, and that could well set off a chain of events that would shake our banking systems to its foundations.

I deeply appreciate your kindness for receiving my views and will sincerely thank you for your help.

LET US GIVE THE POLICEMEN OF THIS COUNTRY OUR FULL SUPPORT

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I insert a remarkable editorial from a recent issue of the Detroit Free Press in the RECORD. This column by Bob Talbert was called to my attention by Jack Stonebraker, a detective sergeant on the Muncie, Ind., police force.

Mr. Stonebraker is national legislative chairman of the Fraternal Order of Police, the only national civilian police organization. He also is president of the FOP Chapter in Muncie.

The FOP has been in existence since 1915 and has 80,000 members in 39 States. The requirement for membership in the FOP is that the man or woman in question be a full-time police officer. Through the leadership of John Harrington, of Philadelphia, national president of the FOP, Anthony Coyne, national secretary, of Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Stonebraker and others, the FOP is drafting a national program aimed at more effective law enforcement, an objective which is important to our national survival. A part of this national program, and a most important part, is adequate pay and better working conditions.

To understand why we as Members of Congress should give the policemen of this country full support, I urge every Member of the House to read carefully the column by Bob Talbert, which is movingly eloquent. Let me quote one paragraph:

His critics and his superiors call his job a profession but never mention that he makes less than most union craftsmen.

Incidentally, the FOP is strongly supporting legislation which is pending before the House Judiciary Committee which would give all police officers killed or disabled in the line of duty the Fed-

eral benefits which the Congress already has given police officers killed or disabled while enforcing Federal statutes. There are more than 125 Members sponsoring the pending bills. I hope that this legislation will pass, and am pleased to be listed among its sponsors.

The article follows:

LET'S CARE ABOUT THIS LOUSY JOB

(By Bob Talbert)

You wouldn't do it for love nor money—take abuse, the hours or the working conditions.

Neither would I.

But thank God he does.

He has the loneliest, dirtiest, toughest job in the goldfish bowl and nobody seems to care any more.

I think it's damn time we did.

"It gets lonely out here," the policeman said. "So lonely, sometimes, you could cry."

No one in the country is being so criticized or analyzed as the law enforcement officer. He has no first name. He's cop and fuzz and blue daddy and John Law or the heat. He's pig and flatfoot and The Man. He's trouble and bad news.

Even if he's a good guy—and often he is—no one ever tells him so.

He associates with criminals and city hall politicians. Ordinary citizens want to see him only when they need him. When he goes to a party his badge gets in the way even if he isn't wearing it.

And what does he get for it?

He gets to miss a lot of weekends and holidays with his family.

He gets to be with pimps and addicts, thieves and bums, winos and con artists, girls with no addresses and men who never had one, liars and cheats, the errant elite and the dregs of Skid Row.

He gets to worry about underfed kids, unloved kids, molested kids, crying kids, homeless kids, kids with broken arms, legs, heads and hearts, kids with scars, sick kids, dying kids and dead kids.

He gets to worry about old people no one wants—the ones who walk the cold streets and try to keep warm in a three-dollar room or maybe die trying to keep warm around the unvented gas heater.

He hits a backyard at two in the morning and never knows who he'll meet—a mad kid with a knife, a pillhead with a razor, an ex-con with nothing to lose and a hate as big as a 38 slug.

He's a little bit taller and stronger than you or me and his eyes are superior, but his education is not.

He finished high school, but he didn't get to college. He's criticized for this, even though he had to go to work and he thought this was a job you could hold your head up on.

His critics and his superiors call his job a profession, but never mention that he makes less than most union craftsmen.

People rank his job 54th on the status chart—right between a playground director and a railroad conductor.

They ask him to be courageous in the face of danger, but to remain calm when he is vilified, cursed, and even struck.

They ask him to deal every day with helpless, broken and enraged people, dispensing decency and dignity in a shabby, smelly office that's too crowded, too noisy and too impersonal.

They ask him to meet all of the community leaders' demands for quality law enforcement and resist the same influential citizens' demands for a double standard of law enforcement.

He doesn't exactly trust the press or anyone under 25. He doesn't think they understand that his job is to enforce the laws, not write them or judge them or change them.

He feels frustrated by legal jungles, paperwork mountains, and an apathetic public.

He lives with the knowledge that his chance of being assaulted during the year is one in eight.

He knows that his family fears for him every minute he's away from home.

He has to do this lousy job because we aren't very nice to each other.

He is needed because of us. Yet we criticize and curse him.

Maybe we had better start caring about him—and ourselves.

Or it will be so "lonely out there" that we can all cry.

NEED FOR A STRONG MERCHANT MARINE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech given recently in Mobile by my good friend and fellow Alabamian (Mr. EDWARDS). He quite clearly expresses the needs of this country for a strong merchant marine in light of the growing Soviet seapower. He is careful to show that these needs are consonant with the overall demands of the country and would harmoniously fit in with overall planning for all contingencies both domestic and foreign.

His remarks were given at the dedication of the U.S.S. *Ortolan*, a catamaran-type submarine rescue ship of the ASR class:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JACK EDWARDS

The sea and man's effort to cope with it, have always been a fascinating subject to me. I don't think there is anyone here today that doesn't thrill to the sight of the surf breaking on the beach. But likewise we know of the terrible devastation that the sea can produce both above and below its surface when the full forces of its fury are unleashed against the civilization built by men. All of us have witnessed the ruins left in the wake of Hurricane Camille. But have you ever thought about how little we know of the depths of the ocean?

Our submarines today, are charting unknown waters in the interests of science and national security. Through generations, the pages of history are full of the efforts of seafaring men and their struggles to return safely to their loved ones. But no country in the world has expended its time and resources to the extent that we have in the United States of America to assure that our brave men of the sea have every chance to return. And this is especially true in the submarine service.

As part of a continuing program to provide safety for men at sea, a new breed of American ships like the U.S.S. *Ortolan* is being built. These support ships are a part of a much needed rescue operation plan involving—among other things—the Deep Submergence Rescue Vehicles of the Navy. These technological advances are designed to prevent the loss of all hands that sometimes occurs when a submarine runs into trouble while submerged.

Next week, in a joint session of the Congress, the astronauts of Apollo 11 will be honored for their magnificent accomplishment in the vast outer reaches of space. And they should be honored because they are heroes in every sense of the word. But their spectacular achievement in July eclipsed the news of another accomplishment that even-

tually may have even greater significance in man's quest for a better way of life. That event is the month long cruise up the Gulf stream by the research submarine the "Ben Franklin." This rather silent, but spectacular feat is part of an ongoing program designed to assure U.S. supremacy in marine technology. But although we have the technology and the potential to be a great maritime power, our lack of strong support for our maritime and shipbuilding industry has put us far behind in international shipping. It may not be as glamorous as space travel; but it is no less important, and more emphasis must be given to it.

Our forefathers earned their living from the sea; and in the early days of this Republic, we were known as a great maritime nation. But today through rising costs and lack of public support, we are losing what I have often referred to as the "Wet War."

A nation's seapower depends on its shipbuilding ability. On the skills of its shipyard workers. On the seamanship of its seafaring men. On the technological advances of its shipyards. On the innovations of its naval architects. All accomplished in a favorable government atmosphere. A nation which attaches no particular importance to its merchant ship construction will slowly lose these talents and skills. Without a doubt this will have an adverse effect on the building of naval ships.

Much of my work in Washington has been aimed at rebuilding our merchant fleet, upgrading shipbuilding skills and assuring first class shipbuilding yards so that we can always have the ability to turn out ships such as the Ortolan.

An now President Nixon has given renewed hope to those of us who have been working for a new shipbuilding program in American shipyards. He has appointed Mrs. Helen D. Bentley as head of the Maritime Commission. Mrs. Bentley is not only knowledgeable in the field of maritime affairs, but is well-known for her hardfought efforts to bring about improvements in the maritime industry. She is one person, I am sure, who will not allow herself to be smothered by the weight of bureaucratic red tape that frequently silences action in Washington. She has already raised her voice in favor of the need to move quickly on the building of modern competitive merchant ships in American shipyards.

One of the most appalling facts about America's merchant ships today is that by 1971 approximately eighty percent will be at least twenty years old. This means that four-fifths of the vessels we depend on to handle our coastal trade and part of our international trade in peacetime, and as back-up shipping in times of international conflicts, will be over their economic life. The fourth arm of defense is fast becoming non-existent. We can't supply the troops fighting in a modern war with broken down ships. We must develop long range plans now to rebuild America's merchant fleet.

Superiority on the seas is a must for a nation which is virtually surrounded by water. The Soviets are beginning to flex their sea power muscle in a dramatic show of strength. Just last month a Soviet naval squadron sailed within a few hundred miles of our shores in the Gulf of Mexico. Under the leadership of Brezhnev and Kosygin, the Soviet Union has realized the strategic value of sea power and are giving top priority to the development of Soviet naval strength at a time when we are reducing ours through direct cuts and a lackadaisical approach to American shipping needs.

The United States must develop a solid commitment in both the public and private sectors. We must strengthen our merchant marine, which serves both sectors, through an increased public investment in shipbuilding. We must reassess our naval military priorities in light of the growing Soviet sea strength. And we must step up our pro-

gram of oceanographic exploration to expand our technical knowledge in this area for its scientific and strategic importance.

There are those in Washington right now, today, who want to cut back drastically on naval ships and military procurement generally. Certainly improvements in defense spending must be made, but we must stand firmly against weakening our overall defense position. And a very important part of a strong national defense posture is a strong naval fleet. The security of our nation demands it; and we must not let a handful of shortsighted Americans whose battle cry is "peace at any cost" put us into a state of unpreparedness.

Yes, we must be strong militarily, and we shall be. We must do everything possible to maintain all aspects of our naval strength—including our merchant marine position. But in making progress, in providing for our security, in developing weapons systems and ship systems, we must be ever mindful of the safety of our men. We must continually improve our ability to come to the aid of a fallen comrade; we must be ready to innovate, to try something new. Such a state of continued concern and preparedness is especially important in aiding those men who meet disaster under the sea. The Ortolan is a giant step in that direction.

Yes, we must have a national commitment which will assure us of continued supremacy on the oceans of the world. The dollars invested will bring multifold returns in jobs, personal income, international payments receipts and national strength and prestige. A lack of commitment to any one of these segments will weaken our overall naval posture.

I believe the Nixon Administration is ready to make such a commitment. And I believe that the past and present efforts of many in the shipbuilding industry show a similar strong commitment. Through such a government-industry partnership working together to build a better navy and merchant marine, we can all help build a better America.

HOT, POLLUTED WATER MIGHT WIPE OUT SALMON

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Peter Tack, professor of fisheries and wildlife at Michigan State University, predicts that Lake Michigan will lose all its trout and salmon population in a few years if 10 nuclear powerplants planned along its shores are permitted to discharge heated water without control.

Dr. Tack is an authority in his field and his views must be given consideration. I find them reported in an article in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., by Frank Mainville, the outdoors editor, published Sunday, September 14, 1969.

Mr. Mainville's article describes the recent death from shock of a number of chinook salmon which had encountered a current of hot water devoid of oxygen discharged from a powerplant. The salmon swam from Lake Michigan where the water was 55 to 65 degrees into Lake Muskegon with water temperatures of 70 to 80 degrees. The proposed nuclear powerplants would raise the temperature of millions of gallons of Lake Michigan water 21.8 degrees.

Before we heedlessly arrange wholesale destruction of fish, I think we ought

to investigate. I have introduced, with Representatives JOSEPH E. KARTH, of Minnesota, and RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of New York, H.R. 1056, which would require Interior Department approval of Federal licenses for construction of any plants which would impound, divert, control, or otherwise modify public waters.

The Lansing State Journal article follows:

HOT, POLLUTED WATER MIGHT WIPE OUT SALMON—TACK PREDICTS LOSS BY 1985

(By Frank Mainville)

Last week's death of chinook salmon in Muskegon Lake may only be a harbinger of days to come when Lake Michigan beaches will be littered with rotting salmon instead of alewives.

John Trimberger, Grand Rapids district fish biologist, says the big kings, already under spawning stress, died of shock when they encountered hot water totally devoid of oxygen below 15 feet downstream from a power plant.

He explains that the chinook were not able to withstand the change from Lake Michigan water of 55 degrees to the low 60s to Muskegon Lake water in the high 70s and low 80s.

Trimberger refuses to speculate what may happen in future years if schools of coho and chinook are met by a hot water barrier from 10 proposed nuclear power plants spewing out millions of gallons of water 21.8 degrees hotter than when taken from Lake Michigan.

No one knows, including fish biologists and engineers, what will happen if these salmon hit a coast-long Gulf Stream-like coastal current.

James Wooley, researcher in Michigan State University's Department of Resource Development, admits location of nuclear power plants on inland bays or rivers could cause serious ecological damage.

"But a generator plant situated on one of the Great Lakes, where there is enough water to dilute the thermal discharge, should cause no ecological effect on the area," he stresses.

However, Dr. Peter Tack, MSU professor of Fisheries and Wildlife, predicts all salmonids—trout and salmon—will be gone from Lake Michigan by 1985, due to pollution and thermal pollution.

Back from a summer of study at the University of Washington's Friday Harbor Laboratory, Tack reports warm water piled up in Puget Sound a few years ago delayed sockeye and chinook salmon runs 10 days. The fish did not run until the water cooled.

Tack is skeptical that Lake Michigan's pollution and thermal pollution problems can be controlled—especially in view of the 10 proposed nuclear power plants.

"I think there is a good possibility that in 10 to 15 years Lake Michigan will have no salmonids—trout or salmon—or whitefish," he stresses.

"We're going to lose the environment for these fish. Even an annual shift of only four or five degrees in Lake Michigan water temperatures will make it unfit."

Tack suggests the newly-completed Platte River Fish Hatchery won't be a waste of taxpayers' money—it can be used to rear trout for inland fisheries if there are still suitable cold water streams and lakes.

"We might have a new Lake Michigan warm water fishery for smallmouth bass—which ordinarily follow trout—or white bass, white perch or possibly walleye or striped bass," he points out.

But the Department of Natural Resources has found walleyes difficult to raise. And 300,000 striped bass fingerlings "borrowed" from South Carolina from a rearing experiment, have died in the state's old Wolf Lake State Fish Hatchery near Kalamazoo.

Thus, after spending millions to introduce the exotic coho and chinook—a feat called the ecological coup of the century—Michigan may in another decade, be spending millions more to introduce a warm water exotic to replace salmon.

Or settle for the white perch, an east coast estuarine fish which has already followed the alewife into Lake Huron. Tack expects it to migrate into Lake Michigan.

"White perch grow to four or five pounds," he explains.

"And they're great fun on a flyrod—from shore."

But salmon fishermen and charter boaters who have spent millions gearing up for big coho and chinook, may not be looking forward to one pound white perch.

Some may even discredit Tack's predictions . . .

But only 12 years ago Dr. George Wallace, MSU ornithologist, almost lost his job because he charged that DDT was killing robins on the campus.

And it took the salmon to prove he was right.

SAFE SKIES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I discussed the deteriorating air safety picture last week at a press conference in New York City.

As the Representative for the district which includes both LaGuardia Airport and a small private airport 2 miles from LaGuardia, I feel a special responsibility for directing the attention of the Federal Aviation Administration and the general public to the serious consequences of allowing over our cities a practically unrestricted mixture of huge, fully loaded jetliners and a variety of smaller planes, with different equipment standards and varying pilot experience training.

I hope we shall not await still another tragic midair collision before requiring the FAA to act decisively to end this inherently dangerous mixture.

My press conference statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

The circumstances surrounding the tragic accident this week in Indianapolis were not unique. When a student pilot, with a meagre 38 hours of flying time, can slam into a fully loaded airliner on its landing approach, something drastic is wrong with the nation's air safety system.

There are over five thousand near mid-air collisions each year in which we barely escape a repeat of that Indianapolis tragedy. In New York alone, there were over 600 near mid-air collisions last year.

It is only a matter of time until these potential accidents become major national tragedies.

This situation must be corrected immediately. The federal government—designer and operator of the air safety system—bears a heavy responsibility for past accidents and for reforming the system.

On August 31, 1967, I reported on near misses over New York from January 1965 to June 1967. In that 30-month period, there were 80 near misses reported over New York. The sharp increase in near misses over the New York area—from less than three a month

to fifty a month—is an indictment of alarming proportions.

Right now, private planes are taking off and landing from a private airport in this city located two miles from LaGuardia Airport, one of the nation's busiest terminals. There is no control tower at this small secondary airport, which is operated on city-owned land. At night, pilots who want to land at this small airport have to request that the lights be turned on.

This inherently dangerous situation exists at Flushing Airport in Queens which has been in operation since the pioneer days of aviation. No one in the federal, state or local government has served notice that this open-cockpit, flying scarf brand of flying should be outlawed within our city.

The FAA knows well, as its latest report indicates, that general aviation—the private pilots—are the principal cause of mid-air collisions. A private aircraft was involved in every one of the 34 mid-air collisions occurring in the United States in 1968. Commercial airliners were involved in only three instances. In the latest FAA report, 62 of New York's 74 "hazardous" near misses involved general aviation.

The problem is escalating because of the increased number of people and planes using the nation's limited airspace. In the past six years the number of licensed pilots jumped some 240,000. There are now 618,000 licensed pilots who fly 127,000 airplanes. The vast majority are private pilots flying private planes.

Last year the FAA tried with faint heart to take on the general aviation industry. It failed. It proposed that 33 major airports and the areas immediately surrounding them be excluded to all planes except those actually landing or taking off from these busy fields. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), the voice of general aviation, launched a massive campaign against this limited FAA proposal. The proposal was dropped and a mild limitation on five airports was imposed. This, too, met such opposition from general aviation that it was weakened, then delayed in execution, and finally made a temporary measure, to end on December of this year.

It is elementary that small private planes, scantily equipped and flown by pilots with wide variations of experience and training, must be kept to an absolute minimum over our cities. It may be necessary to ban them from our major urban areas.

FAA has avoided making this painful decision. It is under constant and heavy pressures from general aviation to avoid these judgments. The federal government neglects its duties to provide air safety to the general public—and particularly to the public which never flies but lives beneath the present uncoordinated and haphazard pattern of air traffic.

IMMEDIATE STEPS THAT CAN BE TAKEN

I. We must restrict private planes over metropolitan areas. We must establish a system of priorities for scheduled airline traffic which recognizes the inherent danger in mixing small planes with giant airliners over urban areas. Only with such a system of priorities can we properly represent the 99 per cent of the population which is outside of general aviation.

This proposal does not envision the abolition of private flying. Even over metropolitan areas, general aviation has rights which must be maintained. But general aviation to be permitted to fly over our cities must meet the same pilot and equipment standards as the airlines. Those standards are necessary to insure the safety of airline passengers and of urban residents whose lives are jeopardized by the present haphazard system of air safety regulation.

II. FAA should immediately proceed to phase out those inherently dangerous situations where a hazardous mixture of general

aviation and air carrier traffic is imposed on certain cities by the location of smaller airports near large air terminals.

One key conclusion of the FAA report bears on this recommendation:

"(1) The proximity of airports in the high density areas creates a traffic flow problem, particularly when an adjacent airport(s) serving light aircraft is a non-tower airport . . ."

This is exactly the situation which exists at Flushing Airport.

There are many other cities where the Flushing-LaGuardia problem exists. Ultimately, the only answer is the closing of such secondary airports where they interfere with safety at major terminals.

New peripheral facilities must then be provided for general aviation which will keep their traffic pattern well away from the cities.

III. The Development and installation of an airborne collision avoidance system should have the most urgent priority within the Federal Aviation Administration. A system already exists which will warn pilots of impending danger from other aircraft and tell them what evasive action to take. It is costly, but economically feasible for large commercial planes. FAA leadership in encouraging such systems and broadening their potential use has been half-hearted.

To insure that these recommendations receive consideration at the highest level, I have today sent the following telegram to President Nixon:

"The tragic accident in Indiana this week was the product of a defective air safety system. It will be repeated across the country unless you direct specific and immediate changes in that system. Private aviation must be restricted, no matter how painful or unpopular this decision. Hazardous private airports must be eliminated. A collision avoidance system, which is technically feasible today, must be installed in every aircraft.

"I urge that you direct the Federal Aviation Administration to proceed immediately to carry out its duties to the general public whose interests in air safety are no less real because they do not own or fly their own planes.

"Air safety is both a prime federal responsibility and a basic citizen right."

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Tollie Bailey, Pfc. David S. Seldon, and Pfc. Israel Martinez, Jr., three fine young men from Maryland, were killed in Vietnam recently. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM: TOLLIE BAILEY, DAVID SELDON, ISRAEL MARTINEZ KILLED

Three more Marylanders have been killed in Vietnam, the Pentagon reported yesterday.

Army Pfc. Tollie Bailey, a native of Baltimore, was killed September 7 when he was mistaken for the enemy and fired upon by "friendly forces" while on a combat operation in Quang Ngai province in Northern South Vietnam.

KILLED BY BOOBY TRAP

Marine Pfc. David S. Seldon, of Quantico in Wicomico county, was killed Sep-

tember 10 when a booby trap exploded at his feet while on patrol 5 miles north of Vandegrift Combat Base in Quang Tri province, South Vietnam.

Private Seldon was a member of N Company, 3d Battalion, 3d Marine Division. He is survived by his parents Mr. and Mrs. Shelton B. Seldon, of Quantico.

Another Baltimore soldier, Army Pfc. Israel Martinez, Jr., died August 30 as a result of injuries received when a military vehicle that he was driving overturned while descending a hill during a combat mission in Pleiku province in north central South Vietnam.

Private Bailey, 20, who lived at 747 W. Saratoga Street, graduated from City College in 1967 and participated in football there. He was a member of the young adult choir of the Mount Olive Freewill Baptist Church in Baltimore.

After graduating, Private Bailey worked for two years as a machinist. On July 6, 1968, he married the former Ramona Griffin, and was drafted three weeks later.

"He didn't want to go, but he knew he had to," his mother, Mrs. Clifford Loving, said.

Private Bailey is also survived by his stepfather, Clifford Loving; four sisters, and one brother.

Private Martinez, 20, who lived at 5132 Alberta avenue, was born in Puerto Rico, but at the age of 2 moved to Great Neck, N.Y.

ACTIVE IN BOXING CLUBS

During his school years, Private Martinez was very active in school boxing clubs and enjoyed ice skating.

After his schooling he joined the Army and did a tour of duty in Vietnam with the Army and did a tour of duty in Vietnam with the 173d Airborne Division.

After returning from Vietnam, he was stationed at Fort Meade and on one trip to Baltimore met Miss Mildred Smelser who was then a hostess at the USO here.

A few months later they were married, but Private Martinez had already enlisted for another tour of duty in Vietnam.

Mrs. Martinez stated that her husband often said of the war: "We have a cause; we have a reason."

She added: "He was proud to serve."

Private Martinez is also survived by his mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. Israel Aviles, of Great Neck, New York.

PLAYED IN SCHOOL BAND

Private Seldon, 20, a native of Wicomico county, attended Wicomico High School and played in the band there.

Upon graduation, he went to Washington and worked as a barber for a year before he was drafted.

Private Seldon was an enthusiastic hunter and fisherman.

In addition to his parents he is survived by three brothers and two sisters.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL III BECOMES STOCKBROKER

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Thomas P. O'Neill III has just passed, with high marks, his examinations to become a stockbroker on the New York Exchange.

This seems entirely appropriate, inasmuch as his father is a fellow named "Tip," our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS "TIP" O'NEILL.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the President of the United States addresses the General Assembly of the United Nations, our best hope for a peaceful world. I for one believe, and I hope the President shares my belief, that the United States must play a more active role in support of the United Nations and must work toward making that organization a true international peacekeeping organization.

In line with my beliefs and hopes I addressed the following letter to the President, making known my concern and my suggestions. I submit the letter for inclusion in this RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your decision to address the United Nations was an admirable one and I would hope that you will take this opportunity to express the United States' determination to aid in the establishment of international order—a necessity today, when wars flourish and threaten every continent of this weary globe. Any one of these conflicts could explode into a world conflagration, ending the history of man on this planet.

As one who is deeply concerned about this world, and about the survival of all the people in it, may I suggest that it is time for the United States to act firmly to strengthen the United Nations and its peace keeping operations. I believe there are certain specific areas in which the United States could and should propose United Nations actions.

First, I would hope you will reaffirm and strengthen our support of the United Nations. Specifically, I would hope you will stress the importance of the United Nation's role in solving the current Arab-Israeli crisis, the importance of keeping the peace along the Soviet-China border, and the role it should play in bringing peace to Vietnam.

The experience of the years since World War II makes clear that peace can be achieved only through an international organization. I would urge that the United States now clear its recognition of that fact of life.

Second, I would hope that you will suggest the United Nations be the agency to oversee arms control reduction. Obviously an impartial and international body is needed to create the trust needed for world wide arms control.

Third, I would hope that you will announce the United States' determination to help finance the new and important programs the United Nations must undertake. (Last year's budget of the UN was \$164 million, about what the United States spends every two days in the Vietnam war.) If through the United Nations we can bring peace to Vietnam and stop any future Vietnams, then the economy of such an effort, in money and lives, is obvious.

Mr. President, I know that we share the same concerns about peace and about the need to assure a fit world for our children and our children's children. I would hope

that you will take this opportunity to outline broad and bold new policy towards peace utilizing the potential of the United Nations.

Sincerely,

DON EDWARDS,
Member of Congress.

VIOLENCE ON CAMPUS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to acknowledge an eloquent address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri, Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON, at the Missouri Military Academy commencement exercises, Mexico, Mo., May 25, 1969.

In the speech, Senator EAGLETON called for a tempered rational approach to the expression of academic freedom and believes that violence in and of itself is anathema to freedom of this expression.

The Missouri Academy is one of the outstanding military schools in the Nation and is a member of the Association of Military Colleges and Schools in the United States. The executive director of the organization has made available the text of the speech which I would like to submit for the review of the Members of this House:

(Speech of Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON)

VIOLENCE ON CAMPUS

We have witnessed in this decade the growth of violence throughout American life—from Vietnam to the streets of Watts, from Harvard Quad to the Pentagon parking lot. The latest to be shaken by violence are our educational institutions.

Campus unrest and student protest are not unique products of this country or even of this age. University students in medieval Europe and early America were often more renowned for brawling and roistering than for serious academic accomplishments. The panty raids which seemed to erupt each Spring during the 1950's may have been sparked by nothing more than youthful exuberance, but they occasionally became full-fledged riots. And universities as far removed as Paris and Tokyo have been forced to close within the past year because of student take-overs by force.

Historical and geographic perspective provide little comfort, though, for the millions of Americans who are deeply disturbed by the new violence on our campuses. They see in the campus disturbances of the last several years a new element which goes far beyond the traditional restlessness of youth. The theme of campus rebels today appears to be: "If this place won't operate my way, it won't operate at all."

They are willing to use the most violent and obnoxious means to reach their goals: seizure of university buildings, disruption of classes, incarceration of administrators, and silencing of those who disagree.

These tactics are anathema to the principles of academic freedom and freedom of expression which underlie the position of colleges and universities as centers of uninhibited scholarship and informed discussion. They can in no way be justified as a means of securing rights denied or protesting inequities gone unremedied: the violent disruption of the university is, of itself, an infringement of the right of professors to teach, of scholars to pursue the advancement of

knowledge, and of students to learn, free from unreasonable pressures or interference. And I fear that this self-seeking violence will produce a reaction from which we and all our institutions will suffer.

To be sure, there are many legitimate needs and aspirations of students which have too long gone unheeded by some institutions and administrators. Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch stated to a Congressional subcommittee recently that: "We cannot assume, out of hand, that campus conflict is simply conflict for its own sake: in many instances it is solidly based in legitimate grievances."

Moreover, the unrest evidenced by students is, to an extent, a manifestation of conditions in our society which should alarm us all.

Young people see, perhaps more acutely than their elders, poverty amidst plenty, pollution of our environment, racial conflict and injustice, war and the threat of more war, a distortion of Governmental priorities—all adding to a general discontent with the quality of American life. Their apparent inability to affect these conditions contributes to a widespread feeling of frustration and, as we have seen, may lead to violence.

But giving due credit to the idealism motivating a large proportion of the campus rebels does not mean that violent and disruptive tactics can be countenanced. Even the most laudable aims of a college protest do not provide a license to destroy.

There are those who would write off this entire protest movement by reciting statistics to show that only a fractional few of the nation's 6,700,000 college students can be classed as destructive radicals—an undeniable and certainly commendable fact. But I think this approach is deficient in that it promotes a kind of complacency, a feeling that one of these days students will return to "normal."

It overlooks the equally undeniable and equally commendable fact that a great majority of this generation of students has expressed a deep concern and sympathy for many of the same causes that have been espoused by the vocal minority. Thousands of students followed Senator McCarthy in a campaign which ultimately transformed the American political scene. Thousands more joined with Robert Kennedy in his quest for a "newer world." Not surprisingly, they and others like them have carried back to their campuses and communities a conviction that people can and must have a voice in the functioning of the institutions of our society.

Those of you who will soon be entering college can have a profound impact on the course of this movement. Its success will be determined largely by the extent to which your responsible leadership can prevail over the demagoguery of those few who measure political victories by the number of heads split open in violent confrontations.

I am not one who sees only violence in militancy, or conspiracy in dissent, but I am one who deeply believes that constructive and lasting change can be accomplished by peaceful and democratic means. We can work to end the war, to aid oppressed minorities and decaying cities—and we certainly can use the energy and ideas and support of youth in doing so.

Young people understandably are inclined to dismiss summarily those who advise patience and deliberation. They have been hearing the counsels of caution all their lives from their parents, their teachers, their elders generally. But, for a while, there was a man young people listened to, a man who earned their highest admiration and confidence. And Robert Kennedy said it better than any of us: "Patience is the greatest, and perhaps the hardest lesson youth must learn. . . . New voices will be heard if they are raised in a responsible manner, not in a harangue, not in shouts of violence, but as part of a reasoned dialogue."

CXV—1635—Part 19

SOUTH EL MONTE—BEST SISTER CITY PROJECT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the very special community accomplishments of the citizens and local officials of one small city in the 29th Congressional District of California, which I represent. I think the people of this community have shown, over the years, a community spirit and a will for civil achievement that sets an example for our local communities, large and small, across the Nation.

I am speaking of the city of South El Monte, Calif.

A quite large delegation of city officials and community representatives from South El Monte have been in Washington this week to receive a national award for their city from the Town Affiliation Association. This is the national organization of cities in the United States engaged in sister city programs with foreign cities around the world. South El Monte was selected for the award for conducting "the best single project" in sister city relationships among cities under 25,000 population.

I might point out that South El Monte was selected for this award as a result of its community effort, in cooperation with its sister city of Gomez Palacio, Durango, Mexico, in obtaining a very badly needed fire engine for the Gomez Palacio Fire Department, and getting the fire engine delivered across the border into Mexico, despite considerable barriers of redtape and official restrictions that our Federal Governments seem to create in such circumstances.

In addition to the securing and delivery of the fire engine—which was a considerable feat in itself for these two small communities—the successful and cooperative effort engaged in by the citizens of the two communities has succeeded in establishing a much greater and closer bond of friendship and appreciation between them—which is what our sister city programs are all about, of course.

But another reason that I am making a special effort today to call attention to the accomplishment of this city of South El Monte is that this latest recognition, extended when the Town Affiliation Association presented its national awards here last night, is but one in a continuing series of civic achievements and accomplishments that South El Monte has realized in recent years.

It is the Sixth National Achievement Award extended to the city for various programs of civic accomplishment within less than 5 years.

In 1965, South El Monte won the first place award for civic improvement by the National Cleanup Paintup Fixup Bureau for the best community improvement in its category. This was for its accomplishments in 1964.

In 1966, the city won the same first place civic achievement award for the

second year in a row, and in the same year was the recipient of the National Trigg Trophy, which is presented to the one city in the Nation, regardless of population size, that is judged to have shown the greatest community improvement and civic achievement during the preceding year.

In 1967, South El Monte was an All-America City finalist in the National League of Cities competitions.

In 1968, it was recipient of a first place award for highway beautification, presented by our U.S. Department of Highways.

And now, this year, South El Monte is the recipient of the Town Affiliation Award for the best single project in its population class under the sister city program.

For a city of only 12,000, or for any city of any size, I believe that is quite a record of civic accomplishment, and one that speaks very highly of the citizens and officials of this community.

Of course, the delegation of city representatives here from South El Monte to receive their city's award last night represents only a small fraction of the civic-minded people of South El Monte who have engaged in their community improvement programs and have made all these awards possible. But since this delegation was here in the Nation's Capital, representing all their fellow citizens from South El Monte, I would like to have their names placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They include: Mayor and Mrs. Max Shapiro, Vice Mayor and Mrs. Frank Stiles, Councilman and Mrs. Vern Allen, Councilman and Mrs. Tommy Duncan, Councilman and Mrs. Joe Vargas, their Sister City President and Mrs. Don Wright, Vice President and Mrs. John Potter, Vice President and Mrs. John Wiezbiski, Protocol Officer and Mrs. George Voigt, Liaison Officer and Mrs. Joe Olivares—who is also the national president of the United States-Mexico Sister City Association—Mr. and Mrs. Gene Budinger, Mrs. Della Martinez, and Mrs. Reina Lampasana.

Also with the delegation, from Gomez Palacio, Mexico, has been El Presidente Municipal and Senora Gustavo Elizondo Villarreal.

CRIME A NATIONAL DISGRACE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a very serious note to call the attention of my colleagues to action which is desperately needed. I refer to the national disgrace of crime.

Despite the fact that the President, Members of the Congress, law-enforcement officers, and the irate, confused, frustrated citizens have all declared with a loud and unanimous voice that crime is one of the most important problems to be solved, virtually nothing has been done to solve it. And, as I see it now, it appears that nothing will be done in proportion to the immediate need. I can-

not understand and, frankly, I am frustrated as to why the business of solving this problem is not being given the highest priority.

As the world watches this spectacle of rampant, unsolved crime, it is beginning to form an opinion that America is a crime-laden Nation, crumbling internally with a problem we are unable to solve. Our astronauts can walk on the moon, but our citizens cannot walk safely on the streets of Washington.

Other nations ask "How can a Nation seek law and order abroad when it cannot maintain law and order among its own people?"

It is a legitimate question in face of the facts.

But even more important than world opinion is the right of every citizen to protection and freedom from crime. It is the first duty of an ordered society to guarantee the peace and safety which result from laws and their enforcement. To do otherwise results in chaos.

A constituent of mine, a lawyer, in his massive frustration, has written a letter to me and to the President describing an armed robbery in a place of business which took place a few blocks from the White House. Though two of the robbers were apprehended and identified by the victims, the Washington, D.C., police did nothing. They refused to arrest the men identified as the robbers. It appears that even some of our law enforcement officers are enveloped by an aura of fear—fear which stems from intimidation and the vague interpretation of the laws. This unfortunate situation seems to bring our police the choice between adverse press and citizen protest and running a legal obstacle course or turning the criminals loose.

What a deplorable state of affairs. What a mockery of justice which erodes the public confidence in our police and debases their morale. The effects are obvious for all to see. Read the statistics. Ask your friends who have suffered crime. Ask your neighbors. Take an opinion poll among your constituents. The whole Nation is racked with fear of nightfall. Americans are frustrated, bewildered, and angry.

Yet, our efforts to solve this problem, which warrants the highest of priorities, seem to make no headway. Are we to let this cancer grow until it destroys us. This problem can and must be solved or America will become a land of vigilantes.

I request that my colleagues take note of a letter which one of my distinguished constituents, attorney Walter L. Green, wrote to President Nixon concerning the crime recently committed in Washington to which I alluded earlier. It dramatically presents the citizens' voice calling upon us to solve the crime problem in Washington, D.C., and in the Nation.

The letter follows:

GREEN, BABCOCK & DUKES,

Hyattsville, Md., September 16, 1969.

In re Law and Order in the District of Columbia—Where is it?

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Armed robbery repeated, repeated and repeated again, makes

it very difficult to operate the Ebbitt Hotel which is located at 10th & H Streets, NW., in Washington, only a few blocks from the White House, your own residence as President of the United States, and only a few blocks from the Capitol of the United States. Is not this to the shame of a once great city and of a great nation?

This, however, seems almost inconsequential when I am told by the Police Department of the District of Columbia that there were 360 armed robberies reported in the District of Columbia for the first 14 days of September, which if continued at that rate will probably exceed the 714 armed robberies committed in the District of Columbia during the month of August of this year.

In coming to my office this morning I heard over the radio that two men were shot in the District of Columbia last night while resisting robberies being perpetrated by armed hold-up men. In the Washington Post of yesterday morning the Ebbitt Hotel robbery was not even mentioned in the crimes that filled one-fourth of page C-2 of that paper.

In a previous robbery at the Ebbitt about three months ago, our night clerk was shot. Besides another hold-up in the meantime and an attempted hold-up, we have also had one employee mugged and robbed in broad daylight two blocks from the hotel, and in addition to this, within the past month and a half we had a customer assaulted in an attempted robbery and he suffered a broken jaw. On August 15th our night clerk was held up and robbed.

In the robbery that occurred Sunday night there were four employees present, with an armed guard that had been employed. This did not deter four thugs from entering the place and robbing it of substantial receipts necessary to pay the employees and the operating expenses of the hotel. Under these circumstances how can a business operate in the District of Columbia?

Incidentally, we have operated this business for the past fifteen years, and never has it been as bad as it is today. In your campaign for the Presidency we vigorously supported you, although we were of another party, and we did this not only because of long admiration for you, but primarily because of your advocacy of law and order and your expressions on the war issue.

We, of course, realize your difficulties in bringing about your desired goals, but looking at the District of Columbia scene from July 26, 1926, when I arrived in Washington the first time, I can see personally that it has never been worse. There must be a cause to produce this effect, and somewhere there must be a remedy for the situation.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,
WALTER L. GREEN.

EAST TENNESSEE WELL
REPRESENTED

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to serve with the Representatives JOHN J. DUNCAN, JAMES H. QUILLEN, and BILL BROCK, from eastern Tennessee for the past 4½ years. All three are able, personable gentlemen who represent their districts well. With U.S. Senator HOWARD BAKER, they constitute a strong team dedicated to the service of the people of eastern Tennessee.

A recent article in the Knoxville News-Sentinel crossed my desk, I was so im-

pressed by it that I include it in the RECORD:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Sept. 14, 1969]

EAST TENNESSEE WELL REPRESENTED

East Tennessee's Representatives in Congress, John J. Duncan and James H. Quillen are deserving of pats on the back for the positions they have taken recently on current legislation. Both have come to the support of the bill exempting certain joint newspaper operations from the antitrust laws.

And additionally Duncan has called for an investigation of the Small Business Administration which lately has been found to have made loans "to criminals and as political favors to individuals with little assets."

Duncan and Quillen are on sound ground in their support of the Newspaper Preservation Act, a bill which would recognize the financial impracticability of two newspapers operating in separate plants in some cities whereas by combining mechanical, sales and circulation operations, but maintaining editorial competition, such as is done by The News-Sentinel and Journal in Knoxville, both papers could be preserved. Quillen testified that in his opinion at least one newspaper each in Knoxville, Nashville and Bristol would have to go out of business if they were forced to separate their physical operations.

Twenty-two cities in the United States are supplied by 44 newspapers publishing in such combinations as is done in Knoxville. With the support of such Representatives as Duncan and Quillen, and approximately 100 others, there is hope the continuity of competitive editorial voices may be preserved.

Duncan's call for an investigation of SBA comes after revelation of a \$75,000 guarantee of a \$100,000 loan to a company headed by a Canadian who has been arrested in a case involving illegal transportation of \$150,000 in stolen jewelry. Other SBA-guaranteed loans to questionable people and companies earlier combine to support Duncan's call for an investigation.

With such representatives as these, plus the unannounced projection of the other East Tennessee Representative, Bill Brock, into a governor's race, and Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. coming to the fore as possible successor to Republican leader Sen. Dirksen, it makes us feel we are in pretty good hands in the nation's Capitol.

REDUCING FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION WILL NOT STIMULATE A VIGOROUS HOUSING UNIT BUILDING PROGRAM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on September 4, the President announced a 75-percent reduction in new contracts for Government construction. This action is shortsighted and will have a disastrous impact on the general economy and a specific sector of the economy.

In his statement, the President said that he was taking this action to redirect the energies of the construction industry into home and apartment building. I submit that this justification is a deceit.

Finally, it is clear that the President's order is a punitive instrument directed at building tradesmen who may not fit

comfortably into the much-discussed "new Republican majority."

We Democrats have been accused of a predilection for inflation and I agree that the current annual 6-percent rate of inflation is excessive and thrusts us forward on a self-destructive cycle. Rising wages are wiped out by rising costs; the dollar is weakened, the frustration of the workingman mounts on discovery that the extra dollars in his pocket can buy no more.

On the other hand, Republican money managers have for years fatalistically flirted with recession. As much as they may protest, their attempts to regulate the economy, to control inflation have led inevitably to unemployment and recession. I fear that the present administration has launched the Nation on a rollercoaster ride which may soon plunge into the trough characterized by too little money, too few jobs, and too little bread.

Typically, in announcing the reduction, the administration refused to classify the order as an anti-inflationary device. Rather, it chose to suggest that this manipulation would release construction resources to the task of providing needed housing units.

Does the administration believe that we are so naive as to believe this? More alarming is the possibility that the administration itself may believe this transparent nonsense. If this be the case, Nixon's vaunted redirection for the 1970's may be an aimless stagger on an arid plain.

For the fact of the matter is simply this: Tight money, soaring land values, and skyrocketing costs of building materials have become the real obstacles to a vigorous housing unit building program. And if the President and Dr. Arthur F. Burns, his counselor, doubt this, they need only ask the father of two looking for mortgage money or the homebuilder in the market for building supplies. Frankly, it is inconceivable to me that the administration can really believe, in this year of the 8½-percent prime lending rate, that the demands of Federal construction have siphoned off resources needed for home and apartment building.

I believe the administration is more sophisticated than this—for the Nation's sake I hope it is—and that it chose the rhetoric of social welfare rather than the dusty prose of despair to again depress the economy. Some doubts linger.

These doubts are fueled by Dr. Burns' sanguine statement to the press that he doubted the President's order would create unemployment in the construction industry.

James Leo Laughlin, former business manager, and Thomas J. Magrann, business manager of the Building and Construction Trades Council of Philadelphia and vicinity have estimated that 10,000 workers in the five-county Philadelphia area will be adversely affected by this order in the next 6 months. The extent of the impact of this order on my area of the Nation as well as others depends on just what construction will be affected. I urge the Bureau of the Budget

to soon provide Congress with a region-by-region breakdown of this impact.

Dr. Burns also clearly placed the blame for rising construction costs on the wage demands of building tradesmen. He assiduously neglected to include land and materials costs and the tight money market in this assessment. The trade unionist has bargained for equity in the economy and if Dr. Burns thinks he has been too successful, I suggest he discuss with the blue collar father of two the difficulty of finding mortgage money. I assure him this would not be an academic discussion.

If the Nixon administration is honestly interested in stimulating the homebuilding industry, I urge the President to use his influence to reduce high interest rates, release Federal land for public use, and to regulate the costs of building materials. He is deceiving himself and the Nation if he thinks penalizing building tradesmen will do any more than put thousands of men out of work and start the long nosedive toward recession.

IMPORT QUOTAS AND FOREIGN TRADE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 12466, that would establish import quotas in the leather footwear industry. I have previously explained the present state of affairs, which is, in brief, that the shoe markets of the United States are being subject to a deluge of foreign imports. I have also explained that my proposed limitations are necessary for the continued health of this domestic industry.

There has been criticism of restrictions on trade since the time of Adam Smith's "The Wealth of Nations," which first appeared in 1776. The ideas set forth in that treatise were lucid and have had a profound influence on the course of Western economic society. At the same time, one can no more form a truly knowledgeable opinion of modern international economics from the writings of Adam Smith than one can claim to understand the machinations of the Soviet Union from a reading of Karl Marx's "Das Kapital."

I doubt if there are many individuals that would seriously contest these statements. Indeed, the remark can be extended to more sophisticated modern approaches. The instructors of beginning economics students at one American university announce that their pupils will spend 1 year learning the fundamental theories of modern economics—the rest of their undergraduate careers will be passed in learning why these theories are not applicable most of the time.

I view with some alarm, then, the unthinking use of the labels "protectionist" and "free trader" in discussions of the curtailment of imports. These are terms of the 19th century, terms which are left over from a time when Congress made tariffs to restrict trade rather than establishing quotas. Even when used casually,

they reflect a bias of mind. They cloud thinking with extraneous affectual associations, such as greedy and ignorant financiers seeking to pad their profit margins at the expense of an unknowing American public.

These associations impair an objective consideration of the problem at hand. First and foremost, we are not dealing with shady procedures that favor inferior products. Our products are on a par with or better than our competitors, if this bears mention. The real issue is jobs—employment opportunities for unskilled and semiskilled workers. These are the proverbial "little men," and it is they who will suffer if our shoe industry begins to die. Remember also that the proposed restrictions are not padding for the pockets of incompetent producers. They are merely sufficient to allow American leather goods to compete with the powers of cheaper foreign labor, whose advantageous position has been enhanced by the ravages of inflation.

The nature of this employment is also noteworthy. The unskilled or semiskilled labor used by the shoe industry would eventually, if employed at all, most likely be employed in the service sector of our economy. This is to say that it would be least likely to be in a position to assist our balance of payments deficit. Indeed, the transfer of labor from the shoe industry to the service sector would most assuredly result in a poorer payments position, simply because more American dollars would be leaving the country to pay for footwear.

It has no doubt become clear that the greatest stumbling block in Smith's analysis is the integration of foreign trade into national policy, accompanied by the modern government's conscious decision to intervene in the operation of the national economy. If we are to be concerned about employment and the living standard, we cannot always opt for unlimited free trade—and I believe that any examination of the current state of government interference in foreign commerce would substantiate this contention by showing that we have not done so. We cannot afford a credulous faith in free international trade, primarily because there is no such thing.

I think that there is a tendency to ignore the fact that the United States is not alone in considering trade policy as a dependent component of national economic policy. Japan, for instance, embargoes the import of American bovine leather despite the fact that it would be a superior value on Japanese markets. At the same time, we permit the Japanese to export to us a wide variety of leather goods, from shoes to baseball gloves. Japan continues to develop her inferior, but protected, leather industry. She does it because it is a national policy to absorb certain grades of labor skills.

Beyond these considerations of the relation of trade to national policy, there is a new technological situation. Sophisticated technological capabilities are no longer the prerogative of any one nation. While it is true that there remain industries in which the United States is perpetually in the worldwide vanguard, the rapid diffusion of knowledge in today's

world does not permit us to exploit any single advantage for long, if indeed that advantage has not already been adopted in a foreign country. Our ancestors took great pains to smuggle industrial processes out of England; with the present state of communications, the task is far easier. We may lead perennially in capital resources, but we fool ourselves if we think that we have a monopoly on brilliance or ingenuity.

Finally, if we are justly concerned with our own balance-of-payments deficit, we should do something now, before the problem reaches disaster proportions. It makes no sense to leave ourselves open to an eventual apocalypse of blind isolationism—I raise the specter because I think the leather industry foreshadows problems for other sectors of American manufacturing—when moderate and calculated restraint at this time could restore a balance.

As when I spoke on this topic previously, I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to place footwear controls high on their list of legislative priorities.

THE LONG-RANGE EFFECT OF TAX REFORM PROPOSALS AFFECTING COLLEGES AND FOUNDATIONS MERITS PRUDENT REVIEW

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably, the great and overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress and the American people are extremely gratified that the Congress is now finally engaged in carrying out its imperative duty to equitably reform our discriminatory and antiquated tax system.

On the whole, those of us in the Congress who have long advocated a careful review and revision of the present tax structure, in order to eliminate unwarranted and unjustified privilege, preference, and discrimination, were very pleased when this House took its first step in all our history to achieve equitable tax reforms when we approved the Tax Reform Act of 1969 last August 6.

At that time, while we expressed agreement with most of the major provisions of the bill, many of us also expressed some misgivings about a few projected reforms in the bill, such as the long-range effect of the recommended restrictions upon charitable contributions that could adversely affect our educational, historical, and cultural institutions. While the Congress certainly does have the clear and urgent duty to expeditiously and equitably reform our entire tax system, we also have the further obligation of trying to be as sure as we can that in legislatively seeking the correction of an apparent abuse we do not, in reality, tend to create a greater and more substantial evil.

For advice and guidance against falling into such legislative error we look, of course, to the voice and testimony of the authorities in the particular fields. Prac-

tically every expert and authority in our educational, historical, and cultural areas have registered their strongest convictions that the proposed tax treatment, in H.R. 13270, as passed in the House on August 6, of gifts of appreciated property to tax-exempt institutions is against the public interest since it would make it extremely difficult for colleges, universities, libraries, museums, and other public and private institutions to secure substantial private donations.

I know that the Members of Congress are deeply interested in trying to prevent any unwitting visitation of major hardships upon these institutions and, indeed, any other individual or organization, in our continuing action on tax reform legislation.

In recognition of that interest and concern, I am pleased to include, at this point, a very timely editorial on the effect of tax reform proposals upon colleges and foundations that appeared in the September 20, 1969, issue of the magazine, *America*. The article follows:

TAXES: COLLEGES AND FOUNDATIONS

The merits of President Nixon's package of tax reform proposals are certain to be explored at length in the hearings now being conducted by the Senate Finance Committee. Two of the President's recommendations, however, deserve immediate endorsement.

The first is the retention of the present tax treatment of gifts of appreciated property to tax-exempt institutions. The House bill would include appreciation on such property in the limit on tax preferences and the allocation of deductions. Under the House version, colleges and universities, libraries and museums, would find it increasingly difficult to secure major private donations.

Since large gifts of appreciated property involve real financial sacrifice by the donors, even though the gifts reduce their tax bills (the reduction in the tax is always far less than the value of the appreciated property), the tax motive for eliminating abuse of the deduction simply does not exist in this case. Moreover, the government is not losing money as a result of this deduction: the loss in tax revenue is more than offset by the gain in total funds committed to public purposes.

Secondly, the President's proposal for a 2-per-cent "supervisory tax" on foundations is much more consistent with the principle of tax exemption than the House bill's imposition of a 7.5 per cent "income tax." Governmental supervision of foundation finances will always be necessary, even if the foundations laudable efforts at self-policing become a reality. It is reasonable for the government to require the foundations to pay a "supervisory tax" (or better, as some have suggested, an annual registration fee) to defray the costs of routine auditing and inspection programs. It is not, however, in the public interest for the government to impose an income tax on funds already devoted to the common welfare.

INTRODUCTION, AS COSPONSOR WITH MRS. DWYER, OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 13865, the Consumer Protection Act of 1969, identical

to H.R. 13793, introduced on Monday by the gentlewoman from New Jersey, the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER. Its main purpose is to give statutory authority, and broad but specific responsibilities, to an office in the White House which would represent, and fight for, the consumer interest in every aspect of government.

It would not create, as some have proposed, a Department of Consumer Affairs with regulatory powers. I have not introduced, cosponsored, or supported any of the bills to create such a Department. In April 1966, in testimony before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I discussed my strong reservations about the idea of a Cabinet department which would be assigned responsibilities for administration of some or all the multitudinous consumer or consumer-related programs of the Federal Government. I am submitting that 3-year-old statement for inclusion as part of my remarks today, because it is, I think, relevant now to the bill Mrs. DWYER has developed and which I am cosponsoring.

Following that statement of mine of 1966, I am also including the statement made yesterday before a Government Operations Subcommittee by Mrs. Esther Peterson, who was the first Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, and whose experiences in that office—and accomplishments—and whose views buttress my own ideas as to the kind of governmental instrumentality we need for coordination of consumer activities at the Federal level.

DWYER BILL WELL THOUGHT OUT

As the principal author of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, which included the Truth-in-Lending Act as its title I, I am delighted that Congresswoman DWYER, who worked on that legislation as the ranking minority member of the Sullivan Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, has entitled her bill for an Office of Consumer Affairs as the "Consumer Protection Act of 1969." It can be one of the most important measures of this Congress on the consumer front.

Mrs. DWYER is in a strong leadership position to advance this legislation in the committee to which it has been referred, the House Committee on Government Operations, of which she is the ranking minority member. Not being a member of that committee, I am cosponsoring her bill as the best avenue open to me in lending support to her efforts.

The bill is comprehensive, and extremely well thought out. The Office of Consumer Affairs it would establish within the Executive Office of the President would have powers by statute which Mrs. Peterson, Betty Furness, and Mrs. Virginia Knauer, three outstandingly capable women who have tried to do this job, have enjoyed only in part, and only by Presidential whim.

Mrs. DWYER discussed the scope of the proposed Office of Consumer Affairs in detail in her speech in the House on Monday. I urge the Members to read her re-

marks. They refer to some of the same points I made in my testimony 3 years ago on the legislation to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs. New hearings have been in progress this week on that same proposal. My testimony from 3 years ago on this issue follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ON PROPOSALS TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMERS, APRIL 19, 1966

I am here this morning not as an advocate of the legislation immediately before you to establish a Department of Consumers, nor, on the other hand, do I particularly oppose such legislation. My primary purpose is to congratulate and give my encouragement to this Subcommittee for scheduling hearings and going into the subject generally. As I understand the purpose of your hearings, they are to survey the degree of protection now accorded consumers by the various agencies of the Federal Government which share in the responsibility for consumer protection, and to obtain testimony from knowledgeable people here and throughout the country on how the Executive Department might provide better and more effective service to the consumer. A Department of Consumers is certainly one approach worth considering and assessing.

In the 14 years in which I have served in the House of Representatives, during which time I have done my best to speak for and represent the consumer interest on legislative issues, an amazing transformation has taken place in the attitudes of Government toward consumers as a group. When I first came to Congress, the annual budget for the Food and Drug Administration was in the neighborhood of \$5,000,000, and the Eisenhower Administration just then coming into power was anxious to find out through a special advisory study whether this might be *far too much* to spend on such purposes and whether the agency might be representing consumers too zealously. There was no such thing then as a Food Additives Act, or Color Additives Act, or Pesticides Control Act, or Hazardous Substances Labeling Act, or Drug Abuses Control Act, or Poultry Products Inspection Act. The basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 was even more obsolete than that it is today, because the major enactments I have just cited had not yet been taken up. There had been a revolution in food technology during and after the war, and chemicals were being added to processed and raw foods in such dizzy variety that no one knew whether they were safe to use. The processor could use them unless and until the Government could establish legal proof of the harmfulness of these additives, and sometimes obtaining this proof was impossible to do, even though the weight of the evidence strongly indicated great danger to consumers.

Furthermore, pesticides had been used in ever-increasing volume and strength; DDT was the farmer's dream. And the factory inspection loophole in the Food and Drug Act was so big that, under court interpretations, the Food and Drug inspectors could not enter a plant without the owner's express permission.

Our law covering the introduction of new drugs into interstate commerce was seemingly the strongest part of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act 14 years ago, but, as we subsequently learned, and as the thalidomide episode brought home to us forcefully in 1962, clearance requirements were not nearly as stringent as we had imagined. Worse, once a drug was cleared for sale and use prior to 1962, after going through what were even then rather elaborate clearance procedures, the Government could not change its mind

and move against it to remove it from the market until the evidence was overwhelming that the drug was unsafe or caused dangerous side-effects not known when it was first cleared. Closing that loophole was perhaps the most important single feature of the Kefauver-Harris Act, and I am proud of the fact that I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill in either House directed to that problem—it was one of the original provisions of my omnibus bill of 1961 to rewrite the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, H.R. 1235, a bill which I have amended and updated and re-introduced in both the 88th and 89th Congress under that same number, and on which I am still trying to get action. However, it is not pending before this Committee. I wish only to point out the long delays in having the entire 1938 Act rewritten.

In any event, my purpose in reviewing the history is to show that when we think back over the past 14 years and see how many important consumer measures have been passed, the record is far from bad. President Kennedy sent the first Presidential Consumer Message ever delivered to the Congress; President Johnson has sent us two such messages. Mrs. Esther Peterson, serving as special assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs as well as an Assistant Secretary of Labor, has effectively and vigorously dramatized consumer issues to citizens all over this country and to the Congress also. Working behind the scenes as well as in the glare of public meetings and discussions, she has accomplished some impressive things in getting businessmen to recognize valid consumer complaints and do something about them.

But despite how much has been done in these past 14 years to improve consumer legislation and consumer protections, including a 10-fold increase in the Food and Drug Administration budget, I would say that we will have as much, or more to do in this field than has already been done. We have, I believe, the best consumer laws in the world—particularly on food safety and drug safety—but that is not good enough. Just as we have led the world in technology and in economic progress, so we should also lead in consumer protections, for continuing economic progress depends upon fair treatment of the buyer.

My feeling is this: it makes little real difference in the final analysis whether you have a Cabinet level Department of Consumers, or an independent agency devoted to pushing the consumer viewpoint within the government, or a continued dispersal of consumer activities among dozens and dozens of government agencies; it makes no real difference, that is, if the laws are sufficiently strong and if the people administering those laws have a strong sense of identification with the consumer's interests and problems. A Department of Consumers which might merely represent an amalgamation of a lot of agencies now under separate departments could be a disaster if it didn't have a dedicated enthusiasm for the job. And, if it were enthusiastic enough—as OPA was, for instance, during World War II—it could become such a target for business attack and criticism and Congressional suspicion as to lose all effectiveness, even in consumer fields which are now being covered successfully. I do not say this would happen; I certainly think it *could* happen.

I hope you will pursue this possibility in your hearings. Try to get frank evaluations from business spokesmen as to their probable attitude toward a department whose role was exclusively consumer protection. Ask them for the truth on that—would they try to undercut the department in every way at every opportunity, considering it "the enemy"? I feel that if business took the approach, we would be better off with the present set-up, because a dozen Cabinet secretaries

and a score of independent agency administrators could better stave off attacks on parts of their programs than one poor beleaguered Secretary of Consumers could do in surviving a constant war for appropriations and for support in the Executive Department, too.

I like the idea of having Orville Freeman and John Gardner and Stewart Udall, and Willard Wirtz and Robert Weaver and Paul Rand Dixon and other consumer-minded government executives directly involved in programs which have a consumer orientation within their departments or agencies; but if these activities were largely centered in someone else's domain the consumer might lose some very strong and effective allies.

As I said, I am not opposed to a new Department nor do I favor it on the basis of present conditions. I think we must make the laws stronger *first*, before turning to some single administrator or secretary to work miracles for consumers.

The sponsor of the Consumer Department bill before you, Congressman Rosenthal of New York, a valued member of this Subcommittee, has been working ably and conscientiously with me and eight other Members of Congress on the 15 Member National Commission on Food Marketing and, as Congressman Rosenthal knows, we have been discussing the need for stronger executive machinery to coordinate consumer activities. But we are well aware of the fact that in any administration headed by a strong President who works at the job, no department or agency or office is going to be allowed to initiate divisive battles in public with other agencies over policy. FDR used to permit, and perhaps he encouraged, a certain amount of this sort of thing, but when Harold Ickes, with all of his popularity, spoke out in public against a Truman appointee, he was fired, and so was Henry Wallace when he attacked an Administration policy. These were powerful men in those days, solidly entrenched, but they were fired out of hand.

I am sure President Johnson wants the greatest amount of discussion and controversy within his official family in the development of policy, but I do not foresee him encouraging or permitting a Secretary of Consumers to denounce publicly the policies of other agencies once they are set and agreed to within the official family. Yet I think that is the kind of role you are contemplating or considering for the Secretary who would be appointed under this legislation—a rallying point for consumers within government in the setting of policy and then a resource or reservoir for guerrilla warfare against an anti-consumer policy once it might be set. We consumer-minded Members of Congress would love to have a set-up like that we could go to for moral support and devastating ammunition when fighting against an administration policy—of any administration—if we thought it a bad one, but I don't imagine such a resource would remain open to us very long.

Nevertheless, this whole idea is worth considering and pursuing. Consumer interest is mounting with such intensity in the country that I am just delighted with every occasion which presents itself for really getting this issue out in the open. Your hearings provide a fine forum for that. Perhaps, after you have heard enough witnesses and studied the matter in sufficient depth, you will convince me and other Members that a Department of Consumers is not only desirable but necessary.

In the meantime, however, I intend to keep fighting on the dozen or more fronts in which consumer issues are now being decided in the Congress and in the agencies. Some tough administrators who take their oaths of office very seriously, such as Dr. Goddard in Food and Drug, would do an effective job whether in HEW or any other department, and these are the people we should support and encourage at every point.

TESTIMONY BY HON. ESTHER PETERSON

Next, Mr. Speaker, I want to include the statement made yesterday morning by Esther Peterson when she testified on this subject. The whole consumer movement—and it is now a potent force in this country—owes as much to her as to any single individual for its present strength and effectiveness. She created a focal point for consumer awareness in the country and in government, and with very little staff or funds used great imagination and dynamic resourcefulness to bring to bear on government the legitimate needs and demands of consumers for fair treatment.

No matter how good is the legislation which we pass to aid consumers, it requires effective administration to succeed in its objectives. It needs strong administration and strong enforcement, and adequate funds to do the job. Good laws poorly administered are often little better, if any, than timid laws vigorously administered.

We have passed many good, strong laws on the consumer front in recent years—not enough, but a remarkable number of such laws. The agencies administering them do not always have their hearts in the task, or Congress, as it frequently does, starves them out for enforcement funds. A statutory Office of Consumer Affairs in the White House, as proposed in the Dwyer-Sullivan bills, requires, for its full effectiveness, the solid backing of the President.

Mrs. Peterson discussed this question of Executive support in her testimony yesterday, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. ESTHER PETERSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1969

Gentlemen, my name is Esther Peterson, I am at present Washington representative for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO. While I am not testifying in their behalf today, I am pleased to say they concur with my testimony.

The American consumer has been waiting a long time on a long check-out line, gentlemen. He's asking his government to open an express lane and assure him that his grievances will be processed faster and with better results. He wants a guarantee that he's getting his money's worth!

The hearings of this Committee, Mr. Chairman, tell the consumer that you, too, want action. I congratulate you for giving the issue your attention.

We've seen a dramatic change in the market place in recent years. The consumer is no longer the timid soul, "afraid to fight city hall." He fights. Business sees him as much more than a passive receiver of their goods. He is a force to be reckoned with—the essential element in the economy. He sees himself as having rights as a consumer, just as he has rights as a voter or a wage earner.

As the first special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, I was part of this change. We saw the birth of the idea, its growth and development and now we see its maturity in the proposal before you—the creation of cabinet status for the American consumer.

In 1964 such a proposal was "pie-in-the-sky." At that time, we frankly concerned ourselves with whether or not we would have desks and telephones. Our status was dubious.

President Johnson saw consumerism was a significant movement, that it had a basis in genuine need. He met it by creating the President's Committee on Consumer Interests and I was appointed to head the office.

As aware as he and I were that the consumer's time had come, neither of us really knew how strong a response from the American public would be forthcoming.

When I returned from the ranch, boxes of mail were already in the corridor of the Executive Office Building. Our telephones had hardly been connected when they began to ring with calls from ordinary citizens. Our mail was overwhelming. Letters came addressed to: The Consumer Lady, Washington, D.C.

These were clear expressions of the frustrations that consumers felt. The frustration had been building for a long time. We gave it a focus. We didn't create the stir—it was there.

People who had never written their government wrote to us. Some wrote, "Dear Government." A very few wrote, "Damn Government."

They enclosed dishonest package labels, deceitful boxes, shoddy merchandise, half-filled containers, worthless gimmicks—examples of a "delivery" system that was not delivering a square deal. Letters came with sorry tales of "being taken"—from the child who wrote of his shrinking candy bar to outright land swindles.

We received everything from boxes of shrimp to bags of loose wool from a constantly shedding carpet. People literally came knocking on our door.

We built the program out of these practical issues that our constituents, the consumers, brought to us. The Committee fought hard for the concept that the most significant issues were the ones closest to the consumer.

We checked their claims and tried to deal with some of their problems—to use the power of the Federal government to right the imbalance in the market place. We set in motion activities in and out of government to deal with the problems.

We became the voice of the consumer before Congressional Committees. We traveled everywhere responding to consumer requests. We held conferences, made speeches, organized state committees, pressed other agencies for consumer representation on key commissions and boards. We pushed and cajoled and accomplished a great deal toward making the consumer issue as important as it is today.

I think we firmly established the principle for every Administration, as we said in our report to the President, that: "The Federal Government has a responsibility to see to it that the basic rights of the consumer are respected and that the consumer interest is fully considered in the formulation of policies."

We accomplished whatever we did with no statutory power. We could do little more than make a phone call to an offending manufacturer or a reluctant government official. The effect of that phone call from the White House was impressive.

But without statutory authority we could not do as much as was needed, nor could we depend on continuity. There is little change in that situation today, even though the staff members still have desks and telephones.

I am delighted that President Nixon has apparently decided to maintain the office and has appointed a dynamic, knowledgeable lady to fill the post.

She has been making some excellent speeches and has taken some significant legislative stands. But I am afraid Mrs. Knauer will discover that "Knauer Power," like "Furness Power" or "Peterson Power," is directly dependent on the support of the President and others around the President.

Whatever inclination there has been on the part of the Executive Branch to keep the consumer office alive has been buttressed time and again by demands from the people back home.

Consumer injustice is a live political issue. Every voter is a consumer, and no one is more aware of this than you Congressmen. You must be more sensitive than any government official to the issues which excite and interest the American people most.

Hardly anyone remembers one-time Federal officials. Yet, I can say that, because I am identified with the earliest day of this government's concern with consumer problems, I am still stopped in the super-market and thanked by shoppers for our efforts. They are not recognizing me. They are recalling a moment when our government seemed particularly responsive to their call for help.

May I submit for the record our report to the President of March 1967 which summarizes the principal activities of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests between 1964 and 1967. I think it will be of interest to the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before you would establish a Department of Consumer Affairs. It accords full recognition to the important status of the American consumer. Its sponsors are to be congratulated for their far-reaching proposal.

For years I have participated in debates over whether or not another cabinet-level department—a Department of Consumers—is what the consumer needs. Frankly, I think there are good arguments on both sides of the question. Not only that, there is nothing in the present organization of the President's Committee to prevent it from accomplishing the aims of the Rosenthal-Nelson bill.

The present structure, if adequately backed by statutory authority, funds and staff, could be effective, in carrying out the programs of H.R. 6037. Structure alone cannot assure an effective program. That takes the backing of the President and the right person in the job, armed with a legislative mandate, and an adequate, trained staff.

The Secretary of Consumer Affairs would be an awesome job. It would certainly provide a focus for action, but it would also provide a focus for attack.

I do not think a single Department could withstand the combined opposition of the powerful economic forces which would be marshalled against it. More could be accomplished by well-administered programs in different agencies coordinated by a single office with statutory mandate and a will to do the job.

There is also the time element. The consumer can't wait for a major administrative reorganization to solve his problems. He needs help now. A consumer office with statutory authority should have the responsibility to propose new legislation. It should be a think-tank for the consumer, anticipating needs. It should oversee enforcement of existing legislation and coordinate existing consumer programs. It should be able to let out contracts to develop meaningful consumer education programs, open dialogues between business and consumers, and build community consumer organizations.

When I assumed my post, I asked for a legal counsel. "You won't need a lawyer," I was told. "You have the Justice Department."

When I needed an economist, I was told to turn to the Council of Economic Advisors. But I soon discovered that this vast army was really a battalion of tin soldiers. They were on call to their general.

Whatever its final form, the consumer office needs its own staff of top attorneys and field representatives and top economists.

Our regulatory agencies should be monitoring the essential services of our econ-

omy for the benefit of the consumer. But too often, they have lost sight of this function and the consumer is a useless appendage at their hearings.

The consumer office should restore the consumer's presence before regulatory agencies and be his voice before committees of Congress. It should intervene in the consumer interest whenever and wherever the consumer voice needs to be heard.

Whatever form Congress finally determines will best serve the consumer, I would hope it calls for a Senate-confirmed presidential appointee to head this office and an Advisory Board with the emphasis on consumer representation.

In short, we would like to see an office with the powers of a Department, with a human touch. A structure with which the consumer feels at home. Mrs. Bess Myerson Grant is doing this in New York City. Consumers there know they can appeal directly to their city. They should have that same sense of a personal advocate in Washington.

What is needed now is an agency with authority to translate the results of a single experience into benefits for the millions.

As one letter writer put it, "It's good to have someone in our corner—not in our pocket."

That is the spirit of the bills before you, the spirit of these hearings.

I thank you for the opportunity of presenting my views.

RULES FOR NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, control of radioactive pollution is expected to become an increasingly important issue throughout the Nation as the numerous nuclear powerplants now under construction or on order start going into operation in the 1970's.

The Atomic Energy Commission claims that it has sole jurisdiction over safety standards and operating procedures of atomic plants in all States. In Minnesota, however, the State pollution control agency has announced that it will limit radioactive discharge from nuclear reactors to levels considerably below those currently allowed by the AEC and it ordered Northern States Power Co. to reduce its discharge levels of its Monticello plant, now being built, to the State standards. This insistence by Minnesota that it has the right to set safety requirements for nuclear powerplants raised important legal questions as to whether the States can enforce more stringent rules than the AEC, and Northern States Power announced it will fight the limits imposed by the PCA in both Federal and State courts. This forthcoming court struggle is significant because it will be the first major test of whether States or the AEC should set safety standards for nuclear powerplants. On September 13, the Vermont attorney general stated that Vermont, which is concerned about the effect of thermal pollution from a nuclear powerplant under construction in Vernon, near the Connecticut River, will join the

Minnesota case challenging the regulatory powers of the AEC.

This past weekend, the Wisconsin Resource Conservation Council, representing 35 conservation organizations in the State, passed a resolution at a general membership meeting in Manitowoc, calling on the State of Wisconsin Natural Resource Board to require stronger nuclear powerplant pollution controls than those of the AEC. This action reflects the concern many citizens have about the safety regulations of the nuclear plants and their desire to have their own States adopt standards which are more strict than those required by the AEC.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following resolution of the Wisconsin Resource Conservation Council to the attention of my colleagues:

NUCLEAR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATION

Whereas plans are rapidly taking shape for many new Atomic Power Generating Plants on Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River, and

Whereas such plants produce both nuclear radiation wastes and thermal water pollution dangerous to human and animal life; and

Whereas the techniques and equipment are presently available for controlling these air and water pollutants and dangerous atomic wastes but present plans do not include installation of such equipment adequate to reduce such dangers, and

Whereas the Wisconsin Natural Resource Department has had no objection to these discharges:

Now therefore be it resolved that the Wisconsin resource conservation council meeting, September 13, 1969 goes on record that the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board adopt a policy to require more effective nuclear pollution controls than those of the Atomic Energy Commission and further require the use of closed circuit cooling towers to reduce thermal water pollution.

PORNOGRAPHY IS BIG BUSINESS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the scope of the pornography business in this country today really is immense—what we see is really like the tip of the iceberg which protrudes above the water.

It has infiltrated all parts of our Nation, although, of course, it is most conspicuous in our larger cities.

The Buffalo Evening News in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., is doing a great public service in its current series of articles outlining the extent of the pornography business.

I included the first article in the series in the RECORD on page 25519 last Monday. Following is the second article in the series:

PORNOGRAPHY, JUST LIKE ALL THINGS IN DEMAND, HAS A HIGH PRICE TAG

(By Jerry Allan)

A plain deck of cards sells for about a dollar today in Buffalo but a deck with dirty pictures on the back sells for \$5.

"And the color pack," says Detective Sgt. Frank V. Spano, a Buffalo policeman, who

tries to keep a lid on pornography in books, magazines, films and other media, "will bring as high as \$35 a pack."

Pornography—"or dirt for dirt's sake," as Sgt. Spano says—is popular in the U.S. now and anything that is popular is also profitable, a money maker for publishers, writers, movie makers and printers.

"I've been on this job (head of the Salacious Literature Squad) for six years," Sgt. Spano said, "and the flood of what I call pornography is worse than ever. There must be a demand for all this stuff."

CONTACT IS CASUAL

Depending on personal views of what or what is not pornography, a trip to some book stores in the area of Main and Chippewa Sts. confirms Sgt. Spano's view that dirty publications sell and are expensive.

A magazine devoted entirely to nude men and women sells for \$2.50. Another also heavy on nudity, also sells for \$2.50. A magazine pegged to homosexuals, \$3.50.

"You'll notice," Sgt. Spano said, "that in these magazines, although the nudity is very, very suggestive there is no distension, no tumescence. The contact is casual. Now this comes close to what I call pornography but the courts, led by the Supreme Court, say it's all right.

"And that's what accounted for the availability of all this stuff today. You don't have to look for the obviously dirty book stores. Your corner drugstore has all this stuff, or would stock it, if it sold."

NO SPECIAL TRAINING

Sgt. Spano said book store owners "know the law sometimes even better than I do" and are careful not to sell questionable books and magazines to boys and girls under 17.

"They make a bundle selling to adults," he said, "so most of them have signs limiting sales to persons over 21."

The State Penal Law, Sgt. Spano said, is rigid on sales to minors.

"So at least minors are protected," a reporter suggested.

"It doesn't work out that way," Sgt. Spano said. "They get to the stuff. A parent leaves it lying around the house. Or people throw it out with the garbage. The youngsters get hold of it."

A 19-year veteran of the Buffalo Police Department, Sgt. Spano acknowledges that he has no special training to qualify him in saving Buffalo from moral contamination.

"PROSTITUTE'S WRITING"

"I get that kind of questions from defense attorneys in court," he said, "asking me how I can be a judge of what's obscene, what's pornographic. I'm not a judge, of course. It's up to a judge and jury to decide if a book is obscene."

Sgt. Spano says he will confiscate a book and arrest the seller ("only after I get a warrant") when he believes that "it is dirt for dirt's sake," that the book has no redeeming literary merit.

Pornography, a combination of "graphos," Greek root word for writing, and "porno," for prostitute, means literally "the writing of a prostitute."

These days, pornography has come to mean obscenity in writing. "Now obscenity, if it can be proved," Sgt. Spano said, "is against the law. It's as simple as that. Proving it, of course, has come to be a tough proposition."

FOR DIRT'S SAKE

Sgt. Spano moves against hard pornography in Buffalo because he is charged with enforcing Section 235 of the State Penal Law. The section says in part:

"Any material (meaning book, magazine or a deck of cards) is obscene if considered as a whole its predominant appeal is to

prurient, shameful or morbid interest in nudity, sex, excretion, sadism or masochism . . .

"And it goes substantially beyond customary limits of candor in describing or representing such matters . . .

"And it is utterly without redeeming social value."

What this means to Sgt. Spano, he says, "is dirt for dirt's sake."

The "dirt for dirt's sake" standard is interesting because Federal Judge John M. Woolsey, in a historic 1933 decision lifting the ban on the importation of "Ulysses," the James Joyce classic, used the identical words.

STANDARDS CHANGE

"I have not found anything that I consider to be dirt for dirt's sake," Judge Woolsey said. Joyce published Ulysses in 1913 and few persons today consider his work pornographic. Joyce manuscripts, in fact, are at the State University of Buffalo.

"He's nothing," Sgt. Spano said, "to what's available today anywhere, stuff that's not even considered hard pornography."

The sergeant, who is 46, remembers that in his boyhood Esquire took the prize as a risqué periodical.

"It still shows a lot of nudity," he said, "but compared to other stuff today it's a Boy Scout magazine."

Sgt. Spano believes that Supreme Court decisions since 1960 have allowed some book publishers to feed on the public appetite for obscenity.

"Sex and nudity and all that goes with it," he said, "is popular in books, movies, the stage, and so on. If you want to write a best seller, put in as many four letter words as possible and you've got one."

MONEY MOTIVE

He also believes and hopes "that the pendulum will swing the other way. When the public gets fed up on this stuff, when it is no longer profitable, then we won't have so much of it."

Money is the motive, he insists. He unlocked a cabinet in his office to get hundreds of packets of 4 x 5 photos in color.

"Sex, sex, sex, all of them and the real stuff," he said, "six in a pack and they sell for \$4. You can buy 8 by 10s of the moon and astronauts for about 50 cents."

A reporter told the sergeant that hard pornography is apparently legal now in Sweden.

FROM SWEDEN

"Yes, I know," he said, "that's what we get from Sweden along with the Swedish massage. I also believe that Sweden has one of the world's highest venereal disease rates and one of the highest suicide rates."

Pornography by mail is in the federal jurisdiction but Sgt. Spano gets many complaints from Buffalo residents who get unsolicited material in the mail.

"I refer them to the postal inspectors," he said, "but it's part of the total problem" and he took a leaflet from the cabinet.

"This is a colored brochure," he said, "going through the mails now. Not the book itself, just plugging the book, with a coupon for ordering. But even the stuff in the brochure, especially the pictures, is hard core pornography."

"FIZZLE OUT"

Sgt. Spano said citizens groups and church organizations "give the police help from time to time in alerting the public" to the current pornographic exposure.

"But they fizzle out," he said.

Sgt. Spano has come to be known as "sort of a one-man squad" but he said he gets good co-operation "and all the help I need" from his superiors, particularly Chief of Detectives Ralph V. Degenhart.

"The state troopers help," he said, "and so does the FBI. But the printing presses

roll on and on all the time. Some of the public seems to want this stuff and pays high for it. I hope the pendulum begins to swing the other way soon."

THIS DOESN'T MATCH HIS LIFE

"Sex Life of a Cop" is a book Detective Sgt. Frank V. Spano had curiosity about as head of the police department's Salacious Literature Squad.

A lower federal court, Sgt. Spano said, declared the book obscene because, the judges discovered, the story moves quickly from one sexual enterprise to another.

"We cannot believe that the First Amendment's great guarantee of freedom of expression can be elasticized to embrace the Sex Life of a Cop," ruled the court.

But the U.S. Supreme Court, on appeal, Sgt. Spano said, reversed the lower court decision.

THE LEAA

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a column by James J. Kilpatrick, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, of September 16, gives a good account of the "State and local community-conscious" approach which can be expected from the still new Nixon administration. The recently created Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Justice Department, as pointed out in the column, has demonstrated an up to now rare capability in its performance since it officially got underway. It seems to have avoided the pitfalls traditionally attributed to bureaucratic arrangements—the entanglements that result from uncoordinated and often undefined leadership—and it has succeeded in sharing, if not giving, the onus of the responsibility for the formulation of workable, relevant programs to the communities which must exist under them.

It is apparent that not only in the area of law enforcement but in all areas which are of such great concern to the people at the local level, the Nixon administration is going to institute a form of federalism that we can identify and call workable. In the face of rising complaints and increasing fears over the dangers of big government the new leadership in the White House is going to return a valued degree of control back to the people and the leaders to which they can easily turn at home.

I commend this approach as displayed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. In the area of "law and order," an area that has grown so rapidly in appeal and importance during recent months, it is good to know that those in charge have responded so quickly and so well to the communities who need their assistance. In my own State of New Hampshire we have begun to feel the benefits of the funds and Federal assistance which have already been made available and we look forward to greater advancements as a result of this new agency that is serving to display the quick and efficient management of the Nixon administration.

The Kilpatrick column follows:

AID TO POLICE A BRIGHT LESSON IN FEDERALISM

The President's advisers were trying to sell him "the New Federalism" a few weeks ago, as a neat little label to paste on his programs. Richard Nixon reportedly turned the label down, on the skeptical grounds that federalism isn't as familiar as corn flakes. How could he sell a new federalism to people who don't know the old?

In the superlative job done in its first year by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice the President could find an outstanding example of new federalism in action. One hesitates to write a rave review, but the LEAA's performance appears to merit the highest praise.

By way of background, it will be recalled that the Omnibus Crime Control Act became law in June of 1968. One section of the act authorized matching grants to states and localities "in order to improve and strengthen law enforcement." In August, Congress approved a \$69 million budget. In late October, with only eight months remaining of the fiscal year, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration went to work.

Federal grants-in-aid, of course, are nothing new. Roughly 400 such programs are in operation now. But most of them, to judge from the complaints of local officials, are mired deep in bureaucratic swamps. They suffer from too many guidelines and too much paperwork. Most of the grants are characterized by regimentation, nitpicking demands, and maddening delays.

The miracle of this fledgling agency in Justice, under the direction of Charles H. Rogovin, is that apparently it has avoided all these morning-glory entanglements. In barely five months, the LEAA assembled staff, conferred with law enforcement officials in the states, and disbursed \$19 million for planning.

The state governments, which so often are accused of apathy and incompetence, responded to these galvanic urgings with the zeal of ballplayers just offered cold beer. By April 10 of this year, California had filed the first action plan—a 26-volume application amounting to nearly 6,000 pages.

Other states followed in a rush. By the time the fiscal year ended on June 30, everyone but American Samoa had come under the wire. In their scope and variety, the state-local programs provide a notable example of federalism at its best.

California is pursuing a dozen projects, ranging from alcoholism to court reform. Alabama and Iowa, among others, will use their grants in the field of juvenile delinquency. Idaho came up with training seminars for judges, Maine, Ohio, Arizona and Minnesota are concentrating on police selection and training. Nebraska, Texas, Nevada, Colorado, Alaska and Rhode Island are seeking to improve communications systems. Georgia won approval for a pilot program of work release for prisoners.

Meanwhile, 14 large cities have qualified for direct federal grants. Detroit got \$100,000 to work on an "electronic robbery stake-out system." Dallas got \$18,000 to study a first-offender program among juveniles. Los Angeles won \$50,000 for an evaluation of "closed-circuit television capabilities in tactical situations." Chicago bid for "Operation Outreach," described as a detoxification, diagnostic, and referral center. In a separate program, academic fellowships were going to some 20,000 college men studying police techniques.

Doubtless some of the money will be wasted, in the sense that some of the experiments, pilot studies, and demonstrations will prove useless. But this is a part of what federalism is all about. What is new here is a bureaucracy with sense enough to keep its cottonpicking hands off the states, and to let them make their own successes—and their own mistakes.