

space demands that our potential undersea technological capability not be fettered by international political considerations.

In reply to this contention, I should like to recall some rather memorable words of the late Dag Hammarskjöld:

The question is not *either* the nation or the world. It is, rather, how to serve the world by service to our nation, and how to serve the nation by service to the world.

Thus, we must strive to understand the national interest in terms of the larger, more comprehensive international interest; this is the democratic imperative cast in a worldwide setting, and it is in this context that the development of ocean space must be charted.

In some respects, Mr. President, a hopeful beginning has been made: The last session of the General Assembly witnessed the creation of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed; in our own country, the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources has issued its report, urging that the United States take the initiative in trying to reach worldwide agreement on a new international regime for the marine environment. In this regard, the Commission specifically cautions:

Unless a new international framework is devised which removes the legal uncertainty from mineral resources exploration and exploitation in every area of the seabed and its subsol, some venturesome governments and private entrepreneurs will act to create *fatts*

accomplish that will be difficult to undo, even though they adversely affect the interests of the United States and the international community.

In closing, Mr. President, let me express the belief that, as the major power in undersea technology, the United States has a special responsibility, one which demands that its diplomatic posture be as achievement oriented as that of its military-industrial complex. Such a posture clearly requires an unrelenting desire to establish an international framework which will guarantee the peaceful and orderly development of the extranational marine environment.

I offer this resolution in the hope that it may help to spark such a desire.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate today, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 7, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1969:

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

#### FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

James C. Counts, of California, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

#### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

James V. Smith, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

#### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

#### To be Lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, **XXXXXX** Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederick James Clarke, **XXXXXX** U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Frederick James Clarke, **XXXXXX** U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Joseph John Sisco, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Samuel De Palma, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### FRENCH PERFDIDY

#### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has been widely known for many years that the Israel Air Force has relied almost completely on French equipment, Mirages, Mysteres, Super Mysteres, and Super-Nords.

President de Gaulle's recent embargo on arms to Israel is not only a callous attempt to trade an old alliance for new adventure, but seriously threatens whatever delicate balance of power exists in the Middle East.

In this latter respect, De Gaulle's action borders on provocation. It invites the Arab States to believe, mistakenly I must add, that Israel may not have the air might to defend itself. The risk of open conflict mounts.

The fact of the matter is that Israel will defend itself, with or without French arms. In uneven conflict Israel will fight to the last man, woman, and child staining those oil-rich sands with blood into millennium.

Now, the Nixon administration proposes to discuss with De Gaulle his solution to the Middle East problem, or should it be called, the Jewish question. Israel has proven itself, before God and man, to be a tough, persevering nation. They will not sacrifice on the altar of

four-power diplomacy the blood of national achievement.

And if now, Israelis have only scorn and contempt for De Gaulle, they are not alone. Their brethren in America stand by them.

On Wednesday, January 29, Ambassador Charles Lucet of France visited his nation's consulate in my hometown, Philadelphia. On that occasion, the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia, comprised of 34 metropolitanwide Jewish organizations, presented him this statement, reflecting the views of thousands of Philadelphia Jews.

I would like to enter this statement for the RECORD:

This breach of faith in which the President of France again has turned on his friends and comforted their enemies will lead to more warfare that can embroil all of mankind. It will embolden Arab terrorists; strengthen Arab intransigence, and stifle Arab moderates. If his policy were to succeed, Israel would stand helpless against massive Soviet armaments in the hands of irresponsible Arab governments bent on Israel's annihilation.

We will not be passive spectators to this teacherous policy. As accusing fingers, we will stand vigil in the weeks ahead in the shadow of the French Consulate so that all Philadelphians will become aware of De Gaulle's perfidy.

We will not try to dissuade—even if we could—those whose anger compels them to bypass France in their travel plans.

Nor will we try to discourage—even if we could—potential customers from seeking alternatives to French government-owned businesses such as Air France and Renault.

Whether we go beyond this depends upon future circumstances.

The world knows this infamous policy is the work of one man. And so we do not seek to penalize the people of France. We know that the French people are our strongest allies in this struggle. We know they share our shock at this betrayal of France's traditional policy of friendship toward Israel and the Jewish people. We are confident that ultimately their will shall prevail.

### USE OF DRAFTEES IN UNDECLARED WARS

#### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor a bill to prohibit the sending of draftees to fight in undeclared wars without their consent.

It is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, that the power to declare war has, for all intents and purposes, been snatched away from the Congress by the executive branch, despite the specific provisions of the Constitution.

It is even worse that we tolerate the sending of boys into undeclared wars, though we in Congress ourselves assume none of the responsibility for it.

I am not here asking an end to the draft. But I do think that if the Executive decides to send the soldiers, on its own initiative, to risk being killed in

battle, it should be only with their consent.

I suspect we could get enough volunteers, with appropriate incentives, to fight our wars. I see nothing wrong, then, with keeping our drafted young men on duty in the continental United States or at bases abroad where the interest of the Nation requires it but where there is no fighting.

If the executive branch chooses to ask Congress to declare war, then the provisions of this bill would not apply—for the Nation, in democratic fashion, will have spoken. But I do not approve of the current system, and call for the enactment of this measure to modify it.

**PRIORITIES LONG OVERDUE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SYMINGTON**

**HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on last Wednesday evening, January 29, it was my privilege to introduce Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, who addressed the annual meeting of the Norfolk, Va., Chamber of Commerce.

The Hampton Roads area of Virginia, in which the city of Norfolk is the largest political subdivision, is presently approaching a population of nearly a million persons. Located in this expanding area of Virginia is one of the largest concentrations of military establishments in the world. Senator SYMINGTON's remarks concerning our need for an assessment of our commitments abroad and at home, as well as a meaningful establishment of our priorities, were delivered from his broad knowledge of the military, and with his characteristic candor.

Mr. President, I am pleased to bring this thoughtful address to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

**PRIORITIES LONG OVERDUE**

A thorough assessment of our nation's commitments both abroad and here at home, followed by a meaningful establishment of priorities, is long overdue. With the changing Administrations, there would appear no more opportune time than now to begin this all-important task.

The Congress has been presented with a Federal Budget for the fiscal year 1970 of over \$195 billion, a jump of almost \$80 billion during the past six years.

If the succeeding six years produced a comparable budget escalation, the United States Government would be requiring the taxpayers of America to put up \$325 billion annually to support the Federal Government alone. This would be in addition to all state and local taxes.

Such an increase, in the face of growing fiscal and monetary problems, would appear a difficult if not impossible burden for our people to bear.

Accordingly, hard decisions must be made now, so that we may plan our total expenditures in relation to our revenue and thereby limit future Federal deficits. If we are to continue as the number one nation, very possibly if our capitalistic system is to survive, some day we must learn to live within our means.

The dangerous rate of the inflation currently being experienced demonstrates clearly that increasing deficits—last year the Federal deficit alone was over \$25 billion—are bound to lead to ever higher prices; and the effect of these inflated prices can only be particularly damaging to this nation's international balance of payments, with inevitable further loss of world confidence in the integrity of the dollar.

A preliminary estimate of our 1968 balance of payments situation does indicate a slight surplus—the first in many years—but the Treasury cautions that the final analysis will probably show a further deficit.

In any case, the most disturbing item in this year's payments picture is the drastic decline in our trade position in the private sector, a sector which until recently has been in heavy surplus. That surplus has provided the principal antidote to the heavy, often reckless and often unnecessary Federal spending which has been characteristic of our policies abroad.

In determining priorities for the allocation of our limited resources, it is now becoming increasingly clear that more attention must be paid to the cost of the largest single category in the Federal Budget—national defense. More than \$80 billion—some 42% of that Budget—is requested for the military. It will be wise, therefore, for us to weigh carefully those proposed expenditures as against other high priority demands. Because of the tens of billions of dollars involved annually, a small saving in this field is worth more than a relatively large percentage saving in any other category.

In this connection, and where I personally believe we could achieve the greatest reductions at no sacrifice to national security, it would appear of paramount importance not to place new weapons systems into production until they have been fully engineered.

Nor should we decide to invest heavily in defenses against what later, if history can be any judge, turn out to be strictly theoretical threats.

After examining carefully what the world would be like after a full nuclear exchange, any thoughtful person would agree that every effort possible should be made to reach, at earliest opportunity, a meaningful agreement on the limitation of nuclear arms.

This is true not only because of the rising threat to civilization as more countries obtain thermonuclear weapons, but also because of the backbreaking additional costs which can only result from a further spiraling upwards of the arms race.

Let no one misunderstand my position. The United States must maintain forces strong enough to deter any would-be aggressor, regardless of cost. But with that premise, let us strive to invest our resources wisely. It was Lenin who foresaw, towards the beginning of this century, that economic disaster could be almost as decisive as military defeat in bringing down our system of free enterprise.

The bright people who, with little if any practical experience, have in recent years been directing much of the future of our defense posture, have been utilizing funds appropriated by the Congress for research and engineering more to produce technical arguments than to produce needed new weaponry.

As but one example, even though this nation is now spending over \$8 billion a year on military research alone, it is a fact that, since 1954, not a single new combat fighter plane—Air Force or Navy—has been produced in this country; and only one, and that was last week, has been approved even in the blue-print stage.

Many years must now pass before this nation has a new fighter; and the sad significance of that statement is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that during the same fourteen-year span, we have actually photographed, flying, 13 new Soviet fighter models; including a VTOL, of which we have none;

three supersonic STOLs, of which we have none, and the fastest combat fighter in the world today.

Apparently leaders in the Soviet Union notified their Defense Department to end the arguments and produce some hardware. The result is reflected in their tanks, in their small arms, in their submarines, and in their planes.

Finally, as the wisdom of utilizing our resources in the best possible fashion—maximum return for minimum output—appears more important every day, let us take a look at the incredibly wasteful fashion in which we have used those resources in Vietnam. There is no use crying over the spilled milk, but one can only hope that we have learned a lesson to the point where this type and character of waste will never again be repeated.

Over one hundred billion dollars of taxpayers' money has gone down the drain in this major land war on the mainland of Asia; and not only is there little to show us it, but also because of the nature of the conventional military establishment it has forced us to build, this nation could be moving closer to what civilization dreads most—a full nuclear exchange.

More important than any cost in money, however, is the fact that more than 31,000 of our finest youth have been killed, and over 195,000 wounded.

As Dr. Kissinger, President Nixon's foreign policy White House advisor, pointed out in a recent article, during November 1967 the head of the United States military in Vietnam stated that "the war was being on militarily," adding that "a limited withdrawal of American forces might be undertaken beginning late in 1968."

And less than a year ago the Administration emphasized that "the pacification program—the extension of the control of Saigon in the countryside—was progressing satisfactorily."

In a few days came the Tet offensive. This development negated these two assertions. Today our position in Vietnam, despite the above gigantic expenditures in lives and treasure, would appear unimproved.

From a purely military standpoint, the reason for this tragedy is clear. Fighting against brave and well-led guerrillas, the ground forces of the United States have been at grave disadvantage, one major reason being that the three countries which border South Vietnam have been declared sanctuaries; therefore our troops have never been able to counterattack, that vital requisite to successful ground war.

At the same time, ever since the United States, in effect, took over this war, our air power and sea power have been shackled, in a manner, and to a degree, never before known in major warfare.

No doubt because of the true political position which was brought out by the results of the Tet offensive, and in further effort to start peace negotiations with Hanoi, on March 31 last this shackling was increased. United States military forces were forbidden to conduct any attacks whatever, either by air or by sea, north of the 20th parallel. (Actually none above the 19th parallel, which gave the North Vietnamese full use of Vinh, their major supply base in the southern part of that country.)

By this latter action it was hoped the North Vietnamese would come to the conference table. This they did, last May 13; and the American people looked forward with relief to a reduction, if not a cessation, in the cost and the killing. Since that date, however, 8,040 Americans have been killed, 54,207 wounded; and not a penny less than 20 billion additional dollars have gone down the drain of this war.

On November 1 last, the United States made an even further military-political concession by announcing that there would be no further air or sea attacks against any part of North Vietnam.

This would appear to be acknowledgement that a true victory was not in the cards because—Kissinger again—"the guerrilla wins if he does not lose. The conventional army loses if it does not win. The North Vietnamese used their main forces the way a bull-fighter uses his cape—to keep us lunging in areas of marginal political importance."

Since this further concession, we all know what has transpired.

Sixteen years ago, a great Army General, who knew, as did we, that he was being relieved of his command in Korea because of protesting the way that war was being fought, came before the Armed Services Committee.

He volunteered that during his entire life he had taken special interest in coaching football.

Wherever stationed, General Van Fleet said he invariably applied for a coaching job; and as a result of this experience he advised, "Never put an American boy in a game you don't want him to win."

And there is another quote we should remember: those who forget the lessons of history are prone to repeat them.

With that premise, surely we should all do our best to establish priorities so as to curb Federal expenditures, an arduous but essential task which now faces both the Congress and the Administration. A strong and stable economy is not only essential to our prosperity and well-being, but also to our national security.

**A COVERED WAGON TRIP TO WESTERN KANSAS AS DESCRIBED BY ANNA McCULLOUGH**

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of my good constituents, Mrs. Anna McCullough, who is only 90 years young, has written an account concerning a covered wagon trip to western Kansas and, in this day of hustle and bustle and modern communication and transportation, we tend to forget the trying experiences of those who made the trek west.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Mrs. McCullough's account of the trip in the Record at this point:

**A COVERED WAGON TRIP TO WESTERN KANSAS AS DESCRIBED BY ANNA McCULLOUGH**

In the early spring of 1887, our family of George and Emma Madison with their five children, Anna, Mamie, Julia, Willie (Will), and baby Chester living near Hattville, Kansas, near the eastern border, decided to move out in western Kansas, where a boom was on, causing many people from the eastern states to go out there. Some of our neighbors and friends had been out there for two or three years and reported big wheat and corn crops and insisted on our coming out—telling us they would put in early crops and gardens if we would come and also rent a farm for us. Father sold extra cattle and other livestock and made all plans for leaving, fitting us with a covered wagon. We were to travel in this for about 300 miles to Larned, Kansas. A few days before our leaving, our hired girl built a big wood fire in the kitchen stove that sent sparks onto the roof which was made of clapboards. She quickly climbed a ladder with a bucket of water and put the fire out and we were so thankful Father always kept a "rain barrel" at the side of the house filled with water for just such emergencies as he was afraid of those loose boarded roofs. Mother decided to go by

train taking Julia, Willie (Will) and baby Chester with her also had all the household goods shipped by freight. Father, Mamie, and I were to travel by covered wagon, in company with two other wagons and neighbors going with us. He also took several good milk cows that Mamie and I would drive behind the wagons, taking turns riding a fine little horse that we really enjoyed. The going was very slow and we would stop early to camp at road sides to enjoy a good supper and a lot of milk. One morning Father told we girls we would reach the Flint Hills by night and he would show us how the Indians start their camp fires. We anxiously waited until time came for our evening fire. He took Flint rock striking the two together several times. Then a spark flew into the grass and we had our fire. The Indians had left the Hills a few years before altho we sometimes saw some. Mother had a brother, William Butlers, who lived at Sterling, Kansas, so she went there and stayed with them until time for us to reach our new home. Our covered wagon bunch stayed two or three days with Mother and Uncle William's family so we had a rest from travel.

Our new neighbor had rented a small farm for us and had listed the corn and had wheat seeded as well as early garden so we were very thankful. There were no fences anywhere and wagon loads cut across the wild prairies every direction. Mamie and I would herd the cows anywhere we wanted them to go—and had orders never to get off our pony because rattle snakes and prairie dogs were scattered all over in tall blue grass. They lived in villages together and often times wild owls came to join them.

The spring was ideal, everything came up so well and looked so promising. The wheat turned out quite well, the men harvested it with headers in the field taking about six or eight inches off the top, then hauling it to our tables to be threshed later in the fall.

Extreme hot winds from Indian Territory came from the south just as our fine corn was tasseling lasting three days and nights burning our fine green corn to a crisp. Heat was extreme and everyone had to remain in their homes. One could grind up the leaves of corn or crush them in our hands and they would look just like bright green tea leaves. Neighbors told Mother to hang wet sheets up at the doors and windows so we could endure the terrific heat especially baby Chester. The whole sky was darkened by the flying dust.

Following the heat wave a very hard wind storm with terrible lightning came. Never can I forget the black angry looking clouds as they came our way over the wide expanse of prairie. Our little home was struck by lightning going down stove pipe through the kitchen stove on through the floor putting a lot of fire holes in a copper boiler under the house. Mother thinking the storm was over opened the kitchen door, was stunned and fainted scaring we children so much. No fire was started so we were glad. Part of our garden was very good especially the peanut crop. We children were so excited in digging them but were told not to eat any until they were dried and roasted in the oven. We had over two big sacks full and they were a real treat. The school house was very close and a fine teacher was hired as nearly all the people out there were from the east. Our health remained very good except one serious time we had with Willie who had very high fever. Father rode a mule eight or ten miles to get a doctor who had come there from Ohio. He rode a horse back and told us he was a terrible sick little fellow and that he would remain all night with us to watch him carefully. We decided he was a very fine doctor as his treatment brought Willie out in good shape. A neighbor once a retired minister and Mother decided our country side needed a Sunday school so they called other friends to meet with them and agreed to start one. People came for miles

around in wagons where kitchen chairs were used to sit on and we all enjoyed singing together. The first songs I ever learned such as "Work for the Night is Coming," "Bringing in the Sheaves," and "Jesus Lover of My Soul" as well as others.

The vast wide open spaces without a tree or bush to be seen were interesting in the late summer evenings when very queer lights looking just like men riding very fast on horses carrying bobbing lanterns would always go in the same direction following a slough of tall buffalo grasses. We were told they were gasses that formed out there. Often times in early morning Father would awaken us children to come at once and see the mirages reflected in the sky just above the horizon, where sometimes we would see a town so plainly and we thought it was Ft. Larned on the Arkansas River about 13 miles away. Other times we would see cattle in big herds and I remember so well morning we saw a herd of buffalo but never knew where they were. The pictures would be so plain but would only last a short while suspended in air. All thru the fall time the coyotes would carry on all night. Father would lariat our mules and cows with ropes near our stables which the big bobcats would sneak up and cut so he had to get chains to hold them near. The short buffalo grass was very fine for pasture work and hay would be stacked all over the countryside in small round stacks.

Blizzards were bad with the high winds snow going—many were lost going in circles and couldn't find homes. Father was warned to tie a rope to the inside door knob and take it out to the stable to do chores and be sure it didn't come untied. Mother used to worry so when he would leave for fear he couldn't see to get back.

Our neighbors daughter was married to a young minister from the East, Sophia Wad to Edwin Dixon and that was the only social event while we were out there in the two years.

I will never forget the terrible night in the fall, when all the fields of grass was so dry and burned by hot winds that so many big prairie fires would burn over a large amount of land and all the farmers would plow fire guards around houses and stables where hay was stacked. One evening I saw a fire not too big nearly one and one-half miles away and I was so worried for I had heard the school children telling about their fathers plowing guards so I asked my Father to plow one that evening. He replied, "Don't worry, Anna. That neighbor is burning his potato patch off. I'll plow it in the morning."

After midnight Father and Mother were awakened by a terrific light and they saw the terrible fire over a mile wide coming directly our way. Father rushed out to get the mules that were so nervous over the fire coming at them as they were tied on lariats chains and before going he told Mother, saying, "Emma I'll pull the wagon up here at the door and if it gets too close put the children and bedding in it and I will pull them away." I was so terribly frightened. Mother told me to be quiet and not wake up the other children and we would come out all right. She then went to help Father all she could. A wheat stubble was between us and the fire so he plowed three furrows in it, then came closer to our house and plowed some more—checking it on that side of the house. The little school house was near us close to the wheat field so he ran some furrows around it also saving it from burning. By that time some other neighbors living farther away came with wagons carrying barrels of water to help all they could to check it completely around us. We were so thankful to have our little house saved. The fire went on around us, so all the men went to fight it as it came near the minister's house and stables. When he awakened he said, "Come quick and look Miranda, an awful fire is going around us and see what

the Lord has done." That same fire raged for two or three days going over a vast amount of territory destroying hay stacks and some stables. The grass was of an oily nature and burned so fast. Mother worried about the school house and books, so she got a short ladder climbed in the window getting her apron full of books. When we looked over them she had failed to get Mammie and my books but we felt fine that some were saved.

Our folks enjoyed visiting with other neighbors who had come from the Eastern states to seek new homes. I remember well the doctor who came to care for Willie telling about them settling out there in a sod house and digging a well. As they were digging he was helping and fell into it breaking his leg very badly. As I was listening very much and felt very sorry for him I fainted. They put me on the bed and he soon brought me out of it. Then he said, "Guess we won't talk anymore about digging wells."

They agreed that when Indian Territory was broken up that our hot winds would be lighter and not totally destroy our crops. We had a good school teacher, a man of about 35 or 40 who had taught in Indiana and we enjoyed our work with him.

The next spring our crops came up well but again the extreme winds came and burned us up completely. Both Father and Mother were so discouraged and decided to go back to Eastern Kansas near Hiatville where the winds were not so severe and gardens and fruits were plentiful.

The wheat harvest was better than the corn but we could not depend on that. Some of our neighbors also decided to move back east saying they could not stay where winters were hard. No wood could be found and we were lucky if we could find a very little coal. The only trees we saw out there was some kind of ragged willow trees that grew near the Arkansas River near Larned and how terrible the winds did sweep over those wild prairies. Jack rabbits were thick and some would kill them for food but Father didn't like them so we didn't get many to cook.

Again our covered wagon was fixed up in the Fall of 1888. We sold some of the cows, packed our few belongings to send by freight and Mother, Julia, Willie and Chester went by train. Father, Mammie, and I went in the covered wagon taking a few of the cows back with us. She and I did enjoy riding the fine little horse as we journeyed along. When we reached Hiatville, Mother had found a little house and had it all ready for us to come into. She was extremely happy to see us and to be united again after that hard time we had spent in the far western land. Father found work for the winter. Mammie and I were in school and all our friends were happy that we came back. We were kept in Sunday School all the time which we enjoyed. I never can forget the two years of pioneering on the western plains of Western Kansas.

This is a true story of the trip made from Eastern Kansas to the west in 1887 by the George Madison Family.

I have heard my Father and Mother tell about this trip many times.

## SALUTE TO MEN AND WOMEN OF GENEVA STEEL ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, thousands of Utahans are celebrating a quarter-century anniversary which would not have been possible without

their magnificent efforts. These are the 5,000 Utahans who make steel, celebrating the 25th anniversary of Geneva Works, near Provo, Utah.

Geneva burst upon the quiet, agricultural landscape of Utah Valley during World War II. Its inland location resulted from the need to supply the west coast with steel plates from an area not vulnerable to enemy attack.

This same distance from the coast which kept Utah steel safe from foreign attack during World War II makes it vulnerable to foreign imports now. Nearly 80 percent of Geneva's steel goes to west coast customers, 700 to 1,000 miles away. The combination of expensive shipping and foreign imports presents Geneva with a tremendous challenge which is being magnificently met.

Against tremendous odds, the men and women of Geneva have rallied behind an impressive "Errors Zero" program under the slogan, "People Make the Difference." Their teamwork and innovation are paying off. In 1968 there was an improvement in production and cost reduction unmatched by any other year in Geneva's 25-year history.

The spirit of these men and women is exhibited by Raymond W. Sundquist, Geneva's general superintendent, when he says:

At a time when too many of our young people think they can't win—and give up without trying—more and more of our fellow citizens look to us for an example of what people can do, when they have the self-discipline to accept great challenge and the will to achieve in spite of the odds. This reputation, and the responsibility that goes with it, is up to us.

Of course, there is still much to do. Utah's distance from the west coast will always require extra efforts to compensate for high shipping costs. This distance also requires greater efforts to spur the growth of Utah steel-using industry. In Congress, we must continue to work for reasonable quotas on the foreign imports which cut so deeply into Geneva's markets.

Mr. President, my fight for these quotas in the past is a matter of record. I shall continue this fight.

I salute the men and women who make Utah steel and look forward with them to a big, bright future.

On January 26, the Salt Lake Tribune published an article about the anniversary. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

GENEVA STEEL WORKS WILL NOTE 25 YEARS OF PROGRESS IN UTAH  
(By Robert H. Woody)

It sprawls over the former beet fields. It thunders, groans, clanks and roars. U.S. Steel Corp.'s Geneva Works still provides an awesome sight and sound—even for the old hands who have been with it this past quarter of a century.

On Feb. 4, Gov. Calvin L. Rampton will tap an open hearth furnace—a symbolic recreation of the first tap that took place exactly 25 years ago.

The governor is expected to do the honors at 2:00 or 2:30 p.m.—an hour and a few minutes after the first tap time of 12:55 p.m. on Feb. 4, 1944. Prior commitments by the governor prevent matching the exact moment.

The plant was built during the urgency of World War II to provide plate steel and structural members for the West Coast shipbuilding industry.

### JAPANESE COMPETITION

It was built inland to avoid Japanese shelling and bombing. In retrospect the worst the Japanese did was to lob a few shells into a California refinery and loft fire balloons over the Northwest's forests.

The real irony is that the Japanese steel industry in the early 60's came far closer to scuttling Geneva Works than did their bombers and battleships.

In the late 50's and early 60's, Japanese steel began to take over large chunks of the market that had been originally claimed by Geneva Works.

Geneva Works, 800 miles distant from its prime market place, chafed at the cost of getting its product to the West Coast. While the Japanese, though thousands of miles away, could whittle transport costs with their giant ships.

A nagging question: Would U.S. Steel be compelled to abandon Utah?

The company's answer today is a clear no. Even during the crisis, it earmarked several millions for a variety of expansion and improvement programs.

Two years ago it kicked off its "Errors Zero" program—a deal to create a state of mind and aspiration among its employees that "Geneva shall overcome."

("We joke about 'Errors Zero,' but it's always there in the back of your mind," says one of Geneva's old hands.)

And as the national administration changed hands with the inauguration, there was word from both Japanese and European steelmakers that they would voluntarily curb exports to the United States.

### VARIED OUTPUT

U.S. Steel built the plant for the government. Then, when the war was over, it and about 10 other steel companies put in bids to buy it. Even the Russians put in a bid.

The plant is full of "Ironies." Here and there are beams bearing "Bethlehem Steel" imprint. So, too, are certain structures made of wood. "We had to use anything we could get our hands on when we built it."

It is a very different plant than it was when it produced exclusively plates and structural members for ships.

And none at the time would have dreamed it is doing all the things it is doing now: It produces nitrogen byproducts. Its slag goes into roadbuilding. Its pipe mill is turning out natural gas lines and irrigation conduits. It has recently installed a heavy-gauge shear line than can cut lengths of thick steel ribbon to customer's order.

Its chemical coke plant produces many byproducts. Its rolled coils go to the West Coast for zinc plating and fabrication into a variety of products ranging from pails to air conditioners.

### NEARLY 5,000 EMPLOYEES

Weekly some 300 cars of pelletized iron ore from its Atlantic City, Wyo., mine and plant are hauled by unit train to Geneva.

Fifty-five cars a day come in from its Cedar City area iron mines. Another 25 cars of limestone are hauled in daily from the Kellogg Quarry near Payson.

Geneva now employs nearly 5,000 and yearly payroll is about \$48 million.

About 430 of those 5,000 were employees during its first year of operation.

Some 877 of its employees will be due for the 13-week "extended vacation" this year—a once-every-five-years opportunity that is now part of steel industry's contract with its workers.

The aristocracy of the work force are the "head rollers." They sit in a control chair that employs both foot and hand controls.

### PAY FITS JOB

These activate the machinery that grabs the white-hot ingots and thrusts them into

the rollers in a sequence of maneuvers that will knead them into thin, long ribbons of steel.

Because of his critical role in production, a top roller can make upward of \$20,000 a year on salary and incentive payments.

The men who built and started up Geneva were young men. Among them: Bob Bickerstaff, senior melter, now 57, and Clay Dunn, 53, first helper.

Bob came to Geneva in 1944 with 10 years' experience at Wheeling Steel in Steubenville, Ohio. "I'd always been a hunter and fisherman and figured that I could lead a better life here."

Clay, Oklahoma-born, had had experience in the construction industry.

FARMERS PITCH IN

That first day, they recall, was the toughest they ever put in. And as for those Utah County farmers who were the first employees: "None of us knew what we were doing. We were all scared to death of getting hurt."

At first, it was hard to find social acceptance in the Utah community, Bob recalls. But many of the men from Steubenville, Gary and Pittsburgh have since retired in Utah.

Says Clay: "Harry is retiring, and I asked if he was going back home to Gary. And he said, 'I am home.'"

And where else, asks Clay, could you find hunting, fishing and boating just 15 minutes from the plant?

FARM PARITY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the watchdog of farm parity, the U.S. Department of Agriculture January 15 report started the new year off with the dismal news that inflationary costs had driven farm parity lower.

The outgoing administration's final report placed parity at only 72 percent, and with a new alltime high for the cost index. This index figure for cost was nine points higher than 1 year ago and parity was 1-percent lower than January 1968.

Parity had dropped to this level only for 1 month—April 1966—since 1934. Both times under the outgoing administration.

The following table presents the parity percentage for many of the basic commodities for January and the preceding month.

(In percent)

Commodity	December 1968	January 1969
Cotton	48	41
Wheat	47	47
Corn	63	65
Peanuts	76	74
Tobacco	75	74
Butterfat	75	74
Milk	85	83
Wool	45	44
Barley	66	71
Flax	68	67
Oats	67	69
Sorghum	64	64
Soybeans	70	70
Beef	78	78
Chicken	61	67
Eggs	75	75
Hogs	71	74
Lamb	82	85
Turkey	65	65
Average	73	72

AN EAGLE SCOUT COURT OF HONOR IN KENSINGTON, MD.

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Mr. Lawrence F. Regan, chairman of Troop 1439 of the Boy Scouts of America, has brought to my attention the fact that five young men in his troop, all from Kensington, Md., achieved the rank of Eagle Scout and were honored accordingly at an Eagle Court of Honor last November 23.

Attaining the rank of Eagle Scout is significant for the troop, the Scout, and his family, but this instance was particularly significant in that five Scouts out of a troop of only 36 attained Eagle rank simultaneously.

Statistically, only one boy out of 1,000 has the initiative and stick-to-it-iveness to progress through Scouting's ranks to Eagle Scout. The young men themselves deserve great praise but credit is also due to the adult leadership of Scoutmaster Frederick F. Hiltz, an engineer with Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory and ex-Scoutmaster Robert N. Warren, a supervisory service representative with the Chesapeake & Potomac Co.

Troop 1439 is one of two Boy Scout troops sponsored by the Men's Club of St. Paul's United Methodist Church, 10400 Fawcett Street, Kensington, Md. In its 8 short years as a troop it has sent Eagle Scout Lynn Kern to the Air Force Academy where he is now a second-year man and Eagle Scout Peter Palmer to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point where he is a plebe. Eagle Scout Richard Bradford is a student at Einstein High School.

The five new Eagle Scouts are John L. Ely, 18, of 3102 Homewood Parkway; William F. Hiltz, 16, of 4023 Byrd Road; R. Mark Spencer, 16, of 3904 Spruell Court; Andrew W. Thornton, 16, of 4114 Mitscher Court; and Stephen A. Wood, 15, of 3808 Archer Place, all of Kensington in nearby Montgomery County.

Eagle Scout Ely became a Tenderfoot in December 1961, a Second-Class Scout in March 1962, a First-Class Scout in December 1962, and advanced to Star Scout in July 1963 and to Life Scout in June 1966. In addition to the 11 required merit badges and service project, Jack Ely furthered his personal development as indicated by merit badges earned in archery, woodcarving, pets, leatherwork, canoeing, soil and water conservation, conservation of natural resources, scholarship and space exploration. He won the 1-mile swim award at Camp Catoctin during the summer of 1964. He also served as patrol leader and as troop librarian.

Eagle Scout Hiltz joined the Scouting movement in March 1963 after reaching Bear rank in Cub Scout Pack 772. He became a Second-Class Scout in September 1963 and a First-Class Scout in June 1964. While advancing to Star Scout in July 1965 and Life Scout in February 1967 he, too, competed in the 1-mile swim at Camp Catoctin in 1964. His interests are

disclosed by merit badges in scholarship, reading, music, forestry, wildlife management, soil and water conservation, canoeing, reptile study, and pioneering. He served as patrol leader and was elected to the top leadership position in the troop as senior patrol leader. He served on the staff at Camp Goshen, Va., during the summers of 1967 and 1968 training younger Scouts in scoutcraft.

Eagle Scout Spencer became a registered Boy Scout on December 12, 1963. He became a Second-Class Scout in February 1964 and a First-Class Scout in September of the same year. A Star Scout by September 1965, he became a Life Scout in June 1966. Merit badges in forestry and hiking, signaling, canoeing, electricity, electronics, radio, engineering, conservation and oceanography. He, too, completed the 1-mile swim at Camp Catoctin in 1964 and gained the difficult to acquire Scout Lifeguard emblem in 1967. While progressing through Scouting ranks he served as assistant patrol leader, patrol leader, assistant senior patrol leader and succeeded Eagle Scout Hiltz as senior patrol leader in September 1968. Eagle Scout Spencer also served on the staff at Camp Goshen, Va., during the summers of 1967 and 1968 training younger Scouts.

Eagle Scout Thornton became a Scout on February 5, 1964, having been a Cub Scout with Pack 772, also sponsored by the Men's Club at St. Paul's Church. He progressed to Second-Class Scout in April 1964 and to First-Class Scout in September 1964, and served as assistant patrol leader and as patrol leader in 1964 and 1965. En route to Star Scout in November 1964 and Life Scout in February 1967 he developed his interests by achieving merit badges in coin collecting, canoeing, soil and water conservation, public speaking, rowing, and pioneering. Other elective merit badges include scholarship and athletics. He serves as troop quartermaster in charge of camping and scoutcraft equipment.

Eagle Scout Wood attained Lion rank as a Cub Scout in Honolulu before registering as a Tenderfoot Scout on October 6, 1966 in Massachusetts. He became a Second Class Scout during August 1965 and a First Class Scout in February 1966. He has served as troop scribe and in leadership positions as assistant patrol leader, patrol leader, and currently is assistant senior patrol leader. His advancement to Star Scout in June 1967 was followed in October 1967 by reaching Life Scout. The breadth of his interests is shown by his home repairs, rowing, astronomy, architecture, canoeing, conservation, and wildlife management merit badges. He completed the mile swim in 1967 and currently is registered in Operation Patrick Henry, sponsored by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service System, and Mr. Justice Tom B. Clark of the U.S. Supreme Court to teach scouts the art of public speaking.

No wonder that the minister of St. Paul's United Methodist Church, the Reverend Charles F. Kirkley, heartily endorsed the suggestion of Troop Chairman Lawrence F. Regan that a suitable dinner honor the occasion.

Approximately 150 persons attended the banquet and Eagle Court of Honor

held November 23 at St. Paul's Church. Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey was the featured speaker with Mayor A. Victor Gentilini present, representing the community and neighborhood commissioner Robert C. Swendiman, representing the Scouting movement.

In these days of scare headlines and much TV news coverage of the hippie element and of youths involved in lawlessness and tumult, it is refreshing indeed to be able to add a brief "well done." It is to be hoped that these young men who have done well will continue in their devotion to the Scouting ideals of service to community, State, and Nation under God.

#### ON RUNNING A COLLEGE

### HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harry Philpott, president of Auburn University, has taken, in my opinion, a correct and courageous position with respect to allowing Yale Chaplain William Sloane Coffin to speak on the Auburn campus. In answer to a Federal court summons regarding a suit asking the court to overturn Dr. Philpott's veto of an invitation by the Human Rights Forum to Coffin to speak at Auburn, Dr. Philpott answered:

I shall continue to fight to the limit of my resources.

Dr. Philpott said he felt educators should be a "little more knowledgeable" in the field of education than were students.

Dr. Philpott has said some things that needed saying for some time now. I join with all reasonable Alabamians and Americans in supporting Dr. Philpott in this effort.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I place in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the Sand Mountain Reporter, which offers a timely insight into the problem and into Dr. Philpott's position:

#### ON RUNNING A COLLEGE

We applaud the statements made this week by Auburn University President Dr. Harry Philpott in answer to a Federal court summons for Feb. 3 regarding a suit seeking to allow controversial Yale Chaplain William Sloane Coffin to speak on the Auburn campus next month.

An Auburn group filed the suit asking the court to overturn Philpott's veto of an invitation issued by the Human Rights Forum to Coffin to speak on the Auburn campus on Feb. 7.

The university president said the challenging group, representing the Human Rights Forum, did not think he had the right to decide who would speak on the campus.

"I think I do and I shall continue to fight to the limits of my resources," he said.

Philpott said he felt educators should be a "little more knowledgeable" in the field of education than were students.

U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson Jr. set the hearing on a suit asking for a preliminary injunction to be followed by a permanent injunction on grounds the "oral Philpott rule" was unconstitutional.

"The reputation of the human rights forum would be badly damaged should the

speech not be allowed to proceed as planned," the complaint said.

The plaintiffs told the court they thought Philpott's veto was not in keeping with other campus speakers, including former Gov. George C. Wallace; his late wife, Gov. Lurleen B. Wallace; civil rights figure Whitney M. Young, and others. The suit noted the speakers had represented both conservative and liberal views.

Coffin was convicted in a Federal court in New York state of encouraging draft evasion and has appealed the conviction to a U.S. circuit court of appeals.

It is ironic that this campus group goes to the Federal court system to try to gain its objective of encouraging and counseling with a man who advocates the violation of the laws of this land, and who—in effect—would seek to threaten the security and well-being of the very democratic process which provides human rights in a degree never before enjoyed by any society.

And it is most encouraging to see in this instance a university president who stands his ground and tells it like it is—that a qualified and seasoned and trained university trustee, guided by a blue ribbon board of trustees, knows more about how to run the affairs of a university than does a group of university students. We would have avoided some of the tragic campus circumstances which have erupted across this country if more university administrators had taken such a firm stand a long time ago.

#### THE SCISSORED "PUEBLO" RECORD

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "The Scissored Pueblo Record," published in the Norfolk Ledger-Star of January 31, 1969.

William H. Fitzpatrick is editor of the Ledger-Star, and George J. Hebert is editor of the editorial page.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### THE SCISSORED "PUEBLO" RECORD

In an expression of his concern over the Pueblo affair, Virginia's Senator Harry Byrd has also cited an incidental example of bureaucratic arrogance in connection with the case which disturbed him greatly.

Inasmuch as the court of inquiry now under way is likely to be only the beginning of a much wider examination of the ferret ship's capture, it becomes important to review what was said by important officials immediately after the seizure.

But in going to the files of the Senate Armed Services Committee to look at testimony which the committee received last February 1 from Defense Secretary McNamara and from General Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Senator Byrd found something very strange indeed.

One of the questions the Senator had put to Mr. McNamara, along with the latter's answer, had been completely clipped out of the report.

Senator Byrd, while questioning certain of the Pentagon's specific censorship judgments, freely acknowledges the need to prevent some items of testimony from getting into the news accounts. And this is usually accomplished, he says, by red marks which the Defense censors put beside those portions of a report which are not to be made public after a closed-door hearing.

But cutting the matter from the report entirely and leaving such a Pentagon-doctored file as the committee's permanent record of crucial testimony? The Senator's angry comment on this was that "nothing can justify keeping this information from the review of the Congressional committee charged with that responsibility."

The Senator's complaint is fully justified. From his recollection of the testimony, he seems to believe that what was cut could have an important bearing now on the total assessment of the Pueblo fiasco. But even if not, the cutting of the report was a dangerous assumption of authority.

Senator Byrd is entirely right in calling the Pentagon's hand on it, and the censors ought to be put on full notice that any such tampering with the records will not be tolerated.

XXXXXX

#### EARLY RETIREMENT

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the years our Committee on Post Office & Civil Service has worked to develop a reasonable and up-to-date retirement program for our Federal employees. It is not perfect, and, of course, there will always be differences of opinion on details of retirement rules and benefits. But I believe it is basically a sound system.

Joseph Young, the very able Federal columnist in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, had an interesting article the other day on the familiar subject of early retirement:

#### TALK OF EARLY RETIREMENT WAS MERELY CONVERSATION (By Joseph Young)

When I first started covering the government beat in the good old days of 1945, one of the first government career officials I met was a chap named Farthington.

Farthington was a trim, youthful 46, bright-eyed, with black hair and a splendid mustache.

He was most helpful in furnishing us with good news leads and we remarked appreciatively that we hoped we would enjoy a long and pleasant association with him.

"I'm afraid not," he said. "As soon as I can I'm going to retire."

We expressed surprise, since he was so young.

"Why shouldn't I retire?" he asked, warming up to what apparently was his favorite subject.

"I don't want to hang around until they force me to retire at the mandatory age of 70, feeble and no good to anyone," he said. "No, sir! I want to get out and enjoy life while I'm still young."

We wished him luck and asked when he thought he might take the plunge.

"Well, I'm angling for an involuntary separation so I can get out and get my retirement annuity at the age of 50," he replied.

When he reached the age of 50 and still remained on the job, we expressed mild surprise that he was still there.

"Well, there's a government pay raise coming up this year, and that will boost my high-five-year average salary on which my annuity will be based," Farthington said. "So I'll wait another year."

The next year and another five years came and went and Farthington was still around, and we found the subject of his projected retirement too delicate to mention.

But when Congress was considering the

XXXXXX

bill to allow employes to retire on full annuities at age 55 after 30 years' service, Farthington brought up the subject himself.

"Once this bill becomes law, I'll get out of here so fast that it will make your head swim," he said, rubbing his hands. "Ah, the life of leisure—Florida, fishing, swimming, afternoon naps."

Congress enacted the bill into law but Farthington remained at his desk.

"I understand Congress is going to liberalize the computation of annuities, so I might as well stick around another year," he explained. "It won't hurt me and will be well worth it."

The computation factors were liberalized. But—you guessed it—Farthington remained on the job.

Even the year when employes were given an 8 percent bonus on retiring, Farthington stayed on.

"With the new pay comparability pay law, our pay raises the next few years will be fantastic and will raise my annuity tremendously when I retire," he rationalized.

As he spoke, we noticed for the first time that his once jet-black hair was gray and his mustache was straggly.

And so it went year after year until last week, when we received a call from him.

"Can you come over and see me?" he asked in a quavering voice. We said we'd be right over, feeling rather gully that we hadn't called on him in several years.

On arriving at his office, our first impression was that a stranger was seated at his desk. Certainly, this white-haired man with the palsied hands and wrinkled face was a far cry from our friend Farthington. But, alas, it was he.

"Help me, help me!" he cried.

"How," we asked. "What is the matter?" "I turned 70 yesterday and they're forcing me to retire," he shouted wildly.

"But I don't want to go—I'm still in my prime and there's another pay raise coming up. Can't you use your influence to get me an exception from the 70-year mandatory retirement age?"

As we started to reply, two burly General Services Administration guards walked into the office unannounced. Approaching Farthington, one of them said, "All right, Pop, this is it. They need your office and you'll have to leave."

"I won't go!" Farthington shouted.

"Then you leave us no alternative," the other guard said, hoisting Farthington over his shoulder like a sack of flour and carrying him struggling from the room.

From down the hall, we heard Farthington's piteous wail: "Help me, I'm too young to retire. Help me, I'm too young. . ."

#### WEAPONS SYSTEMS: A STORY OF FAILURE

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an article entitled "Weapons System: A Story of Failure," published in the Washington Post, Sunday issue of the Washington Post, affirms the tragic history of the billions of dollars wasted in the research and development program in weapons systems. The article makes a distasteful case for the billions wasted through the lack of quality control. Although there are some who would use any pretext to abandon our research and development of new weapons systems, the obvious conclusion should be that

improvements in the control of developments are of the highest priority.

Mr. President, there is overwhelming evidence that our R. & D. procedures and methods for developing and procuring effective weapons systems needs an overhaul. It has been emphasized by experts that the DOD must streamline its R. & D. program. This article provides more evidence.

Mr. President, I quote from the newspaper article, written by Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter, which apparently is a review of a classified document prepared by a key Government official:

The Paper first examined 13 major aircraft and missile programs, all with "sophisticated" electronic systems, built for the Air Force and the Navy beginning in 1955, at a cost of \$40 billion.

Of the 13, only four costing \$5 billion could be relied upon to perform at more than 75 per cent of their specifications.

Mr. President, this is a serious state of affairs. It is no wonder the Soviets are closing the weapons gap. These glaring deficiencies in our R. & D. program make it easy for them. It is my firm hope that the new administration, with the advice and consent of this distinguished body, will be able to correct these complex problems and produce effective weapons for the billions spent.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 26, 1969]

#### WEAPONS SYSTEMS: A STORY OF FAILURE (By Bernard D. Nossiter)

The complex electronic gadgetry at the heart of new warplanes and missiles generally works only a fraction of the time that its builders had promised.

The performance of the multi-billion-dollar weapons systems started in the 1950s was bad; those of the 1960s are worse.

The Pentagon appears to be giving the highest profits to the poorer performers in the aerospace industry.

These are the conclusions of an abstruse 41-page paper now circulating in Government and academic circles. The document, a copy of which has been made available to The Washington Post, is believed to be the first systematic effort to measure how well or ill the Pentagon's expensive weapons perform.

Its author is a key Government official with access to secret data and responsibility for examining the costs of the Pentagon's complex ventures. He and his agency cannot be identified here.

His paper, entitled "Improving the Acquisition Process for High Risk Military Electronics Systems," aims at bringing down the costs and bettering the dismal performance of weapons. It does not discuss a question that might occur to others: if these weapons behave so badly, why is the money being spent at all?

For security reasons, many of the planes and missiles examined are not identified by name.

The paper first examined 13 major aircraft and missile programs, all with "sophisticated" electronic systems, built for the Air Force and the Navy beginning in 1955, at a cost of \$40 billion.

Of the 13, only four, costing \$5 billion, could be relied upon to perform at more than 75 per cent of their specifications. Five others, costing \$13 billion, were rated as

"poor" performers, breaking down 25 per cent more often than promised or worse. Two more systems, costing \$10 billion, were dropped within three years because of "low reliability." The last two, the B-70 bomber and the Skybolt missile, worked so badly they were canceled outright after an outlay of \$2 billion.

#### LOSSES FURTHER LUSTER

The paper sums up: "Less than 40 per cent of the effort produced systems with acceptable electronic performance—an uninspiring record that loses further luster when cost overruns and schedule delays are also evaluated."

The paper measures "reliability" in this context: The electronic core of a modern plane or missile consists essentially of three devices. One is a computer that is supposed to improve the navigation and automatically control the first of the vehicle's weapons. Another is a radar that detects enemy planes and targets. The third is a gyroscope that keeps the plane or missile on a steady course.

When the Pentagon buys a new gadget, its contract with the aerospace company calls for a specific "mean time between failure of the electronic system." In lay language, this is the average number of continuous hours that the systems will work.

In a hypothetical contract for a new jet bomber, Universal Avionics will sell the Air Force on its new device by promising that the three crucial electronic elements will operate continuously for at least 50 hours without a breakdown. In the reliability measures used in the paper described here, the plane is said to meet 100 per cent of the performance standards, if, in fact, its gadgetry did run 50 consecutive hours. However, if a key element breaks down every twelve and a half hours, it gets a rating of 25 per cent; every 25 hours, 50 per cent and so on. Should a system operate with a breakdown interval of 62.5 hours—a phenomenon that happens rarely—its reliability is rated at 125 per cent.

#### TEST FOR THE PILOT

Quite obviously, the more frequent the breakdown, the more the pilot of a plane has to rely on his wit and imagination to navigate, find targets and fly a steady course. Over-frequent breakdowns in a missile can render it worthless as an instrument of destruction.

Curiously enough, as the paper demonstrates, the Pentagon and the aerospace industry apparently learned little \* \* \* the systems of the 1960s are even worse.

The document first looks at the performance record of the electronic systems in 12 important programs begun in the 1950s. All but four missiles can be identified by name without breaching security.

Of the 12, only five perform up to standard or better; one breaks down 25 per cent more frequently than promised; four fall twice as often and two break down four times as frequently as the specifications allow.

The document discusses some of the good and bad performers in this group. It observes that the F-102, the Delta wing interceptor for the Air Defense Command, was defeated by an unsatisfactory fire control system. Its first had to be replaced; the next was also unsatisfactory, and an extensive two-year program to modify the device was then undertaken.

#### SIDEWINDER DID WELL

In contrast, the Sidewinder, a heat sensing missile, performed very well. The study attributes this to the fact that the missile was developed in a leisurely fashion, without a "crash" schedule, and that several contractors were brought in to compete for key components.

The paper next examines eleven principal systems of the 1960s. These cannot be identified beyond a letter designation.

To make the best possible case for the Pentagon and its contractors, this survey does not include two systems costing \$2 billion that performed so badly they were killed off. The eleven systems of the 1960s evaluated here account for more than half of those begun in the most recent decade and their electronic hearts cost well in excess of \$100 million each.

Of the eleven systems, only two perform to standard. One breaks down 25 per cent more rapidly than promised; two break down twice as fast and six, four times as fast.

As a group, the eleven average a breakdown more than twice as fast as the specifications demand. Oddly enough, the first version of the system designated met the standard. But the same unidentified contractor produced three succeeding versions that fall on the average more than three times as often as they should. All these successors, the paper observes, were ordered on a "pressure cooker" basis, on crash schedules.

#### HIGHEST REWARDS

The paper also examines the relationship between contractors' profits and performance, and suggests that, contrary to what might be expected, some of the most inefficient firms doing business with the Pentagon earn the highest rewards.

The second chart looks at profits, after-tax returns as a percentage of investment, the only valid basis for determining profitability, for the ten years from 1957 through 1966. During the decade, the aerospace firms managed to earn consistently more than American industry as a whole, piling up nine dollars (or billions of dollars) in profits for every eight garnered by companies not doing business with the Pentagon.

Even more peculiar is the brilliant earnings record of two of the biggest contractors, North American and General Dynamics. Both except for a brief period when General Dynamics tried its hand at some civilian business, made profits far above the industrial average and generally in excess of their colleagues in aerospace.

During the ten years, North American did all but two per cent of its business with the Government. The study reports that it produced one highly successful plane in the mid-50s, another system that met performance specifications, one that was canceled and four that broke down four times as frequently as promised. Nevertheless, the company's profits were 40 per cent above those of the aerospace industry and 50 per cent above the average for all industries.

#### NONE MEASURES UP

General Dynamics had, as the chart shows, a much more uneven profits record. But its years of disaster and even losses were those when it ventured into the economically colder climate of the civilian world to produce a commercial jet airliner. Having learned its lesson, it retreated to the warmer regions of defense procurement and, in recent years, has netted more than the industry average. It has compiled this happy earnings score, the study observes, despite the fact that none of the seven weapons systems it built for the Pentagon "measured up to expectations." Its most notorious failure is the F-111 swing-wing fighter-bomber.

As a final touch, the study notes that complex electronic systems typically cost 200 to 300 per cent more than the Pentagon expects and generally are turned out two years later than promised. But both of these phenomena have been examined so frequently by specialists in the field that the paper does not dwell on them.

#### HOW MUCH PROTECTION?

These findings raise some serious questions. Perhaps the most important is how much protection the United States is getting for the tens of billions of dollars invested in

expensive weaponry. Another is whether the whole process should be turned off and improvements made in the existing devices. Secretaries of Defense have repeatedly assured the Nation that present weaponry guarantees the destruction of any Nation that attacks the United States.

The document under study here, however, takes a different line, one aimed at getting less costly weapons that measure up to the promised performance.

It blames the dismal record on several factors. One is the relentless search for newer and more complicated electronic "systems." The aerospace contractor has an obvious vested interest in promoting "breakthrough" gadgetry. This is the way he gets new, and clearly profitable business.

#### CLOSE CORRELATION SHOWN

But the study asks, do the services need it? Since the Air Force and the Navy almost always accept a plane or a missile that performs at a fraction of its promised standard, it would appear from an exclusive military standpoint that a device of a much lower order of performance fits the Nation's defense needs.

The document also shows a close correlation between "crash" programs and poor performance. Thus, it proposes more realistic schedules. If a weapon is wanted in short order, five years or less, the study recommends that its electronic gadgetry be limited to familiar items.

If the Pentagon wants something that makes a "technical breakthrough," it should allow a minimum development period of five to seven years, it is pointed out.

Another factor in poor performance, the study says, is the absence of competition for new systems after the initial designs are accepted. Typically, the Pentagon requires five or so aerospace firms to bid on its original proposal. But typically, it selects one winner on the basis of blueprint papers.

The study says that the military could save more money and get a better product if it financed two competitors to build prototypes after the design stage. Such a technique was followed, it recalls, with the F-4, a supersonic Navy interceptor. Even though the F-4 employed both a new radar and a new computer, it performed up to the promised standard.

At first glance, such a technique might seem like throwing good money after dubious dollars. But the study contends that if two aerospace competitors are forced to build and fly prototypes before they win the big prize—the contract to produce a series of planes or missiles—they will be under a genuine incentive to be efficient, hold costs down and make things that work.

#### ELECTORAL REFORM

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to put into the Record a letter I received recently from a thoughtful citizen who is concerned, as are many of us, with the whole question of electoral reform. While his opinions may not be shared by many Members of the House, I think it certainly has the right to be represented.

Under unanimous consent I submit the letter from Mr. Karl Haartz, of Andover, Mass., for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN,  
Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office  
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The purpose of the Electoral College is to prevent the creation of two centers of politics: One in Congress, the legitimate one; the other in the Office of President which is illegitimate.

The purpose of the Constitution's design in this area, and which is in harmony with the other unique arrangements for inducing what are now recognized as cybernetic, or self regulating characteristics, is to keep as much politics as possible away from the administration functions of our government.

It can be understood that the popular voting method of electing a President, with its implied promise of overriding the Legislative branch, Congress, and its concomitant competition for the political limelight, leadership and responsibility that ought to be Congress' and was intended to be, is a situation that retards the useful functions of the United States Government.

Consequently, the problem's solution is not more disparagement and disregard of the cybernetic functions of the Electoral College, rather it is for Congress to give us the direction and discipline for returning to the College's requirements so as to protect the citizens' welfare and the Republic's substance.

No member of Congress would advise removal of the brakes from a train because they were not properly maintained or used, or because the engine could now run faster and some of the passengers wanted more speed. Yet such logic sums the substance and is the epitome of the logic so far stated in support of the move to further remove the cybernetic control inherent in the Electoral College's design and ability.

The election of the President and Vice President in full accord with the Electoral College without a Presidential campaign would elevate that office to the function of administration of Congress' programs. It would encourage Congress to return to its rightful and essential place of originator and leadership in legislative programs. That improvement in practice would also discourage political action in the executive branch whose efficacy increases in direct proportion as its political action decreases; that is, as government of three separate and independent parts becomes a government with but one center of politics, Congress.

Therefore, may I ask that your Committee ask Congress to direct that elections for President and Vice President be in accord with the requirements of the Electoral College as delineated in the Constitution: And for the reasons stated here and in The Federalist Papers?

With every good wish,  
Sincerely yours,

KARL HAARTZ.

#### POLLUTION AND POWER IN A SMALL MILL TOWN

### HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the January 26, 1969, issue of Potomac magazine contains an excellent article entitled "Pollution and Power in a Small Mill Town," written by Shelby Coffey III. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**POLLUTION AND POWER IN A SMALL MILL TOWN**  
(By Shelby Coffey III, assistant editor)

For the average resident the reality of Covington is the funeral atmosphere about the streets at night. Car after immobile car is shrouded with plastic covers or with thick white cloths across the windshield. Protection against industrial fallout, claim the car owners. Some Westvaco executives have what they call a mill car, an older car that will not be much ruined by the dustfall, the cinders and ashes. Some people in town claim their white houses have been dyed an unappealing goldish color because of the pollution.

Ask a service station attendant in Covington how to wash the pollution off your car after it has been in town for several days and he will recommend toilet bowl cleanser and warn you to be careful not to burn your hands with it. One frustrated housewife went so far as to sweep up the fallout on her front porch, pack it and send the box of dirt off to the president of Westvaco in New York city.

L. C. Claybrook of the Clay shoe store has been in business for over twenty years. He says that in an average year he has 30 to 35 customer complaints of shoes falling apart, complaints that Claybrook can't explain except by the way one shoe company replied to his complaints. "They said that some sort of chemical had eaten out the threads."

Dr. Winn is the local, eye, ear, nose and throat physician. He feels that there is a "considerably" higher incidence of bronchitis, colds and sinus trouble than in comparable towns without large mills. But he admits he has no statistics for actual comparison, just a lot of daily complaints.

When Peyton Place began to make it big on television, some of the residents of Covington, Va., took vicarious pride in comparing their town to the fabled New England hotbed of sin and status-strife. There was the giant West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company plant at one end of the town, and the owners of the company had once lived in a baronial mansion set on the hill overlooking the little mill town of 11,000.

Now the home sits in deserted splendor above the factory smoke that broods through the hollows of the Virginia countryside. In the valley, the workers' home, one- and two-story rectangles of gray and off-white, are squeezed together in regimental rows.

There are classic small town earmarks: Salvation Army volunteers calling for contributions on Main Street just before Christmas addressed everyone by his first name through a scratchy megaphone. Behind the cash register at the best restaurant in town, the owner has set up individual candid shots of all his children. And there are good small town scandals, too, worthy of Grace Metalious: a young college student working at a Shell station part-time hints of scandal behind an unsolved slaying years ago. A wise country-boy-to-city-bumpkin smile on his flushed face above the khaki work shirt, he explains, perhaps jokingly: "This is a funny town. You can get a ticket if you park five minutes overtime on Main Street, but you can get away with killing somebody."

That story would make a whole Monday evening TV installment. But this sort of gossip is not what really sets hot words flying these days in Covington. The deep concerns of the 60s have come to this urban anachronism. What really stirs passions, wrath and intrigue, what brings on questions of conflict of interest on state boards, what brought state-wide interest in this little town last fall was air pollution.

For the newcomer, the passing motorist, the unprepared visitor, Covington begins as an odor—a harsh sulfurous smell that meanders and settles into your car, your motel room if you spend the night, and your slightly shocked nostrils in any case. The odor

covers Main Street in Covington, an archetypal collection of two-story buildings—dime stores and jewelers and clothing stores with sensible discount prices advertised in show windows where mannikins wear styles imitating what was fashionable in New York a year or two ago. And the sulfur smell is stirred by the customized machines of lynx-eyed young men with slick hair; their rumbling autos driven past sidewalks where people still take the time to stop when they say hello in passing.

But on a "bad day" when the precipitators at the mill are acting up and the cove-like air conditions in the valley cause an inversion, a thick bluish haze clogs all of Covington. Main Street, three blocks from the huge barrel-like stacks of Westvaco, becomes a blurred image like a faded, aging photograph of the little town your grandfather talked about spending his hard but fair childhood in.

Then comes the sense of claustrophobia. You can't get away from the smell, the haze, the feeling that your lungs are swallowing in some vaporous disaster. As if you stepped into a room where a hundred chain smokers had just held a two-hour meeting.

This is just a newcomer's impression. Most Covington residents said "you get used to it" and shrug. After all, the mill employs over 2000 workers, pays a sizable share of the city's and Allegheny County's taxes and has been, in effect, the economic life of the community for the past seventy years.

On the other hand, some Covington citizens decided not to shrug it off. Last September in a carefully worded series of questions that detonated a political blast in Richmond, a citizen's group termed itself the Allegheny Crusade for Clean Air Inc. took a deep breath and trumpeted an open letter to the Governor of Virginia. The letter asked, among other things: "Do any members of the State Air Pollution Control Board transact business, or benefit indirectly from business, with West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company?" (The five-man State board was set up as a result of a state air pollution act passed in 1966.) The letter also asked if the makeup of the Technical Advisory Committee, which studies technical matters for the State Board, was such that members of the Committee could "present impartial advice on Air Pollution Control matters when such advice may be contrary to their company interests? Does this constitute a conflict of interest?"

One member of the State Air Pollution Control Board is Frank Kinzer, an insurance man, in Covington. "It smells pretty good to us (natives)," Kinzer says with a smile, referring to the economic benefits that the mill has brought to the little Virginia town.

"There was one time when the air smelled clean," recalls Kinzer. That time turns out to have been during a strike. And back then when the winds were fresh and had maybe an unfamiliar hint of honeysuckle was also a time "... because they were scarce."

In seventy years in Covington, the Westvaco mill has brought millions of dollars to the area's economy. In turn the mill has asked for and received the co-operation of many grateful members of the community. And vitriolic as they sometimes wax on the subject of Westvaco's behavior, members of the Clean Air Crusade are always careful to add that they don't want to see the mill driven out of town. A speech by high Westvaco official Crawley Williams on Jan. 12, 1961, seemed to hint that "the economic facts of life" might indeed affect the status of mill as employer.

The Covington Virginian, the local newspaper, headlined the next day: "Don't Take Mill For Granted Says Mgr., Civic Effort Needed." Some townspeople were described by the newspaper as "stunned" by the implications. The official Westvaco position is that

Williams did not mean to imply any sort of threat to people who were not willing to put forth much "civic effort" or to the community in general. He was, they feel, misinterpreted. Some of the Clean Air Crusaders respond to this interpretation of misinterpretation with pithy phrases associated with the nearby farm country.

For Frank Kinzer, though, Crawley Williams is not a figure of controversy but a good friend whose companionship he has valued much of their adult lives. They have been "going to the Kentucky Derby together for years." A distinguished-looking man with silvery hair, and a soft Virginia accent, Kinzer declares with patrician emphasis and pride that he and Mr. Williams are "personal friends."

As a member of the State Board concerned with air pollution, Kinzer says he is careful not to go to "these meetings" in Covington where the pollution problem becomes a subject of controversy. His presence, he feels, might be misconstrued, and "the Go XXXXX wouldn't like that either." He says that his insurance business is about 60 per cent with union employees at the Westvaco plant and about 40 per cent with mill management and other local people. He worked at the mill himself a couple of summers while he was in college. And he has "the personal insurance of three mill managers."

In this delicate position Kinzer tries "to be friends with everybody... to see both XXXXX. Otherwise, 'You would cut your own throat if you leaned too much to one side or the other.'" On the other hand, he doesn't think too much of the activities of the Covington Allegheny Crusade for Clean Air; they are, he says, "always agitating... writing letters... claiming they have 1400 members..." In short: "Keeping things stirred up..."

No matter how hard the Crusade members try to represent the State Board and its Technical Advisory Committees as a wretched cauldron of conflict of interest, the members feel that progress is being made in the touchy and newly explored area of air pollution. The Technical Advisory Committee was set up to advise the State Board on the mechanical aspects of controlling pollution.

The chairman of the Advisory Committee is I. Russell Berkness, a Richmond businessman dealing in industrial equipment such as paper mill pumps and boiler accessories. Berkness says he does business with Westvaco. When asked how much business, he replied, "I don't think that's a proper question." Later he added that the business he does with Westvaco is, at the moment, "no more than we do with a lot of others" of the major industries in Virginia. As Berkness sees it the potential for conflict of interest "falls back on the personal ethics of the individuals." He stands on his record, and feels that the men on the Advisory Committee have uniformly advocated progress in pollution control.

"They don't say 'we can't live with this.' In my contact with them they have said they want to move along for the Governor and for the public." And before the Federal government gets involved.

Berkness says he will have been on the Committee two years in March and that he and his fellow members have been asked if they will accept reappointment. Among the other members who are on the Advisory Committee are some who drive the Crusaders into suspicious broodings.

One of these gentlemen is William D. Major, one of the superintendents at the Westvaco plant in Covington. He is the chairman of a subcommittee on process industries, which is concerned with industries like Westvaco. Other members of the process subcommittee include W. C. Chapman, Technical Director of the Bleached Paper and Board Division of Union Camp, another paper-manufacturing concern; Robert Frazier of the Frazier Quarry in Harrisonburg;

Dale Kieffer of Borden Chemical Co.; George Kneass of Foote Mineral Co., and John S. Lagarias, President of Resource Research Inc. in Reston, Va.

"Sometimes I get this feeling of helplessness," says A. B. Caul, chairman of the Allegheny Crusade, as he drives by the vast Westvaco mill.

Thick smoke is rising out of the stacks and flattening a little higher up, forming a giant gray pancake over Covington. "Did you ever read the novel *Hawth*? Remember the fort? The great impregnable fort?"

One man who definitely does not feel any sense of impotence about the present pollution controversy is Virginia House Delegate Lewis McMurrin of Newport News, chairman of the State Air Pollution Control Board. After the Crusade's letter to the Governor, McMurrin told the Associated Press, "Our job is to clean up the air in Virginia, not to drive out or close down the state's industries."

He also stated that the technical advisory committee was made up of professional engineers and that the state was lucky to have their advice. He said that the State board, not the advisory committee, made the decisions and that State law required that no member of the board "may be connected with any industry that would be subject to air pollution control regulation."

In a sense, part of the uproar over air pollution is the fault of the geography of the place which creates "inversions" which in turn keep the smoke spread out over the town. Mill experts say this happens 150 to 200 days a year. Also the company points out that it has spent \$5 million on air pollution control, \$3 million since 1966.

This does not satisfy the hardcore local critics. They point to the sixty-odd years in which Westvaco spent only 2 million. Further, the critics charge that Westvaco is acting more from self-interest than benevolence in setting up recovery units, since the material recovered is lucrative. Allan Lindsey, a mill supervisor specializing in pollution problems, says that the control devices in the carbon section of the plant are now nearly able to pay for the process itself. But as Doug Luke, a young Westvaco official and a relative of the founder of the company, puts it: "We have nothing to be ashamed of. We are making substantial progress."

For the small percentage of the vocally disgruntled among Covington's residents, progress is not coming fast enough. Spend two hours with a group of the Crusaders and you witness displays of outrage, gallows humor, a little irrelevancy and a sense of frustrated righteousness.

His letter to the Covington Virginian last March replying to a Crusade member has typified, to the despair of the crusaders, the attitude of many townspeople who feel that their jobs might be hurt by any change in the status quo of the mill. The letter read: "Dear Sir: May I make a suggestion to our so unhappy new citizen of Covington, J. I. Bernhardt? Why don't (sic) he find a place more suitable to live in that will meet his needs? I am sure we are not holding him here. If it wasn't for the 'Gold Dust' falling around him he would have to leave anyhow. (Signed) W. Wallace Harris, Covington, Va."

#### AN UNFAIR CAPITAL LEVY

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, last week I reintroduced my bill to reduce the capital gains tax, and I received an immediate response from the president of the Investors League, Inc., of New York City,

Mr. William Jackman. I would like to include Mr. Jackman's letter in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC.,  
New York, N.Y., January 31, 1969.

Congressman JAMES B. UTT,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN UTT: The millions of stockholders and home owners of America indeed owe you a debt of gratitude for introducing H.R. 5675, your bill to cut the maximum long-term capital gains rate from 25% to 12½%. We are conducting a national survey of investors which so far indicates that the U.S. Treasury revenue from this tax would be five times higher than present revenue.

When the government needs more revenue and can get it from a tax decrease, why shouldn't they do so?

#### AN UNFAIR CAPITAL LEVY

Non-partisan eminent tax economists feel that the economic principle that appreciation or increases in the value of capital is not income. So long as capital is held by the owner, scarcely anyone would assert that appreciation in its value is income. When the capital is sold, the sale does not produce income, since the money or other valuable consideration received in exchange is presumably of no greater value than the capital sold. In other words, the taxpayer is clearly no better off after the sale than he was immediately before. When there has been inflation, the so-called "capital gain" may not be even a real gain in capital. For example, if the owner of a capital asset sells it today for twice as many of today's dollars as the number of dollars he paid for it in 1940, he is not one bit better off, since today's dollar is worth in purchasing power less than half as much as the 1940 dollar. When the government takes one-fourth of such fictitious appreciation, it is clearly imposing a capital levy, not an income tax at all. Since the inflation was caused by the government itself, the tax is particularly unfair.

This is not a tax on income at all, but a capital levy creating a penalty for selling a stock in direct proportion to the rise in quotations. This capital levy was one of the weapons by which it was proposed to "soak the rich" at a time when "redistribution of wealth" was one of the prime objectives of the administration in power. Few Americans realize how drastic an impost this is for it exists in no other major capitalistic country. Certainly at a time when our government can actually gain revenue by the process, we should at least cut the tax in half as another step back toward economic sanity and freedom—freedom to determine without penalty just where we want our savings invested at any time of our choice.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM JACKMAN,  
President.

#### THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to arrange for representatives of the Pennsylvania Jewish community to meet with Rodger P. Davies, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, to convey their concern over the current situation in the Middle East. Deputy Assistant Secretary Davies works primarily on Middle East matters.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to Secretary of State William Rogers, that was presented at the January 30 meeting, and the Secretary of State's response be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

This delegation of Rabbis representing more than 1000 rabbis serving the Jews of the Eastern seaboard from New York to Washington present the following resolution to the Secretary of State, the Hon. William Rogers, for his serious consideration.

WHEREAS the State of Israel has been forced into 3 wars during the 21 years of its existence despite its continuous efforts to seek and to offer peace.

WHEREAS a consistent stream of vicious acts of terrorism has flowed from the lands surrounding Israel before and since the War of June 1967.

WHEREAS ruthless and useless acts of murder have been committed over and over again exacting the lives of children on a summer tour, shoppers in a Jerusalem market, passengers at a Tel Aviv bus depot, travelers in an Athens airport, and many others.

WHEREAS the government of Iraq has catered to the lowest animalistic instincts of their citizens by lynching 14 people, 9 of whom were Jews, as a spectacle for gleeful cheering, frenzied mobs.

WHEREAS the Russian and French governments have seen fit to further encourage and inflame the Arabs in their openly declared aim of annihilating the State of Israel and by so doing wiping out America's only reliable friend in the Mideast.

WHEREAS from a political, moral, and spiritual standpoint it is the duty of this country to stand up for the basic rights of life and liberty.

Therefore, we the rabbis of these States applaud the Secretary of State's recent response to such inhuman acts. However, being fearful of the dreadful signs which forebode a continuation of such murders, we ask the United States government to make the most weighty representations to the United Nations and to those countries which maintain relations with Iraq, that they utilize every diplomatic, humanitarian, and moral means to dissuade the government of Iraq from continuing its barbarous course so alien to the highest concepts of humanity and justice.

We hope and pray to Almighty God that the thousands of Jews still under Arab domination will not be added to the 6,000,000 Jews already plaguing the world's conscience because of its hesitation to act in their behalf.

BALTIMORE BOARD OF RABBIS,  
BOARD OF RABBIS OF GREATER  
PHILADELPHIA.

ESSEX COUNTY BOARD OF RABBIS,  
NEW YORK BOARD OF RABBIS,  
TRI-COUNTY BOARD OF RABBIS,  
WASHINGTON BOARD OF RABBIS.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, February 3, 1969.

Rabbi LEO LANDSMAN,  
President, the Board of Rabbis of Greater  
Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR RABBI LANDSMAN: Mr. Davies has given me the Resolution you handed him on January 30 and has told me of his conversation with you and the other representatives of Eastern Rabbis.

I understand completely your reaction to the recent events in the Middle East and can assure you that I and my colleagues in the Department of State share your deeply-felt concern. We shall do everything we possibly can to alleviate the plight of Jews and other minorities in the Middle East. As President

Nixon has pledged, we shall direct the influence of this Government in support of a reduction of tensions in the Middle East and the achievement of a lasting peace settlement.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator Hugh Scott.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR  
AWARDED TO TWO NATIVES OF  
NEWNAN, GA.

### HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson recently presented the Congressional Medal of Honor to two officers who were natives of the same hometown of Newnan, Ga. In making the presentation, the President commented that this was the first time two men from the same small town were honored with the Nation's highest military award.

I have received a letter from Legionnaire Charles R. Forman of Post 107 of the American Legion at Leeds, Ala., pointing out that two members of that post have been awarded the Medal of Honor. Leeds, with some 6,500 residents, certainly qualifies as a small town. Both men were born in Leeds, and at last account, both were still in the service. To set the record straight, I would like at this point to insert in the Record the citations of William R. Lawley, Jr., and Alford L. McLaughlin:

LAWLEY, WILLIAM R., JR.

Rank and organization: First Lieutenant, United States Army Air Corps. Place and date: Over Europe, 20 February 1944. Entered service at: Birmingham, Ala. Birth: Leeds, Ala. G.O. No.: 64, 8 August 1944. Citation: For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action above and beyond the call of duty, 20 February 1944, while serving as pilot of a B-17 aircraft on a heavy bombardment mission over enemy-occupied continental Europe. Coming off the target he was attacked by approximately 20 enemy fighters, shot out of formation, and his plane severely crippled. Eight crewmembers were wounded, the copilot was killed by a 20-mm. shell. One engine was on fire, the controls shot away, and Lieutenant Lawley seriously and painfully wounded about the face. Forcing the copilot's body off the controls, he brought the plane out of a steep dive, flying with his left hand only. Blood covered the instruments and windshield and visibility was impossible. With a full bomb load the plane was difficult to maneuver and bombs could not be released because the racks were frozen. After the order to bail out had been given, one of the waist gunners informed the pilot that two crewmembers were so severely wounded that it would be impossible for them to bail out. With the fire in the engine spreading, the danger of an explosion was imminent. Because of the helpless condition of his wounded crewmembers Lieutenant Lawley elected to remain with the ship and bring them to safety if it was humanly possible, giving the other crewmembers the option of bailing out. Enemy fighters again attacked but by using masterful evasive action he managed to lose them. One engine again caught on fire and was extinguished by skillful flying. Lieutenant Lawley remained at his post, refusing first aid until he collapsed from sheer exhaustion caused by loss of

blood, shock, and the energy he had expended in keeping control of his plane. He was revived by the bombardier and again took over the controls. Coming over the English coast one engine ran out of gasoline and had to be feathered. Another engine started to burn and continued to do so until a successful crash landing was made on a small fighter base. Through his heroism and exceptional flying skill Lieutenant Lawley rendered outstanding distinguished and valorous service to our Nation.

Colonel Lawley is presently assigned to duty at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

McLAUGHLIN, ALFORD L.

Rank and organization: Private First Class, United States Marine Corps, Company L, 3d Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division (Reinforced). Place and date: Korea, 4 and 5 September 1952. Entered service at: Leeds, Ala. Birth: Leeds, Ala. Citation: For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a machinereporter of Company L, 3d Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division (Reinforced), in action against enemy aggressor forces in Korea on the night of 4-5 September 1952. Volunteering for his second continuous tour of duty on a strategic combat outpost far in advance of the main line of resistance, Private First Class McLaughlin, although operating under a barrage of enemy artillery and mortar fire, set up plans for the defense of his position which proved decisive in the successful defense of the outpost. When hostile forces attacked in battalion strength during the night, he maintained a constant flow of devastating fire upon the enemy, alternately employing two machineguns, a carbine, and hand grenades. Although painfully wounded, he bravely fired the machineguns from the hip until his hands became blistered by the extreme heat from the weapons and, placing the guns on the ground to allow them to cool, continued to defend the position with his carbine and grenades. Standing up in full view, he shouted words of encouragement to his comrades above the din of battle and, throughout a series of fanatical enemy attacks, sprayed the surrounding area with deadly fire, accounting for an estimated 150 enemy dead and 50 wounded. By his indomitable courage and superb leadership, and valiant fighting spirit in the face of overwhelming odds, Private First Class McLaughlin served to inspire his fellow marines in their gallant stand against the enemy and was directly instrumental in preventing the vital outpost from falling into the hands of a determined and numerically superior hostile force. His outstanding heroism and unwavering devotion to duty reflect the highest credit upon himself and enhance the finest traditions of the United States naval service.

Staff Sergeant McLaughlin is presently assigned to active duty with the Marine Corps.

### REPORT TO THE FIFTH DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

#### HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues and those who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will have access to the report I am sending to the people of the Fifth District of Georgia, I include the attached report, in full, in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEAR FRIEND: A new Congress: The 91st Congress has convened, and I must express

my deep appreciation to the voters of the Fifth District for the opportunity of continued service to you in the House of Representatives. I am truly grateful to all of you for your support. If there is any way in which I can serve you, please let me know. My address is U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C. 20515, telephone 225-3801 (Area Code 202). My Atlanta District Office is at 327 Old Post Office Building, telephone 524-1275.

Looking forward: Now that Richard M. Nixon is the President everyone is asking what will his administration be like, what does the future hold, will we be able to move forward together, as his slogan suggested? Presidential honeymoon: Nixon is the first President in over 150 years who faces a Congress controlled by the opposition party. Both the House and the Senate are controlled by Democrats. How successful the Nixon administration will be in achieving its objectives will be due in large part to the attitude taken by the Congress. The Nixon programs will have to be sold on their merits. *Pres. Nixon's arm-twisting such as that practiced by the Johnson administration will be a thing of the past.* Expect the Congressional leaders of the Democratic Party to be cooperative with the Nixon administration for the first few months with future cooperation yet undecided.

You can expect: Nixon as President will be calm, competent, careful and cautious. Do not expect him to make promises to the poor and other groups which he knows can be fulfilled. Do expect his administration to be more candid. An effort will be made to eliminate the credibility gap of the Johnson administration. Nixon has given orders that the truth is not to be twisted in an effort to obtain political support with promises which cannot be expected to be kept.

Problems ahead: Some of the problems inherited by the Nixon administration . . . eliminating poverty . . . aiding the poor. Expect the Nixon approach to be one designed to enable the poor to help themselves, obtain a stake in America. *Emphasis will be placed more on home ownership, than government housing; helping people to enter into business and train for job security, than on hand-outs . . . educating the entire population so that they can all make a contribution to our country through the use of their talents and labor.*

Peace prospects: In the inaugural address, one message overshadowed all others . . . peace. President Nixon is determined to conclude the war in Vietnam through honorable means just as did President Eisenhower in Korea when he took office. *Probably no problem will receive as much of the President's attention in the early days of his administration than ending the war in Vietnam and bringing about peace throughout the world.*

Social security: Last session, we tried unsuccessfully to provide automatic increases in Social Security when the cost of living goes up and removing the limit on the amount of money a person receiving Social Security may earn when he has to work after age 65. I will reintroduce both bills in the 91st Congress. Expect the Nixon Administration to support automatic cost of living increases in Social Security.

Taxes: Last year I opposed the 10% Income tax surcharge, because I maintained it would be inflationary and make businesses increase their prices due to their increased overhead. This proved to be true. Now, talk is of renewing the tax surcharge beyond June 30. I will have to be convinced that any renewal will actually reduce inflation before it will get my vote. As your Congressman, I cannot support any additional taxes unless there is a dire need, and I feel that first priority should be given to cutting down government spending.

Protecting moral standards: The moral fiber of America is under attack by profiteers who peddle dope and smut material, not just to adults but to high school and teen-age

population. The Supreme Court has made almost completely ineffective laws preventing the distribution of lewd, obscene materials. As your Congressman, I have introduced a constitutional amendment to grant to Congress the right to pass laws regulating obscene material. We have the right to protect ourselves from those who would ply on our own weaknesses for profit to themselves. Our mail has been heavy with letters from people in the Atlanta area objecting to vulgar materials being sent unsolicited to them and their teen-agers and which at present we cannot adequately prevent.

**Ethics:** Having been a leader in revisions of the standards of ethical conduct for members of Congress, your Congressman has already filed with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct a full disclosure of all sources of income and assets and was one of the first to do so.

**Aircraft hijackings:** This is one of the most difficult problems to solve. Three solutions basically are possible: (1) Search every passenger boarding an airplane for arms. This is repugnant to our American way of life and has the taint of a police state. (2) place armed guards on each flight. The danger here is a "shoot-out in the sky" with a stray bullet causing the airplane to explode, killing all on board. (3) Convincing the Castro government in Cuba that the hijackers must be returned to face justice in the United States. This is the best solution though admittedly the most difficult to place in effect. Diplomatic problems may be almost insurmountable, yet we must bring about a solution before some maniac causes the death of an entire plane-load of American citizens.

**An unbalanced budget:** Outgoing President Lyndon B. Johnson presented a budget which he claimed not only was "balanced" but also would have a \$3 billion surplus. What he didn't tell you was that he used Social Security and Highway trust funds to make the budget appear in balance, even though another section of the budget showed the national debt increasing during the same period of time from \$354,445,000,000 to \$381,053,000,000. You only balance a budget by not spending more money than you take in.

**Keeping America strong:** Being personally and intimately acquainted with the new Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, I can assure you that America's strength will be maintained. Secretary Laird will not be lulled into any false thinking about the security of your country and recognizes that true peace can come to the world only by long, tedious diplomatic efforts on the President's part with a strong defense establishment backing him up. Leaving no stone unturned toward achieving peace, we will still "be as strong as we need to be for as long as we need to be."

**A personal note:** As your Congressman, I and my family spend half our time in Washington and half our time in Georgia. Because of this we have to have two homes. Shortly before the election, I bought a lot and built a home for my family up here. Thanks for your vote and letting us move into it rather than selling it without ever having used it.

It is a high honor for me to serve you in Congress.

Yours very truly,

FLETCHER THOMPSON,  
Member of Congress.

#### MOUNTAIN GROVE 4-H CLUB

#### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress has confirmed the fact that

the Mountain Grove, Mo., 4-H Club is the first 4-H Club to be inaugural guests of the President. I insert at this point in the RECORD the report by Mrs. B. B. Mackey describing the events that led up to this selection as well as the outstanding efforts of the Mountain Grove community to make this trip a reality. The report follows:

A Mountain Grove 4-H Club learned Tuesday, January 28, that it will go down in history.

Congressman Hall of the Missouri Seventh District confirmed the fact the club was the first 4-H Club to be an inauguration guest of a President.

Twelve members of the Live Wires 4-H Club spent nearly a week in Washington. The club had written to Richard Nixon following his election, congratulating him. In the letter he was informed that they had "elected" him by a small majority in a mock vote prior to the election. The results of their mock vote were: President-Nixon 9, Humphrey 1, Wallace 8; Vice-President-Agnew 10, Muskie 3, Lemay 3; For Governor-Ross 5, Hearnes 11.

This, plus citizenship activities, earned the trip, according to Mrs. B. B. Mackey, Community Leader of the club, who received the call from Congressman Hall's office.

Mountain Grove's 3,178 people raised \$730.00 in 51 hours to help finance the bus trip, and an additional \$50.00 was brought in by State Representative Tom Carter from the people of Hartville and Norwood. Mr. Lee Horning and his good neighbors on 59th Place, Cheverly, Maryland furnished lodging, food, and transportation for the 4H'ers in Washington.

Mr. Horning and Dr. Carl Fichtel arranged a tour of the Goddard Space Center, which is a part of NASA, and a three hour lecture which was given by Dr. Don Kniffen.

Mrs. Mackey, who, along with Mrs. Raymond Coffman, accompanied the group, said, "My husband and I live on a 160 acre farm outside Mountain Grove, Missouri. My husband is handicapped and we could never have led the farm unattended if our friends hadn't been so wonderful." She said three foreign scientists, who are working at the Missouri State Fruit Experiment Station in Mountain Grove, took care of the Mackey farm while they were gone. These scientists are Petu Mamarov and Vesselin Todorov of Bulgaria, and Darshan Singh Saral of India. All three are Ph D's. While at the Inauguration, the 4-H'ers met many distinguished people. Among these were Governor Warren Hearnes, Senator Tom Eagleton, and Congressman Durward G. Hall of the Missouri Delegation.

Members making the trip, Mary, Bentley, and Alvin Mackey, Nyalin Schott, Susie and Billy Jones, Bob and Steve McGinnis, Judy Dennis, Carol Peebles, Mary Beth and Terry Coffman believe that the success of the club has been largely due to the fact that we give credit to a higher power. Four years ago leaders with no previous 4-H experience proceeded on instinct and felt their way along. They set up a time for devotions at each meeting. We believe this honor accorded us to attend the Inauguration was due to this practice. First Samuel says, "The Lord saith. . . . For them that honor me, I will honor." To Him we give credit for any successes that we have. Without Him, we are nothing.

LIVE WIRES 4-H CLUB,  
By Mrs. B. B. Mackey.

(NOTE.—In their citizenship activities, the club has received communications from President Richard Nixon, Mrs. Ethel Kennedy, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, Governor Warren Hearnes, Dr. Durward Hall, Representative Tom Carter, and Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.)

#### FLOOD PREVENTION

#### HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Congress has been slandered by accusations of "pork barrel" whenever it authorizes or appropriates money for flood control and other water resource development projects. These same critics applaud the very restrictive appropriation bills of the last few years, totally ignoring the future adverse effects of having to reduce current expenditures for urgently needed new water resource development projects.

However, the last 2 weeks have demonstrated what flood control measures have saved in life and property in the State of California. This is further evidence of the value of such projects. In the report which accompanied the fiscal 1968 public works appropriation bill, it was noted that flood control benefits realized to that time by construction of flood control facilities by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority was \$15,000,000,000 in damages prevented and \$6,000,000,000 in expenditures for such protection—House Report No. 505, 90th Congress.

Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of the Army Engineers, recently stated:

The biggest metropolitan flood prevention operation in history escaped the attention of the American people during the last two weeks as they saw, heard and read reports of mud slides and rampaging streams in unprotected areas of California. But then, floods that don't happen are not as dramatic as rivers of mud which claim lives, crush homes, erode canyon roads and silt up miles in unprotected suburbs.

The deluge which hit Los Angeles county this month was greater than the record flood of 1938 when more than 5,600 homes were destroyed, 86 people perished in mud and water, and 127 more were missing. Without the billion-dollar flood-proofing system built in the county by the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with local interests during the past three decades, damages would have soared above the 1.2-billion-dollar mark during the past two weeks.

General Cassidy termed it the "most dramatic justification for flood control measures ever seen," pointing out that the population of Los Angeles County has almost tripled since 1938. The Chief of Engineers further stated:

This new record storm at Los Angeles was mostly trapped in flood and debris control dams or flowed harmlessly within banks of hundreds of miles of channels and thousands of miles of storm sewers. The investment of \$340,000,000 of Federal funds and \$750,000,000 of local funds returned more than 100 percent dividends in this single storm.

In other portions of the State, where flood control projects were in existence, damages prevented ran into the millions of dollars. The 1,484-square-mile Russian River basin would have suffered another \$1,270,000 in damages in Sonoma and Mendocino counties, had it not been for Coyote Dam and Lake Mendocino. In Marin county, the partially completed Corte Madera creek project prevented additional damages.

The Santa Ana River would have rampaged through a considerable portion of

Orange County too had it not been for Prado Dam. Water poured into the reservoir at the rate of 74,000 cubic feet per second but was released at the rate of 4,600 cfs. Storage in the reservoir reached 72,000 acre-feet, all of which will be released slowly enough to prevent downstream damage.

Throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basin the 1,300 miles of river levees and numerous multiple purpose dam and reservoir projects functioned as designed. Through a system of by-passes flood flows of the Sacramento River were shunted around the capital city permitting business as usual. Flood water channels between levees and water behind dams along the Sierra from Shasta to Isabella near Bakersfield on the south prevented an estimated \$50 million in damages.

General Cassidy concluded, and I believe we can all agree, that "control of floods is an essential and sound investment for the American people."

I insert in the RECORD at this point a press release by the South Pacific Division Corps of Engineers, of January 27, 1969, and several news articles concerning the damage which was prevented by Federal and local flood control projects:

SAN FRANCISCO,  
January 27, 1969.

Flood control structures built by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have in the past two weeks prevented over \$1½ billion in damages to urban and suburban areas over the State of California according to Brigadier General William M. Glasgow, Division Engineer.

The great portion of this protection has been realized in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, hard hit by mud slides and surplus rainfall, where they would have suffered another estimated \$1,200,000,000 in flood water damages without the Army Engineer flood control structures. Natural water run off into the five Los Angeles county drainage areas (LACDA) flood control dams, and through the intricate system of main-stream and tributary channels was greater than the 1938 disastrous flood. Glasgow said had the LACDA project not been constructed, more lives would have been lost, thousands of additional homeowners would have been displaced, and a considerable portion of all transportation and communication services would have been out of commission.

Federal cost of the LACDA project has been \$340 million to date spread over a 30-year period. The people of Los Angeles county have paid another \$750 million over the same period. "Thus," General Glasgow said, "the LACDA project almost paid for itself in just this one storm."

The Santa Ana River would have rampaged through a considerable portion of Orange County too had it not been for Prado Dam, General Glasgow added. Water poured into the reservoir at the rate of 74,000 cubic feet per second but was released at the rate of 4,600 cfs. Storage in the reservoir reached 72,000 acre-feet, all of which will be released slowly enough to permit percolation into the underground water table as conditions permit.

In other portions of the State, where flood control projects were in existence, damages prevented ran into the millions of dollars. The 1,494-square-mile Russian River basin would have suffered another \$1,270,000 in damages in Sonoma and Mendocino counties, had it not been for Coyote Dam and Lake Mendocino. In Marin county, the partially completed Corte Madera creek project prevented an additional \$25,000 in damages.

Throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basin the 1,300 mile of river levees and numerous multiple purpose dam and reservoir projects functioned as designed. Through a system of by-passes flood flows of the Sacramento River were shunted around the capital city permitting business

as usual. Flood water channels between levees and water behind dams along the Sierra from Shasta to Isabella near Bakersfield on the south prevented an estimated \$50 million in damages.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Jan. 27, 1969]

#### THE FLOOD THAT WASN'T

As we read of the disastrous rain damages inflicted up and down the state in recent weeks, the tendency may have been to overlook a most significant aspect of the winter storm: the fact that the Eastbay escaped with little damage of consequence.

Lake Merritt did not spill over its banks into the downtown area; a raging Temescal Creek did not threaten Emeryville; mud slides did not destroy several Oakland hill area homes; runoff from flooded ravines did not overflow into scores of Castro Valley homes; a rain-swollen Arroyo Mocho in Pleasanton did not inundate thousands of acres of farm and residential land; and Alameda Creek this year did not turn the Union City-Fremont-Newark flood plain into a vast lake.

To be sure, the Eastbay was spared the intense downpours which inundated some communities. But rain it did, and hard enough to have inflicted any of the catastrophes so common in past years.

Most of the credit for what didn't happen must go to the achievements of the Alameda County Flood Control District and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during the past two decades.

Established in 1949, the flood control district now covers some 90 per cent of the county's land area. Its first acts were to survey what the county's flood problems were, decide what had to be done and draw up a master drainage plan to do it.

Since then, some \$100 million worth of flood control projects have been authorized by the public and more than \$35 million worth completed.

Existing creek beds have been widened, deepened, diverted, lined with concrete, encased in pipe or run underground. A constant maintenance program to keep them free of debris assures that they will function efficiently any time a storm hits.

Cull Canyon Dam and Reservoir, Don Castro Dam and Reservoir and Ward Creek Dam have all emerged. All are now used to hold back the crest of potential flood waters.

The army engineers have contributed additional millions of dollars worth of projects to tame San Lorenzo and Alameda creeks.

No one contends that major floods are a permanent thing of the past in the Eastbay. But it may be that nagging every-other-year-or-so floods are.

If so, it's a tribute both to the community which undertook the massive flood control venture and to the public officials who supplied the energy and technical competence which have provided a handsome return on tax dollars invested.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times,  
January 27, 1969]

#### MILLIONS SPENT ON DRAINAGE SYSTEM PAY OFF—RESERVOIRS, STORM OUTFLOW LINES AND RIVER CHANNELS CUT LOSSES DRASTICALLY

(By William J. Drummond)

Los Angeles County, troubled by flooding throughout its history, has been paid ample dividends during the current rain siege from a multimillion-dollar investment in storm drains, reservoirs and concrete river channels, federal officials said Sunday.

The half-century of work to meet the sort of eventuality that has occurred in the last nine days has produced 21 reservoirs, 18,000 miles of storm drains and 400 miles of river channels.

Many of those reservoirs filled to the brim Saturday and Sunday. At first, release valves drained the overflow into downstream chan-

nels. However, as the level continued to grow from the runoff, several reservoirs went over the top and hundreds of gallons of water roared over the spillways and along concrete water courses on the way to the sea.

#### DAY BEFORE IT'S NORMAL

In a day or so, according to County Flood Control District officials, the level will be back to the more normal valve-release stage.

Although lives have been lost and property damaged during the rains, the losses come nowhere near the catastrophic terms of the 1938 flood, which produced a greater loss of life and property than any other flood in county history.

Records of floods in the county go back to 1815, when it rained so heavily that the Los Angeles River abandoned its channel and flowed to the west, following very nearly the present line of Alameda St.

In 1826 the river again left its bed, drifted toward the east, forming its present channel. Before settling into that channel, the river "spread over the country, [XXXXXX] the depressions in the surface, forming lakes, ponds and marshes," as one writer of the period put it.

The 1859-60 winter was a heavy storm season. On Dec. 4, 1859, a southeaster set in and, in 48 hours, 12 inches of rain fell.

#### FLOOD DESTROYS MACHINERY

There was a good deal of placer mining going on in San Gabriel Canyon at the [XXXXXX] and the effect of this storm was to sweep all the miners' sluices and other machinery to destruction.

One historian calls the flood of 1861-62 the "Noachian deluge of Southern California."

"The rivers spread over the lowlands. . . . The Arroyo Seco was swollen to a mighty river. It brought down from the mountains and canyons great rafts of driftwood which were scattered over the plains below the city and furnished fuel for the poor people for several years," he wrote.

Five years later, a flood occurred during which the entire town of Galitan, near Los Nietos, was washed away.

One of the most destructive floods of modern times took place in January, 1914, when the Los Angeles River turned into a torrent and inundated adjacent lands, swept bridges away and interfered with railroad traffic.

A flood that many persons remember and talk about occurred on New Year's Eve and New Year's Day in 1934. During that 24-hour period, more than 12 inches of rain fell. Columbia was playing Stanford in the Rose Bowl that year.

Then came the 1938 disaster. The Red Cross estimated that 5,601 homes were wrecked. Damage to property in the city and county was estimated at \$18 million (in 1938 dollars).

Eighty-eight persons died in drownings and earthshakes, and 127 more were missing.

The scale of the disaster caused the New York Times to observe: "No flood, no earthquake, no fire, no depression will stop Los Angeles. It's tragedy has aroused a nation's sympathy, but the scars will heal."

#### BUILDING OF SYSTEM

The scars did heal, but, moreover, greater impetus was given to construction of a flood-control system that would prevent the pain and suffering the community had just gone through.

Dating back to bond issues of 1917, the county had financed reservoirs in the foothill areas. The largest of the dams built by the county, San Gabriel Dam, seven miles north of Azusa, was financed out of a 1924 bond issue at cost of \$17 million and was completed in July, 1939.

With passage of the federal Flood Control Act in 1936, the Army Corps of Engineers became involved in the county flood control program.

Seven federally financed reservoirs have

been added since then to supplement 14 smaller county dams in providing flood protection for residents of Los Angeles.

The Corps of Engineers also built debris basins and "concrete straitjackets" for the Los Angeles and San Gabriel rivers to keep them from overflowing their banks before emptying into the ocean during high water. Meanwhile, the county was providing a network of storm drains to run beneath city streets and aid in carrying excess water to the sea.

The whole system has come to completion in the last few years.

"Our main work is done, and this flood proves it," said Gerald B. Levin, supervisory engineer of the Los Angeles District of the Corps of Engineers.

Much of the damage to property and the loss of lives in the recent storm have occurred because of collapsing hillsides, not because of flooding of rivers or overflowing of dams, said Stanley B. Steenbock, special assistant to the chief engineer. Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

#### POPULATION GROWTH

With the growth of the population, the importance of the flood control system has increased.

A meteorologist once pointed out that if the roof area of all the houses in the county could be calculated and if to that was added the surface areas of all the impervious highways, and added to that the elimination of grasses and chaparral that had served to shatter the rain into minute drops so that they fell on the earth gently and were easily absorbed, it would be clear that the increase in population increased the danger of flooding.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 28, 1969]

#### RAINS BRING WORST DAMAGE SINCE 1938: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIANS WRING THEMSELVES OUT

(By John C. Waugh)

LOS ANGELES.—Rain, which looked as if it would never end, finally did. And now southern California, under a cloudless sky, is wading out of its worst deluge in 31 years.

For nine dismal days the rains came. Two storms beat in across most of California, one right behind the other. The hammer of rain on the roof was at first just bothersome. Then it canceled a pro golf tournament.

But as the rain kept beating down the situation turned from bothersome to serious to alarming. By Sunday the entire state had been declared a disaster area by President Nixon.

Torrents of water, swollen to many times wider than their bedstreams, leaped and cascaded through towns in Los Angeles and Santa Barbara Counties, Topanga Canyon and Glendora, small residential areas few outside of California had ever heard of, suddenly were international names—the first tossed on a raging torrent of water, the second fighting and fleeing an oozing wall of mud.

#### FEDERAL AID AUTHORIZED

By Sunday, the rains were ending and the plowing from under had started. But the toll was big—89 fatalities and \$35 million in property damage statewide. Los Angeles Mayor Samuel W. Yorty, floating over the floods in a helicopter, pegged the damage in Los Angeles alone at \$15 million.

President Nixon moved quickly from Washington with a declaration of disaster, which now will start \$3 million of relief flowing into the state. In addition, machinery is already in motion that will float millions of dollars in federal loans for homes and businesses damaged in the two battering storms.

The storms turned 9,000 Californians out of their homes. An army of friends have manned shovels and opened their homes and apartments to the temporarily homeless.

What happened in a home in the Bel Air

section of the steep rising Santa Monica Mountains happened over and over again here.

Early Saturday morning the hill that lifted abruptly up from the backyard of the house on Nalin Place, gave way in a rush and a fall of mud. As water and ooze piled up quickly behind the house, the family fled.

The pressure built up to a point where it appeared the house would explode from it. A friend frantically tore a hole in the side of the house to let the mud and water in and take the pressure off. A bed of ooze and water and mud covered the whole inside—but the house was saved.

Other houses fared less well with many swept away before the walls of water and mud.

#### PREVENTIVE WORK PAYS OFF

But for the millions of dollars plowed into reservoirs, storm drains, and river channels here over the past half century, the nine days of rain would have turned into a cataclysmic disaster.

Even so, many of the region's 21 reservoirs rose and ran over the top. But the 13,000 miles of storm drains and 400 miles of river channels in Los Angeles County alone kept the flood manageable and the damage and loss of life down.

The losses nowhere near matched those of the last major flood here in 1938. Some 5,000 homes were lost that year. There were at least 83 fatalities, 127 more persons were missing, and damage in the county and city alone mounted to \$18 million.

Water, rain, and mud form one of a triumvirate of natural disasters that dog southern California. In this region, made up mostly of sunshine and temperate weather, the only three natural phenomena that ravage it are earthquake, fire, and water.

#### REPAIRS UNDERWAY

Some of the hill-clinging residential areas that suffer most from the brush fires which sometimes rage out of control here are also hardest hit in rain, with their moisture-holding ground cover destroyed by fire.

Some of the same residents in Bel Air, who only a few years ago were fleeing a raging wall of fire, over this past weekend were fleeing a sliding wall of mud. The same hills that grow the incendiary brush also supply mountains of mud, which oozed down on many homes here over the past few days.

The joint plowing in of men and money from federal, state, and local governments is in full tilt here. Some 300 national guardsmen and an armada of helicopters, vehicles, and heavy equipment initially involved in rescue missions now are beginning the long job of digging out and repairing the damage.

In Montecito and Carpinteria in Santa Barbara County, crews had to fight back water-swollen streams just as they would fires out of control.

Evacuations were under way through the rain on everything from aircraft to horseback. Now the digging out is by shovel and bulldozer—friends and neighbors mostly manning the first and various governmental agencies the second.

Out of the disaster then also has come a unified hand up throughout the rain-soaked area.

#### THE INEXCUSABLE RISE IN INSURANCE PREMIUMS

### HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great many letters protesting the unconscionable rapid rise in insur-

ance rates in recent years. Considering the avalanche of automobiles, trucks, and other transportation vehicles which have increased throughout the Nation, the public is at the mercy of the large insurance trusts. It is high time that steps be taken by the Congress of the United States to have a complete investigation of the fabulous prices of ordinary insurance rates throughout the country. I am hereby submitting a letter from Mr. A. D. Jackson of 1526 Steiber Street, Whiting, Ind., 46394, which is merely a sample of the mail coming into my office on this problem:

WHITING, IND.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: I am writing to you concerning some of the insurance rates charged in this state which are both **XXXXXX** and discriminatory. My problem is with all-state insurance which charges so called "special rates" for males 18-25, 25-29, and 30 **XXXXXX**. Many other large companies also think that it takes a man 40 years to learn to drive a car.

Besides being high, I might add that these "special rates" apply to males only. No consideration is given to a male driver's intelligence, potential, or education. I am past 25, a college graduate, and have a good driving record.

Since many companies base their rate **XXXXXX** rather arbitrary criteria, I suspect that this may constitute both a monopoly and a conspiracy. A policy is regarded as a private contract, but certain males of legal age are not able to enter into a contract on an equal basis with their peers thereby becoming "de facto" second class citizens.

The legal complications run further. Insurance questionnaires fail to inform the prospective client that what he says may be held against him. The Miranda and Escobedo decisions of the Supreme Court have not been put into effect on these forms. I therefore contend that any extra premium charged to a male that is beyond the ordinary cost was acquired illegally.

Because the rates charged are both arbitrary and oppressive, and perhaps unlawful, I have little other recourse except to request your help. Any advice you can give me will be greatly appreciated. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

A. D. JACKSON.

#### PRAYER AMENDMENT

### HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend that portion of the first amendment of our Constitution dealing with freedom of religion. In a truer sense, the amendment I propose does not change, but merely restores and retains, the original meaning and intent of this portion of the first amendment to the Constitution. In recent years court decisions have tended to discourage the recognition of our religious heritage and bar even nondenominational prayer in schools. Just recently a woman received nationwide publicity when she criticized the Apollo 8 astronauts for reading from the Bible in their Christmas Eve message from outer space. Such events have reached the point of absurdity.

The founders of this country did not intend that the church and state be hos-

tile and suspicious toward one another. It was not intended that our Government never recognize and encourage the worth of religious activities. In fact, the very opposite has been the case. The U.S. Supreme Court begins each session with these words:

God save the United States and this Honorable Court.

The U.S. House of Representatives starts each day's proceedings with a prayer by a religious leader, and has its own Chaplain. Tax exemptions are allowed for church property and tax deductions for religious contributions. Federal funds are used to pay salaries to officers in the armed services who are military chaplains, and whose sole function is to minister to the spiritual needs of our armed services. Municipalities and counties give fire and police protection to churches who do not pay any taxes. The motto that appears on our coins and currency and the motto of States such as Florida, is "In God We Trust." The oath of office of our President and Members of Congress ends with "So Help Me God." These are but a few examples illustrative of our Government's recognition and acceptance of the importance of religion in our daily life and in the heritage of this country.

Discussing the background of the first amendment to the Constitution, Allen C. Brownfield in an article entitled, "The Constitutional Intent Concerning Matters of Church and State," 174 William and Mary Law Review, Vol. 5, 174 at 204 (1964) states:

In 1789 we were emerging from a situation in which each colony had an established church, or barring this, had given religious groups a preferred place in status. The era was one in which the very concept of religious freedom was a revolutionary one. For Madison to propose the First Amendment was an important step forward. To say that he meant to place Government in a "neutral" position—as against religion on the one hand and secularism or agnosticism on the other—is hardly borne out by the facts. The intention of Madison, Mason, and Jefferson seems to have been that Government be neutral about endorsing any particular religion—but not about religion and a belief in God itself. (emphasis added)

For nearly 150 years after the passage of the first amendment to the Constitution, no serious questions were raised about the meaning of the first amendment regarding religion. The case of *Reynolds v. U.S.*, 98 U.S. 145 (1879) was the first major case involving interpretation of the first amendment. In the Reynolds case the conviction of a Mormon who had practiced polygamy in accordance with his faith but in violation of the Elkins Act was upheld. Thereafter there was little activity until 1940 when a series of cases involving the first amendment were decided such as: *Jehovah's Witnesses, eg., Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940); the school-bus case *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947); released time cases *Illinois ex rel McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (1948); and *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952); *Blue Law Cases, eg., Gallagher v. Crown Koshier Super Market of Massachusetts, Inc.*, 336 U.S. 617 (1961); test oath case

*Torcaso v. Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488 (1961); and the school prayer issue *eg., Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962).

The only consistent rationale in these cases appears to be a search for a balance between those who want to recognize the religious heritage of this country and those who believe in a complete separation of church and state. I am in complete agreement with those who say there shall be no interference with the free exercise of religion in this country. I am also in complete agreement with the principle that the religious views of one person or one denomination should not be forced on any other person or denomination.

The amendment I propose states:

SECTION 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building, vessel, aircraft, spacecraft or facility, which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

This amendment does not violate either of the above principles.

It is time we took a commonsense approach and established a reasonable position between these two conflicting principles. This should not be left to judicial fiat. Not to adopt this proposed amendment would be to prefer those who have no religion over those who do. Not to adopt this amendment would be a signal for the Mrs. O'Hairs of the world to attack our other religious institutions, such as the reference to God on our coins and even our holidays such as Christmas. As ridiculous as this sounds, who could believe that today it is illegal in school for children to say:

"Thank You for the world so sweet,  
Thank You for the food we eat,  
Thank You for the birds that sing,  
Thank You God for everything."

I would hope that none would find this proposed amendment offensive and that those who disagree will understand the spirit in which it is offered.

#### THE CONSUMER PROTECTIVE ASSISTANCE BILL

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring today, with several of my colleagues, a bill which proposes the enactment of a Consumer Protective Assistance Act, which is being introduced in the Senate today by the senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS.

We are all consumers, and consequently, we are all affected daily by the economics of the marketplace. Some form of consumer fraud is evident in all walks of society, and torment each and every one of us. However, numerous studies now show that the bulk of consumer fraud affects the poor citizen,

contributing to the crisis in the cities. For instance, the Committee on Government Operations has recently found essentially valid allegations that are frequently made that, first of all, the prices of selected food items are often raised on the dates that welfare checks and food stamps are received, and second, that merchandise, particularly meats and produce, is frequently inferior in quality in chainstores located in low-income neighborhoods. What is more, the committee also found that even the regular day-to-day prices were often higher than those in upper- and middle-income areas. It seems blatantly clear that the poor are indeed paying more and receiving less.

In addition to this, the middle-income citizen also pays a fee for his lack of special education. The expert technician has a grasp on the average citizen who cannot be expected to understand the complicated technology with which we live. For instance, an automobile mechanic, a telephone repairman, or a plumber can charge exorbitant rates for repairs which merit only half the cost. In a sense the layman has become captive to the expert—and it is for this reason that I am introducing this bill, the purpose of which is to allow the consumer to deal evenly and intelligently with the ever-increasing expertise and specialization belonging to those few who are able to deceive their customers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides specifically for Federal grants to the States, who would then submit to the Secretary of Commerce a plan to provide:

First, a State consumer protection office to investigate dishonest practices. Second, a program to regulate false advertising, unnecessary services, and other activities, and to provide consumer protection.

Third, educational programs and the dissemination of information to increase the consumer's knowledge.

This bill, then, relies primarily on action by the State with help from the Federal Government, to add to the steps which have been taken recently in the executive branch. Enactment of this measure into law will provide fundamental protection and information for all consumers.

#### SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN LOU FREY JR.

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, a speech delivered by my good friend, colleague, and fellow member of the 91st Club, Hon. LOUIS FREY, JR., of Florida, to the student body at Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla., on January 30. I would like to commend these remarks to you, as I believe they are particularly relevant in view of the restlessness of today's youth.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN LOU FREY JR., OF FLORIDA, FIFTH DISTRICT  
If I had to pick a time in the recorded history of man in which to live and partici-

pate in government, I would pick 1969. I will recognize that there are great and complex problems that face this nation and the world. We live in times of great change in all fields. The nation has been torn by social upheavals. From 1965 through the end of 1968, there have been 213 riots with a loss of over 200 lives. The amount of property damage through July 1968 has reached the astronomical figure of \$159,439,000. Sit-ins and demonstrations have become a way of life. Hippies and Yippies have become front-page news. These people, who are attempting to destroy our society, are receiving all the publicity. The very foundation of our political system has been shaken with the rise of a third party. Our electoral system has been questioned as a result of the unfaithful elector from North Carolina.

Our economic system is under attack both at home and abroad. We have suffered through a gold crisis, and today the national debt is over \$370 billion. Our third largest expenditure in fiscal 1970 will be interest on this debt, totalling 16 billion dollars. We are involved in a war in Viet Nam that has been the most unpopular war in our history, with the first light of settlement just appearing on the horizon. And even in our higher education system turmoil exists, with the question of student participation in the administration of colleges and universities yet to be resolved.

We have made tremendous economic, technical and scientific advances; yet approximately 26,000,000 Americans live in abject poverty. Investive, abuse and even assassination have marked political discourse over the last eight years. The threat of the ultimate weapon capable of destroying the world hangs over our heads. Yet, despite these problems and many others, I repeat that this is a great time to be involved in charting this nation's course. It is a time of crisis, but also a time of great challenge. Our country is at the crossroads. Never has any generation had so much opportunity to make dramatic and fundamental changes in our way of life. It has been said that we have just concluded a 36-year political cycle that began with FDR in 1932, and that we are approaching a new era.

How we approach these problems, what solutions are offered, and what this new era holds for us rests with you, the young people of this country. I don't think there is any question that young America is better educated, more informed and more interested than at any time in our nation's short history. During my recent campaign, I spoke to many high school classes and found they asked more penetrating questions than most of the groups I appeared before. After the election, due to some political pressure at home from my 11-year-old daughter, I appeared in front of her sixth-grade class and was amazed at the questions they asked—such as—"Why aren't we mining Halphong Harbor," and "Why are taxes so high?" But, let me quickly add that interest, information and education are empty tools by themselves.

At the present time, there appears to be two approaches by Young America to the problems in this country. One group uses the education, the information and the interest to destroy rather than build; to yell and shout about issues rather than to discuss issues; to make up one's mind that everything is wrong with our system and that anyone with a different view is ignorant; to put a label such as "the establishment" on anyone who doesn't agree 100 per cent with you and refuses to look behind that label; to claim the right to dissent while at the same time disregarding the rights of others who disagree with you; to believe that words such as patriotism, duty, honor, and yes, even the American flag are corny, old-fashioned and just used by politicians who want votes; to believe that the country owes you a living and that you don't owe the country anything in return; to be-

lieve that the volume of noise regarding an issue is directly related to the deepness of one's feelings and belief. I saw this approach during the Inauguration. The Hippies and Yippies failed to get the attention they wanted, and took to the streets throwing rocks and garbage through windows.

The other approach by Young America certainly does not receive the publicity and front page headlines. It's one that says—yes, there are great problems that face this country. It's one that says—let's use the education and the information and the interest constructively. It's an approach that involves self-discipline and responsibility. It's one that is based on the knowledge that there are no simple solutions or easy answers to the problems that face this nation and the world. It's one that says—let's build instead of burn. Let's reason rather than riot. Let's look behind labels and generalizations to see what a person really believes. Let's try and solve problems rather than capitalize on the weaknesses in our society. It's an approach that realizes that this is not a perfect system of government, but it is the best one known to man. It's an approach that's not afraid to vigorously and actively dissent and disagree, but at the same time respects the dignity of another human being to disagree with you. It's one that realizes that only through participation in our government can we effectively change government—and, probably, as important, it involves people who can step back and smile at themselves in this human comedy without losing their seriousness of purpose.

As I said when I started, this is a great time to be alive and participating in our government. The opportunity exists not only to have our views heard, but to direct the course of this nation, and even the course of the world. But, it can't be done on the sidelines. We must participate and give of ourselves. Life is not a one-way street. As a young Congressman and as a young man, I fully realize that I do not have all the answers to the problems, and in many cases don't even know the problems. But, I believe that men of good conscience who are working together for the same goals can achieve solutions to these problems. These solutions won't come about overnight, and when reached may not be easy solutions.

Young Americans thirty years of age and under today represent approximately 50 per cent of our population. Young America has the physical and mental resources to get the job done. It remains to be seen whether Young America has the self-discipline and is responsible. As part of Young America, even if a little over the age limit, I feel that we do. Let's become both concerned and committed. We are the key to the future of this country and I believe we will live up to the challenge that faces us.

### OIL BUBBLING INTO WATER OFF COAST OF SANTA BARBARA

**HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1969

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 days we have had the opportunity to read in the newspapers across the country that approximately 21,000 gallons a day of crude oil is bubbling up off the Continental Shelf into the waters off the coast of Santa Barbara, Calif.

This oil is coming to the surface as a result of the drilling activities of the Union Oil Co. These lands were leased by the Federal Government recently to the oil companies for oil exploration and development.

Mr. Speaker, at the time that these offshore oil lands were leased to the oil companies, there was a great dispute as to whether or not the hazards to the conservation in the area outweighed the benefits from such oil development.

Now it seems that the conservationists who were crying out warnings that such a catastrophe could occur were correct.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that President Nixon should appoint a board of inquiry to investigate the reasons for the catastrophe. The inquiry should direct its attention to at least the four following questions:

First. Whether there were adequate fail-safe devices known and employed by the Union Oil Co.

Second. Whether there has been adequate research into potential hazards which may be anticipated when drilling along known earthquake faults.

Third. Whether there has been sufficient research and experimentation with detergents to determine the ecological effect of such detergents, particularly relating to marine life.

Fourth. Whether the hazards to conservation outweigh the benefits resulting from oil resource development on the Continental Shelf.

Tomorrow I will introduce legislation which will establish marine sanctuaries and a Channel Islands National Park.

### FIGHT OVER MAINE PROJECT PERILS OIL SUBGOVERNMENT

**HON. PETER N. KYROS**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, the Maine Port Authority applied last May to the U.S. Foreign Trade Zone Board for establishment of a general-purpose foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine, and a special purpose subzone in Machiasport, Maine.

The Maine Port Authority has complied with every provision of the law authorizing the establishment of foreign trade zones and subzones. Two public hearings were held, one in Portland and one in Washington. More than 600 pages of testimony were recorded. Exhibits running into thousands of pages have been submitted. A complete record has been made.

Yet a series of unconscionable delays and roadblocks have been thrown in the way of the State of Maine.

Mr. Speaker, it is my unshakable conviction that these delays are due to the influence in the Federal Government of the U.S. oil industry. The major oil companies and the independent oil producers are opposed to the application of the Maine Port Authority because it is proposed to establish a large oil refinery at the Machiasport subzone. What we have here is, in the words of Laurence

Stern, writing in the Washington Post, a "dramatic collision of regional interests—fuel-scarce New England versus the Southwest." Mr. Stern wrote that the collision "may well ignite a national debate that would singe and shake the foundations of oil's subgovernment in Washington." He is right. New England is not going to give up easily in this fight.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Stern's column at this point in the RECORD:

**FIGHT OVER MAINE PROJECT PERILS OIL SUBGOVERNMENT**

(By Laurence Stern)

Two weeks before his hard-fought accession to the Senate's number two leadership position, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) issued a bristling but little-noticed challenge to the oil industry. The words were uncharacteristically harsh for the equable, young Senator from Massachusetts.

"The oil industry has over-reached once too often," he said of the all-out assault on the proposed Machiasport, Maine, refinery complex that is becoming New England's Alamo. "It will be haunted by its unwillingness to accept the Machiasport proposal. The people will want to know why large corporations are permitted to band together to prevent the entry of competitors into the market."

It was poetic that the man Kennedy challenged and beat for the job of Senate Democratic Whip should be Russell B. Long (D-La.), as artful and energetic an advocate of oil interests as there is on Capitol Hill. The odds, however, against Kennedy's winning the Battle of Machiasport in the waning days of this Democratic Administration are far more adverse than those that weighed against him in the leadership fight. The partisans of oil in Congress and the Federal bureaucracy, as well as the industry, stand together against the granting of an import quota to New England.

Nonetheless this dramatic collision of regional interests—fuel-scarce New England versus the politically potent Southwest—may well ignite a national debate that would singe and shake the foundations of oil's subgovernment in Washington. It would open up for public questioning such hallowed subsidies won by oil politicians from Congress and the executive branch as the 27½ percent depletion allowance and the protectionist import control system that has pinched the New England states.

What is politically most significant about the Machiasport dispute is that the plaintiff's case against the oil interests will be argued by two of the strongest potential contenders for Democratic presidential nomination in 1972—Kennedy and Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine.

The immediate issue in Machiasport is the mandatory import control system that was proclaimed by President Eisenhower in 1959. If Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall should act at the last minute to approve the 100,000-barrel-a-day import quota to the Occidental Petroleum Corp. for the Maine project, it would punch a big hole in the protectionist wall. This is the chief reason for the industry-wide opposition.

The mandatory import curbs, adopted after the Suez crisis, were intended to protect American producers from being swamped by cheaper foreign oil. They were proclaimed in the interest of "national security."

This bounteous package of Government-patented benefits is administered by an obscure bureau of the Interior Department called the Oil Import Administration. And here the spirit of clientism toward industry overflows.

It was best illustrated in the remarkable letters of solicitation sent out to oil executives last month by Assistant Oil Import Administrator T. C. Snedeker. The official

urged industry men to support him for elevation to the top job and vowed to maintain "strict controls" on imports.

Udall's successor, Walter J. Hickel, became a party to the controversy when he ordered a suit filed in the name of Alaska to block the import allocation to Machiasport. With his home state in the midst of a major oil development boom the issues for the incoming Secretary of the Interior are clearly native loyalty and self-interest.

Those are always the paramount stakes whenever oil gushes to the surface on Capitol Hill.

**ANOTHER LOOK AT POSTAL SERVICE**

**HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article published in the New York Times magazine which describes the tremendous problems besetting the U.S. Post Office Department. The article, because of its vivid description of these problems, is worthy of our attention. The author, Robert Sherrill, has made an important contribution to our understanding of the present state of the Post Office Department.

It is my hope that we can move toward the goal of more effective and efficient postal service for all Americans. We cannot delay our consideration of this matter any longer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the article, entitled "Bring Back the Pony Express," published in the New York Times magazine on November 3, 1968.

The article is placed in the RECORD at the request of John F. Rengstorff, Post Office Box 523, Fair Lawn, N.J.

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

**BRING BACK THE PONY EXPRESS**

(By Robert Sherrill)

WASHINGTON.—The United States Post Office Department is monumental proof that even the worst ravages of bureaucracy cannot destroy a good idea. Jockeyed around by 11 labor unions, shredded by political jealousies and favoritism, bothered in recent years by racism and internal violence and starved and abused by Congress, the Government's largest employer of civilians still manages to get most of our 82.3 billion pieces of mail delivered—sometimes damaged, often late but eventually stuffed into the box or through the slot.

The Post Office is, considering the size of its job, a miracle of efficiency; but there is more reason to feel fear for its future than gratitude for its past. For two years this fear has been creeping up the Executive branch, resulting in several crash studies; President Johnson is expected to leave behind some proposed legislation as his lame-duck lag-lap. Wherever people are pressed together the U.S. Post Office is a boiler wheezing at the seams, and this is especially true in the clogged Washington-New York-Boston-Chicago triangle. Precarious is the word for it.

Any major breakdown would bring about a repeat of the grotesque occurrence in Chicago in October, 1968, when the machinery stopped and mail stacked up so high that for days the post office simply didn't function.

The pony express gave faster service across

Indian territory than the planes and trains sometimes give between Washington and New York. A letter mailed in Washington at 7:15 p.m. Monday, say, will not be delivered in New York until Wednesday morning, about 40 hours later. It's 200 miles from Washington to New York, so the letter traveled at an average speed of five miles an hour—half as fast as the best time racked up by the pony express between St. Joseph, Mo., and the West Coast. (Even five miles an hour is rapid, however, compared to the speed of New York City cross-town mail, which may take two or three days.)

Of course, there is an explanation for this—there is always a reasonable explanation for lousy postal service. In the case of the Washington-New York letter, the 7:15 p.m. mailing missed connections by about 20 minutes. According to estimates by postal officials, it would take 2 hours and 15 minutes to get ideal conditions to get the letter canceled, sorted and sacked, and 50 minutes or so to carry the sack across the street from the office to the railroad terminal. The letter would miss the 10 p.m. train out of Washington, the last one that would get it to New York in time for distribution the next day. Sorry, the letter would also miss the last useful airline connection. In fact, conditions are so chaotic around New York airports that no mail is shipped there by air from Washington after 5 p.m., and to make that connection a letter must be posted by 1 p.m.

Whether this kind of postal service between the world's two most important cities should be a matter of concern is a question that divides the experts. Within the Post Office the debate goes on between the O'Brienites and the Watsonites. Lawrence O'Brien quit as Postmaster General in June with the warning that the system is not merely wobbly but in fact is in "a race with catastrophe." His successor, W. Marvin Watson, who was President Johnson's closest assistant until he moved over to the Post Office, scoffs at O'Brien's warning as being more dramatic than accurate. A little machinery here and a little shaping up of personnel there, says Watson, and the system will be in shape.

Most of the top officials in the Department side with Watson, but none so loyally as W. McMillan, a lean, tight-eyed son of the Texas bonodocks who keeps three pictures of President Johnson hanging on the wall behind his desk. McMillan is Assistant Postmaster General for Operations, and as such is the top overseer of mail traffic. He thinks things are going great. "Obviously we don't hear about all our mistakes," he allows with a modest twang, "but we get only about 600,000 complaints a year."

Anyone who thinks that only 600,000 of the 82.3 billion pieces of mail moved this year will go astray—that's 1 in 137,000—will take McMillan's statement seriously. Others might prefer to trust the findings of the Presidential study committee headed by Frederick R. Kappel, the retired board chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph; this was an imposing group that also included such men as George P. Baker, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business, and Rudolph A. Peterson, president of the Bank of America. Like O'Brien, they have concluded that the system is "in crisis" and that postal workers are helpless to do anything about it. Their report is a rag bag of bleak summations: "From a distance the mail service is not bad, but the more you use and depend on it, the less satisfactory it seems. . . . Individuals or businessmen requiring assured next-day delivery between major cities, or even within a metropolitan area, cannot buy it from the Post Office at any price."

But as with so many of the Washington brain trusts that pass through Washington, the Kappel committee turned up few surprising facts and suggested virtually no revolutionary reforms. The commission was use-

ful mainly in itemizing what most users and most employees of the Post Office already knew.

There is a turnover of more than 100,000 of the 720,000-man force each year, which must mean that working for the Post Office is a rare and unforgettable experience. In some seasons and in some regions the turnover hits 50 per cent. The effect, of course, is predictable. A Washington resident recently called the Post Office to protest being skipped by the mailman that day and was told that he shouldn't feel especially put out because 13 other routes had been bypassed also—personal shortage, the postal authorities said.

In some big-city offices the relationship between the hired hands and their bosses is pretty chilling. James Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, complains that "the average supervisor today is told by his elders that he must dominate and tyrannize over his employees or he will lose control of them. This is all nonsense, of course, but it is part of the folklore of the Post Office. The new supervisor is made to believe he is a lion tamer—alone in the cage of wild beasts, armed only with a whip, a chair and a gun filled with blanks. When the Clyde Beatty approach doesn't work, he is hurt because the lions snarl back at him."

This is a mighty thundering piece of exaggeration on Rademacher's part, but it is answered in kind. Daniel Jaspán, legislative representative of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, makes it sound as if most supervisors could use a whip, a gun and a chair for protection. "Postal supervisors have cause to be seriously concerned about being maimed or killed by recalcitrant employees," he said. "This has shattered the morale of supervisors throughout the country."

Jaspán says there have been more than 600 assaults on supervisors in the last five years, and he pulled a few from the list to indicate that postal work can be exciting: A Philadelphia supervisor told an employee to return to his post, irritating the worker (an ex-convict), who later waylaid the supervisor in the parking lot and murdered him. In recent altercations, New York postal workers have threatened their bosses with fire axes and have used knives, fists and feet on them. In Chicago, a supervisor had his head cracked open by a worker who had earlier announced that he would "hit the first supervisor who talks to me"; a woman clerk dipped a Kleenex into the blood and ran up and down the aisles waving the makeshift flag and yelling, "We have his blood—let's finish the job." Not long before that, another Chicago postal employee knocked a supervisor to the ground and rammed the point of an umbrella into his chest several times.

Jaspán says things have improved somewhat since this Congress passed a law against such mischief (local police had previously been reluctant to make arrests on Federal property), but even now many New York supervisors leave work in twos and threes for protection.

Jaspán avoids the conclusion that the violence has any racial basis, but most of the attacking employees are Negro and "we have heard of no colored supervisors" being attacked. Still skirting the race issue, he adds: "The employees we're getting now are not like they used to be. The Post Office is getting employees that can't work anywhere else."

He's right about the change, but it is no mystery. In the Depression years of the nineteen-thirties, a Post Office job at any level was considered big stuff, and it was not at all unusual to find a man with a college diploma delivering mail or clerking in the Post Office. In the urban centers of the North and West this began to change rapidly after World War II, especially for the better-educated white men, who, unless they had made it into the supervisory ranks or had accumulated too much seniority to surrender,

dropped out for industries that offered better advancement opportunities. But even the low-paying postal jobs looked good to the blacks who were moving in from the rural South or who didn't have the money to go on to college.

Then began a racial-economic schism. The more the blacks took the lower-level jobs, the less appealing these jobs were to whites, with the inevitable result that in some cities the postal service is heavily black at the bottom (in Washington it is about 90 per cent black) but mostly white in the supervisory jobs, which are filled by veterans of the old Caucasian epoch. There may have been some racial discrimination along the line, but today—when more than 20 per cent of the total postal force is Negro and (except perhaps in the South) the barriers are completely down—the difference in rank is mostly the result of seniority. To many blacks, however, the division of labor looks like the old frame-up white boss, black hand and no chance for advancement. And this has resulted in raw feelings, physical assaults, slowdowns and generally depressed morale.

The system isn't altogether to blame. Many of the new employees, blacks and whites, are undereducated and unqualified for anything but rote jobs. For a while, New York's post office needed help so desperately that new workers were not tested for general intelligence. A Post Office consultant who inspects operations in many cities said illiterates and semi-illiterates are sometimes hired; they "sort the mail randomly," he said, one letter for this sack, one for that, etc. The consultant added that some of these people aren't caught for several years. "If you have 1,000 sorters in a big city, you cannot catch one man out of 1,000." But, he added tolerantly, "If one man does this out of 1,000 people and you probably have 10 per cent goofing off in general, what is that extra one-tenth of 1 per cent? It is tragic but not serious."

It is a nice gesture for the Post Office to give jobs to the underprivileged, but it would also be nice—for the sake of those 200 million customers out there waiting for their mail—if the Post Office kept its charges working at a reasonable pace. Not long ago I was given a tour of Washington's main post office. My guide, high up the supervisory ranks, seemed hardly an oppressive employer. Showing me how adept his workers are at operating a semiautomatic letter-routing machine, he reached into a slot marked "Newark, N.J." There were only two letters in it: one was supposed to be going to Independence, Mo., and the other to Houston, Tex.

"Well," he shrugged, "we do make mistakes." Most of the routing is still done by hand. A sign over the rows of clerks doing this job warned that the Post Office expected them to stuff letters into pigeonholes at a "minimum rate" of 39 a minute and a "standard rate" of 46. By my count, few of the clerks were hitting even the minimum rate, and some of them were barely averaging 10 or 15 letters a minute; when I said so, the postal official scolded me. "These are human beings, not automatons," he said. And they only earn \$5,472 a year to begin." (The point of his argument will probably escape professional workers who earn no more.) I asked him if it was common practice for the clerks to stop to read messages on postcards, as I have seen several doing, and he waved the question away. "Oh, we try to discourage it, but I suppose it goes on."

Apparently the Washington work pace is not unusual. A New York supervisor told me that when he was starting out in the system, a clerk would pigeonhole from 1,000 to 1,600 pieces of mail an hour; the maximum today, he said, is 500 or 600 pieces.

Admittedly the average Post Office building is not likely to inspire pride in being a part of the system. Many of the most important postal centers are falling apart, badly

ventilated and unsanitary. The main office in Chicago, the largest in the system, is a dungeon. New York will soon have a new post office—its first new facility in 30 years. The antiquated vastness of the present office, as one witness complained to a Congressional committee, "would have given adequate space for the Wright brothers' first test flight," but is no longer adequate for anything. Things are not better in the sticks; the only difference between the Raleigh, N.C., post office today and when it opened 90 years ago is that now it has indoor toilets and electric lighting. In some big-city post offices there are no women's rest rooms, even though women are employed by the hundreds, not only as clerks but as letter carriers. As for eating facilities, Wyatt C. Williams, vice president of the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees (mostly black and increasingly militant), finds the New York situation rather unappetizing: "It's hardly possible to get any type of meal from the hodgepodge of vending machines that seem to be under the management of one company. I did see an unsanitary, fly-attracting can opener that is used to open canned soup. If you are lucky, you might be near that one location for the coffee machine, but if you are unlucky you'll get daily training in a long-distance obstacle course."

If Congress has been stingy about replacing Depression-era building facilities, it has been just as stingy about installing equipment. Afraid that machines might bump some employees and thereby shake its cozy situation, Congress has slowed the postal system to remain just this side of the Stone Age. In terms of dollar volume, the postal system ranks ahead of Texaco, U.S. Steel, I.B.M., Western Electric and all aircraft and chemical corporations, yet it has been spending in earnest on research and development for only two years (\$35-million currently; up from \$12-million in 1966), and its capital investment is laughable compared to private industry. John L. O'Marra is head of the Post Office's Bureau of Facilities; he used to be with Western Electric, the Bell Telephone's left arm. He likes to shame Congressional committees by telling them that, whereas the Post Office spent 2.2 per cent of its revenue on new buildings and equipment between 1958 and 1965, the Bell System has spent one-third of its revenues on such investments during the last 10 years—a difference in viewpoint that may account for the fact that, while first-class postal rates have tripled since 1932, coast-to-coast phone rates are less than one-fifth what they were.

For \$500-million (a fraction of the cost of a month's fighting in Vietnam), the 75 post offices handling 52 per cent of the nation's mail could install equipment that would do everything from lining up envelopes for canceling machines to reading addresses and sorting parcels and sacks. The price is Postmaster General Watson's estimation, and he is considered something of a tightwad himself. But Congress is not rushing to supply the money. Of course, New York couldn't use more machinery right now anyway, says Watson; officials fear that it would fall through the rickety floors.

Cowed by Congress and intimidated by the usual unseen crosscurrents of bureaucracy, the Post Office Department operates at the top under so much secrecy, red tape and subterfuge that one might mistake it for stupidity. Agreement on some important points is difficult to find. Assistant Postmaster General McMillan, who should know, told me that 90 per cent of first-class mail is delivered the day after it is posted. The Kappel commission (which had the full cooperation of postal officials in its investigation) says that only "some 71 per cent" of first-class mail gets next-day delivery. The Washington post Office's transportation chief insisted that "passengers will be bumped by the airlines if necessary to make

room for air mail," but the head of the customer-relations office disagreed: "The idea that an airmail stamp guarantees immediate airline service is a myth."

When the House Appropriations Committee asked a postal official for the cost of operating the Chicago headquarters in 1966, the witness said he could deliver "the number of hours worked in Chicago," but "I regret we don't have the total cost." Congressman Silvio Conte couldn't believe it: "You mean to tell me you can't call the regional office and ask them how much they spent for the Chicago post office in 1966?" That, as it turned out, was exactly what the witness meant.

Only recently has the Post Office tried to discover what types of mail make up what percentages of its total load; an Assistant Postmaster General told me that 80 percent of the mail originates with business, but the Kappel report (using official data) sets it as 74 percent, and, although a 6 percent difference may not seem like enough to quarrel about, when you are talking about 6 percent of 82.3 billion pieces of mail, it could make quite a difference in the accuracy of rate proposals and operational cost estimates.

At the level of the local postmaster, the problem is not so much an oppressive bureaucracy as it is a hack attitude. The typical contribution of the National League of Postmasters to the Congressional hearings this year was a resolution stating its total opposition to "any proposal to take the appointment of postmasters out of politics." When Congressman H. R. Gross pointed out that some post offices operate very smoothly and efficiently without postmasters for five or six years and inquired of Henry Womack, president of the league, as to what he thought a local postmaster is good for, Womack replied: "One of the postmaster's most important functions is public relations."

While Assistant Postmaster General Richard Murphy, widely viewed as one of the most knowledgeable men at the top, was conceding to Congress that "the Post Office Department physical plant is, indeed, in a sad state as regards modernization," Womack, who serves as postmaster at Castron, Mo., was preparing to tell the Congressmen that members of the league believe that "in most cases, the working conditions are good" and "compare very favorably with those in industry." Grassroots postal America seems to have only the vaguest idea of the crisis in the urban Northeast and West.

And this ignorance is compounded by the isolation in which most postmasters, even those in the larger offices, have traditionally operated. Their view does not extend past their own harassed fiefdoms.

"There has been little cooperation within the postal service regarding new developments," said Watson, who has visited 170 of the largest post offices since he took over. "In Washington we were still at the blueprint stage of developing a conveyor-belt apparatus for feeding out mutilated envelopes that would foul up the cancellation machine. Then on a trip to New York I found that they had developed just the thing we wanted and that it had been in operation in that post office for months. We knew nothing about it. I also found that both Houston and Nashville had developed sorting machines that nobody else knew about."

When a postal system has been operating for years like that, it hardly takes psychic powers or a blue-ribbon commission to figure out where it can be improved.

The Kappel commission's major recommendations to President Johnson for reforming the system were these: Set up a federally owned, Congressionally chartered corporation run by a nine-man board of directors (six appointed by the President and approved by the Senate and three others

selected by the original six); end all political appointments in the system; remove the postal workers from Civil Service and give them the same sort of career protection under the corporation, and give the corporation the right to fix postal rates, subject to Congressional veto.

Under this plan, the office of Postmaster General would be taken from the Cabinet. In fact, it would be killed.

O'Brientes think the proposals are grand, but that may be partly because O'Brien and his advisers got the study started. Watson isn't impressed, partly, perhaps, because he isn't terribly fond of O'Brien. (Watsonites will tell you, in shocked tones, that O'Brien not only did nothing to ease the transfer of duties but even took the desk out of the Postmaster General's office when he left!) O'Brientes, on the other hand, swear that President Johnson was on the verge of approving the Kappel report as soon as it came out and Watson persuaded him not to.)

The Kappel commission says the Post Office Department is wasting \$1-billion a year through inefficiencies, Watson disagrees. The Kappel group thinks the Department is in serious trouble. Watson doesn't think so—"Not if we do what needs to be done and what I think can be done within five years. We know exactly what needs to be done. It's just a matter of getting the hardware to do it." The Kappel commission thinks the public is bothered by bad service. Watson doesn't; he thinks: "One, the people are mostly concerned about a commemorative stamp of something that hasn't been done recently; two, they are very concerned about the so-called pandering through the mails, things they receive—pornography."

In fact, the only thing he really likes about the Kappel plan is the idea that the Department be made to pay its own way, which is, to the postal user, the most non-essential proposal of all. This kind of wrangling will doubtless once again leave the Post Office without relief, and that's too bad, because what is at issue here is simply the natural decay of a gigantic department that has been abused by politicians.

There would be no need to take the Postmaster General out of the Cabinet, or to replace him with a nine-man board, if Presidents would let the man fulfill his titled role. The Secretary of Defense is permitted to run the Defense Department and the Secretary of Agriculture is allowed to run the Department of Agriculture, but the Postmaster General is always up at the Capitol lobbying through some of the Administration's nonpostal bills (as O'Brien did) or touring the country (as Watson does) giving speeches extolling his boss's virtues.

The personnel problem is no more complex in the Post Office than elsewhere in the Federal Government, which is notorious as a haven for deadheads. Firing useless or inefficient personnel under Civil Service is always a sticky matter, and postal unions have been especially vigorous at raising hell when officials suggested the enforcement of minimum production. But some more effective culling system will simply have to be worked out.

Higher wages won't improve the quality of the personnel nearly so fast as a classier atmosphere (the Kappel commission found that Post Office wages compare favorably with wages in industry) and the Post Office seems to have forgotten—except on rare occasions—that the best way to attract an élite crew is to turn away or fire clods. Using the Chicago pile-up of 1966 as their excuse, officials finally worked up enough courage to fire a group of assorted misfits (drug addicts, toughs, etc.) in that office and things have been going pretty well ever since. Watson has helped improve the urban situation simply by ordering all liquor out of postal facilities; it used to be that half-pint bootleggers were operating out of their

lockers in some big-city facilities. To extend this kind of reform doesn't require a great deal of imagination.

Why not try to get some cooperation out of other departments and agencies? Back when James Farley was running the Post Office in the nineteen-thirties, there were 10,000 trains handling the mail; today there are no more than 400 to 650 (another of those figures postal experts can't agree on). Many railroads want to get rid of their uneconomical passenger trains, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is permitting them to get by with it, even though it sometimes plays havoc with the mail. The Post Office is amazingly docile about it all; it says it can take up the slack with airplanes—apparently forgetting that there are places like Missoula, Mont., that are fogged in about one month a year, and forgetting also that to break the Chicago logjam it had to begin back some of the "outdated" trains. XXXXX

Because the department can legitimately boast that more than 90 percent of all first-class mail—even without air mail postage—is now sent by air, it seems to feel that there is a demanding logic to getting rid of other modes of long-haul transportation.

But if postal authorities insist on this obsession with planes, they might at least try leaning on the Federal Aviation Agency to shape up airline schedules and do whatever else is necessary to prevent planes bound for New York from having to start circling over Salt Lake City because of the pile-up. XXXXX But Watson, who believes in compartmentalized government, says it is "out of the question" to pressure these transportation agencies for help. The staff of the Post Office could be a hefty lobbying group for reforms throughout the Government if the departmental leadership developed any unity in the ranks, but the effort has never been made; so the train schedules get worse and worse, and so does airline service, and the postal hierarchy, caught in the bind, just takes it as fate.

Why the endless hang-up over the Post Office deficit? The Kappel commission seems to think the deficit is shameful; so do Watson and his predecessors and so especially does the Budget Bureau. Considering the background of the men on the commission (A. T. & T., General Electric, Federated Department Stores, Campbell's Soup, Bank of America), the fixation on turning the Post Office into a "profit-making business" might be expected. And, of course, the Budget Bureau, which has recently become a policy-making outfit in our times—and that is just about as ominous as allowing accountants to advise physicians on how to perform surgery—can seldom think of anything but cutting.

It is difficult, however, to understand why Postmasters General take this position. Watson says that his job is to "give the fastest and cheapest service possible," but he knows very well that the emphasis of the budget-makers on cheapest will always prevail unless he fights for fastest. In 1950 Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, in a strictly political move, cut back home deliveries from twice a day to once a day, and ever since Post Office officials have been rationalizing it as a good thing. (It would cost only \$350-million to restore.) Now the Post Office wants to cut out one of the three business deliveries as "needless."

Although the postal service is the only part of the Federal Government that benefits the daily lives of most people, it is also, strangely enough, the only major Government service whose cost is looked upon as an unnecessary drain. Many billions of dollars in the Defense Department budget are acknowledged to be no more than subsidies for defense industries; many billions of dollars are paid to farmers for crop subsidies and for not planting anything—but is only the postal subsidy of \$1-billion a year (above the \$6-billion income) that bothers the Kappel group or Watson or O'Brien.

Says the Kappel report: "Some argue that practically all Government agencies operate at a deficit and that the postal deficit is no more a cause for alarm than the Department of Defense 'deficit' or the Department of Justice 'deficit.' In our view, such reasoning misconceives the nature of the postal establishment. All Government services must be paid for one way or another; most can be paid for only through taxes. Unlike the national defense or public health, however, postal services can be and always have been sold to users."

By the same philosophy, of course, the Federal Government could take in enormous sums by simply charging tolls on all Federal highways and by charging users' fees of the highly profitable bargaining industry, which carries 10 per cent of the nation's freight and uses our rivers and canals without charge, although the dredging of these waterways is expensive to the taxpayer. And, of course, the Department of Agriculture could charge farmers for the many services now given free or at a subsidized rate.

Until the Post Office is freed from the notion that we should try to break even because Ben Franklin did, all the schemes for improving the service are not likely to get very far. And, in fact, the schemers cannot be credited with good faith, for first-class mail more than breaks even; fourth-class mail will, under the new rates, pay its own way, and subsidized second- and third-class mail is in truth no great burden on the taxpayer. The deficit is used only as a diversionary issue. An estimated \$5-billion should be spent on Post Office buildings and facilities in the next five years, and all sorts of critical personal adjustments should be made at once—yet Kappel and O'Brien and Watson and their various allies continue to play the old, old game of post office with the budget-cutters.

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

**HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Lance Smith, a junior at Durham High School in the Second Congressional District of California, which I am privileged to represent, won the 22d annual Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest at the local level. At this time I would like to insert his winning essay in the RECORD:

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Communism is probably the greatest challenge to freedom throughout the world.

In a democracy, all people are guaranteed unalienable rights such as freedoms of speech, press, and the right to worship as they please. Everyone is guaranteed an equal opportunity for economical advancement and success in a healthy society of varied interests.

Education is the backbone of freedom, for it can strengthen a democracy by teaching the people how to think rather than what to think. In order to encourage high scholastic achievement special awards and scholarships are given, thus creating a well educated society able to govern itself wisely.

The Communists believe in constant revolts and revolutions; in fact they encourage such actions in capitalistic countries. However, the free and democratic countries of the world know that chaos and anarchy are the greatest threats to a society of freedom. It would be nearly impossible to set up a solid representative government based on a society tormented by such destructive upheavals.

In most cases communism is not willingly accepted. Instead, a country with mass ignorance, poverty and a weak government has possibly no alternatives but to accept the strong-ruling government of a centralized power, in order to stave off the possible loss of a nation and to unite the country under one powerful lawmaking body. The nation may survive; but the people, weakened by poverty and ignorance, suffer.

The Communists know no moral rights or wrongs; in fact they do not worship God, but in His place worship the state in which they live. The Communists are taught loyalty to their state alone, and anything that furthers the cause of the state is good in their eyes; no matter how morally right or wrong the act or belief may be.

Such conditions as these are fatally damaging to the honor and respect of a people; yet every day these conditions expand throughout the world.

Conditions such as these cannot be fought by war, for communism knows no boundaries. Instead, the minds of men will decide whether freedom or communism will emerge as the victor and eventually these two will meet in the decisive battle.

All free people of the world are now in grave danger of the basic totalitarian ideas of communism; for under communism the voice of the people and their freedoms, too, would slowly fade, flicker, then die; just as a flame extinguishes itself when the fuel is gone. Atheism would dominate the world and a socially unhealthy attitude would reign; an attitude that could slowly erase the great cultural progress we have made.

It is up to the free of the world, for they can choose either a prospering equal opportunity society, which is the basic aim of a democracy, or they can allow a Communist society of depressed exploited people to control the world. They do have a choice.

What can the free people of the world do to fight communism? Probably the greatest weapon they can use against communism is knowledge. First, to read and keep informed on world problems; second, to be well informed on the activities of the Communist countries, and third, to act on the knowledge they have received.

They must learn about communism and its beliefs, for they can fight only an opponent they know well. People have to become active in their country's policies and get into politics. Only then, when the free of the world join in these democracy-preserving measures, can we be sure of a victory over Freedom's Challenge.

#### LIFE MAGAZINE CONFUSES SEX AND JOBS

**HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is sad when a national magazine stumbles into the abyss of sex bias. That is what happened when Life magazine, in its issue of December 6, 1968, printed an editorial which bluntly advocated that an important provision of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting discrimination in employment should be disregarded insofar as it applies to sex discrimination.

The editorial, entitled "Unsexing the classifieds", was grisly, unhumorous, thoroughly confused, illogical, and also very misleading. It did not mention that title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

prohibits discrimination in help-wanted advertising. Nor did it mention that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission had squarely ruled several years ago that title VII prohibits job advertising in race-labeled columns. The editorial simply resorted to ridicule and irrelevancies, both coward's weapons, in urging that job ads be segregated by sex, rather than listed according to job classifications.

A number of people, including myself, wrote letters of protest to Life's editor. But Life magazine simply ignored those letters, and sent back a uniform response that was notable for its hypocrisy.

It should be noted that Life magazine's slurring comments are simply part of the heel-dragging displayed by various newspapers against title VII and its mandate of equality of treatment. The American Newspaper Publishers Association and the Washington Evening Star have led the effort to nullify the law through litigation. However, their efforts were recently repudiated by both the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (*American Newspaper Publishers Association v. Alexander*, No. 22519, Jan. 1969). Perhaps we can begin to hope that the classified ad managers will unshackle their minds from 18th century sex bias, recognize the requirements of both the law and justice, and arrange their job ads in accordance with job classifications rather than outmoded sex prejudices.

Job classifications aid the jobseeker to find the job he or she seeks, whereas sex-segregated job ads merely channel the jobseeker into sex-prejudiced work and aid only the employer who seeks to discriminate in violation of the law.

The New York Times, to its great credit, has not defied the EEOC ruling. Instead, it promptly desegregated its job ads and listed them by job classification. Its example will, I hope, provide leadership and encouragement to other newspapers to come into compliance with title VII and the EEOC ruling.

I include in the RECORD the EEOC ruling, the Life magazine editorial, and some of the ensuing correspondence:

#### EEOC ISSUES GUIDELINES ON CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING, RULES SEPARATE MALE-FEMALE ADS ILLEGAL

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission today announced a revision in its Guidelines on Sex Discrimination, stating that the placement of job advertisements under separate male and female column headings violates the law, unless sex is a bona fide occupational qualification (BFOQ) for the position advertised. The guideline will become effective on December 1, 1968.

The Commission announced that in deciding cases alleging sex discrimination in areas such as hiring and promotion, the Commission will consider as evidence the respondent's practices in the use of classified advertisements.

Under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, employers, employment agencies and unions are forbidden to publish advertisements indicating a preference, limitation, specification or discrimination based on sex, unless sex is a BFOQ for the job involved. In its new guideline, the Commission holds that the listing of jobs in columns segregated by sex is an expression of such preference and hence violates Title VII, absent a

BFOQ. As in other areas relating to sex discrimination, the burden of proof that sex is a BFOQ for a given job remains with the employer, employment agency or union advertising the position.

The revised guideline was announced after a review of the testimony presented at the EEOC's May 2-3, 1967 hearings, covering three topics relating to employment discrimination based on sex. The first two matters—pension and retirement plans and the relationship of Title VII to state protective legislation—resulted in February of this year in the publication of revised Commission guidelines.

Under the Commission's earlier guidelines on classified advertising, advertisements could be placed in columns headed "Male" and "Female" to indicate that some occupations were considered more attractive to persons of one sex than the other. Today's action reflects a Commission judgment that such placement has a discriminatory effect, by indicating an employer preference and discouraging, for example, the qualified woman job seeker from pursuing job opportunities listed in the "Help-Wanted, Male" Columns.

In announcing its guideline revision the Commission delayed the effective date to December 1, 1968, recognizing that newspapers might require time to reorganize their classified advertisement sections in accordance with the new guidelines. In the interim period, the EEOC will contact major newspapers and publishing associations to advise them of the guidelines and encourage them to institute changes even prior to the official effective date.

A number of papers already publish classified ads in occupational rather than male-female categories. Readers thus can quickly scan columns and locate the types of jobs desired, rather than reviewing job listings in two separate male-female columns.

The guideline revision was adopted by a three-to-two vote of the Commissioners with Chairman Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., Commissioner Samuel C. Jackson and Commissioner Elizabeth J. Kuck in the majority, Vice Chairman Luther Holcomb and Commissioner Vicente T. Ximenes dissenting.

Attached is a copy of the Commission's revised Guidelines on Sex Discrimination, in regard to the listing of classified advertisements in separate male and female columns.

Section 1604.4 of EEOC Regulations: It is a violation of Title VII for a help-wanted advertisement to indicate a preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination based on sex unless sex is a bona fide occupational qualification for the particular job involved. The placement of an advertisement in columns classified by publishers on the basis of sex, such as columns headed "Male" or "Female", will be considered an expression of a preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination based on sex.

[From Life magazine, Dec. 6, 1968]

#### UNSEXING THE CLASSIFIED

A group of militant ladies are agitating to forbid U.S. newspapers from running separate Male and Female help wanted ads. Borrowing their rhetoric from the Negro civil rights movement, they call the practice segregation by sex, describing it as "Jane Crow" treatment, and call any ladies who tolerate it "Aunt Toms." They have already persuaded the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that they have a grievance under the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the case is now in the courts, being challenged by the newspaper industry. Publishers argue that combining the want ad columns would be a nuisance to both employers and job seekers, and a service to nobody.

Though more than one third of the total U.S. labor force is female, women are still barred from many jobs by outmoded "pro-

tective" legislation passed in the sweatshop era. They are frequently paid less than men for equivalent work and discriminated against in raises and promotions. The *Harvard Business Review* recently abandoned a study of executive opportunities for the career woman because "the barriers are so great that there is scarcely anything to study." Room at the top for the female is equally scarce in the public sector: of the 9,000 top-ranked federal civil service jobs, only 1.7% are held by women.

Some of our more serious warriors fear, however, that we are heading for a condition they call "unisex" because some women are dressing so much like men, while some male peacocks are taking up styles and colors that used to be regarded as feminine. But unisex's day is not here yet, happily, and we see no need to create a uni-column of male and female ads.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., December 11, 1968.

THE EDITOR,  
*Life Magazine, Time & Life Building, New York, N.Y.*

DEAR SIR: The last paragraph of an otherwise accurate editorial ("Unsexing the Classifieds") in *Life's* December 6, 1968, issue is grisly, unhumorous, thoroughly confused, and a complete non-sequitur.

Your editorial correctly notes that outmoded laws enacted in the sweatshop era still bar women from many jobs—that women are often paid less than men for equivalent work—that women are discriminated against in raises and promotions—and that women are largely excluded from executive opportunities both in private industry and in government.

But then your last paragraph raises a bugaboo of "unisex" (which you say is some women dressing like men, and some men wearing styles and colors "that used to be regarded as feminine"). This, you say, shows that it is wrong for the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to rule against sex-segregated job ads in newspaper help-wanted columns.

The fact is that the widespread practice of sex-labeling of classified job ads pervasively fosters and abets the very discriminations cited in your editorial. They reinforce prejudicial attitudes that have long limited women to the less rewarding jobs. They tell the job seeker that sex, rather than ability, is what counts in the job, and that it is useless to apply. The sex label hinders, rather than promotes, the job seeker's convenience, which would be much better promoted by listing the ads by job category, namely, bookkeeper, plumber, cook, welder, printer, secretary, accountant, etc., which men and women alike can perform.

The astonishing aspect of your editorial's last paragraph is that it utterly ignores not only the vast sex discriminations so pitifully recited in the editorial, but also the plain text of the law. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act squarely outlaws any "advertisement relating to employment . . . indicating any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination, based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin." The recent ruling by the EEOC simply said that sex-segregated help-wanted ads, for jobs that can be done by men and women alike, are just as unlawful as job ads segregated on the basis of race or color.

Your editorial, or at least the last paragraph thereof, may have been intended as an exercise in "humorous" writing. But I assure you there is nothing funny about sex discrimination in employment which deprives millions of women, and often men, too, of decent job opportunities and the right to earn the full rewards of their toil and work.

Certainly, I hope you will reexamine, objectively, the whole issue of sex discrimination, and then tell the story like it is. You

will be doing a great service for our country.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,  
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
December 20, 1968.

THE EDITOR,  
*Life Magazine.*

DEAR SIR: As comment to your editorial "Unsexing the Classifieds", I feel that I must express my frank sadness that you are of the opinion expressed therein. That "group of militant ladies"—by which I assume you mean the National Organization for Women (N.O.W.), composed of both men and women—includes many dynamic, optimistic, interesting and aware people so kindly consider them to have retired their black stockings and hatchets.

Linking the pejorative term "unisex" with devices which discuss discrimination on the basis of sex and could function as a help for the economic plight of one-third of the United States work force—which you did mention with some nice statistics that make your conclusion insupportable (there is the lead)—and calling it "unicolium" is to use loaded and irresponsible rhetoric.

I am sorry that you do not recognize the difference between being equal and being identical.

Sincerely,

CLAUDIA LIPSCH

DECEMBER 5, 1968.

THE EDITOR,  
*Life Magazine, Time & Life Building, New York, N.Y.*

DEAR SIR: Your editorial "Unsexing the Classifieds" is shocking and is a cavalier attitude toward the law—even to a female lawyer who has observed over many years the irrationality of sex prejudice in otherwise rational men.

It was astounding that the EEOC originally condoned sex-segregated help wanted ads despite recommendations of the Presidential Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and in open violation of the law, until the National Organization for Women brought action in Federal district court to require the agency to comply with the clear language of the EEOC would defend the general counsel of the EEOC would defend the EEOC "interpretation" at the time it was issued.

Unless one believes discrimination in employment because of sex is right and proper, he cannot rationally defend sex-segregated ads legally or morally any more than he can defend ads segregated by race.

From the practical point of view, a single column arranged alphabetically by occupation is easier for the newspaper and the reader. If an accountant or an office manager is wanted, let the job determine the heading. The newspaper would not have to ascertain from the caller which column the ad should be in and would not have to be careful to enter ads in the right column. No reader would have to locate male or female headings or have to look under both headings.

For occupations in which there are few women qualified, such as engineer, a man or woman would look under "E" in the single column. There would be no more or fewer entries to examine than there are now. For occupations for which few men are qualified or desirous, such as secretary, both men and women would look at the single column under "S" and would have no more or fewer entries to examine than at present. For a position such as economist, for which many men or women would qualify, both men and women would look under "E" in a single column. As it is now, both men and women would have to look in both columns to be positive they have checked all the possibil-

ities although practically all the ads appear in the "help wanted male" column.

Single non-segregated headings should increase newspaper revenues. In those exceptional instances where one sex would be disinterested many employers would spell out the conditions making the job undesirable to one sex or the other.

I have held national office in the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Association of Women Lawyers, Zonta International, and am a member of the American Association of University Women. I know that women in these organizations consider sex-segregated advertising as discriminatory. Business and Professional Women's Clubs and the National Association of Women Lawyers adopted resolutions before and after EEOC action urging national and local units to persuade newspapers to adopt single column headings.

The Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women and the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women, the men and women members of which have a number of years' experience in considering the problems of women, recommended to EEOC in 1965 that it require desegregation of help wanted ads (copy of policy paper enclosed).

I urge immediate reexamination of this issue and an editorial of assurance to your women readers of Life's concern with sex discrimination and respect for law.

Sincerely yours,

MARGUERITE RAWLST,  
Member, Citizens' Advisory Council on  
the Status of Women, and Chairman,  
Legal Committee, National Organization  
for Women.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,  
Madison, Wis., December 10, 1968.

THE EDITOR,  
Life Magazine, Time and Life Building New  
York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The 1968 National Conference of the National Organization for Women unanimously voted, at its plenary session on December 7, 1968, to inform you of our opposition to your editorial of December 6, 1968 entitled "Unsexing the Classifieds."

What a shame that one of our most widely read magazines publishes an editorial as un-informed, misleading, and irrational as "Unsexing the Classifieds." Your writer wrote the editorial either without exploring the issues or with the intent of misleading the public.

What "unisex" is, or what help-wanted ads have to do with it, or what relation the dress of man and women have to either subject, is wholly beyond reason. But what is clear is that the action of the American Newspaper Publishers Association and Life magazine in advocating disobedience to laws they don't like shows a gross insensitivity and blindness to the seething resentment women feel toward the injustices imposed by our culture.

Some of the most important facts are omitted: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers, labor organizations, or employment agencies from indicating in help wanted ads "any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin." The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, in its first year of operation, ruled that it was a violation of the law to insert help-wanted ads in racially separated lists. Although sex-labeled columns are just as illegal as race-labeled columns the EEOC did not make a similar ruling for sex-labeled columns until September, 1968, three years later, largely because of opposition from the newspaper industry, particularly from two or three of our most powerful newspapers.

No respectable unbiased lawyer has ever defined sex-separated lists as legal under Title VII. The former General Counsel of the EEOC would not defend it publicly or privately. The Federal District Court for the District of Columbia recently held that the

EEOC interpretation was proper and that the EEOC had full authority to issue it.

Your editorial also omitted to mention that the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, consisting of highly informed and responsible citizens appointed by the President, and the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women, consisting of the heads of the major Federal departments, recommended to the EEOC in 1965 the precise ruling they made three years later.

Even the most superficial analysis of the want-ad columns contradicts the arguments of the newspapers that combining them would be a nuisance to both employers and job seekers. If you will look at the columns of any large daily newspaper, you will find many occupations, which men or women could perform equally well, listed in two or three columns (not duplicate ads by the same employer). If a bookkeeper, for example, is looking for a job, he or she must read three columns in order to know about all the jobs that are open. Furthermore, the employer who is looking for the best qualified person for the job has to advertise in at least two columns. The present system serves only the needs of the employer who wants to discriminate—to discourage persons of one sex from applying. There are not enough duplicate ads to be a significant revenue factor for the newspapers.

Why they and you get so emotional and irrational on the subject is a fit subject for a psychiatrist to investigate.

We urge that Life Magazine do its homework, fully and rationally, and write the full facts of sex discrimination in employment, which sex-labeled want ads help to perpetuate.

Sincerely,

DR. KATHRYN F. CLARENBACH,  
Chairman of the Board.  
BETTY FRIEDAN, President.

WOMEN'S FREEDOM ACTION LEAGUE,  
Novelty, Ohio, December 20, 1968.

MR. GEORGE P. HUNT,  
Editor, Life Magazine,  
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. HUNT: Several members of this organization have requested that I write you with regard to your editorial "Unsexing the Classifieds," which appeared in your December 6 issue.

I therefore sought out and read the editorial, and find it somewhat puzzling, in that the conclusions offered as your presumable editorial policy in the matter are directly opposed to the fact presentations therein. It is also puzzling to me that you would thus gratuitously risk the ill will of working women, who are in an increasing state of ferment on this matter, when Life does not have help wanted advertising.

The superficial and frivolous tone of this editorial is also irritating to thinking women, and unless you make some factual presentation modifying or reversing this stand, I believe that your publication will feel the results of the resentment you have aroused, probably for a long time to come.

In an era when magazines are struggling to survive and to retain their circulation, I am sure you will want to give this matter some further consideration.

In aid of some practical and factual analysis, may I submit that according to the U.S. Bureau of Census figures, the median income for the white woman with from one to five years of college training was only \$3,333. Figures which I have recently compiled indicate that out of this amount she would pay approximately \$608.65 in income tax, social security and local income taxes, with a 10% surtax to help her avoid any budgetary excesses. This leaves her with \$2,724.35 for food, housing, clothing, transportation, health needs, insurance, recreation and savings for her old age. The women who head households get \$3,638. These amounts are MEDIAN figures. Half the

women earn less. The median figures for women with less education are so low that they would receive more, in most cases, as wards of the state. It comes down to the question of whether you propose that women support themselves in these cases, or whether you wish to support them through increased taxes.

Very truly yours,

ELIZABETH BOYER,  
President.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY  
COMMISSION,

December 9, 1968.

THE EDITOR,  
Life Magazine,  
Time and Life Building,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your December 6 editorial "Unsexing the Classifieds," recognized sex discrimination in employment is still a vivid and discouraging reality, but it unfairly dismissed EEOC action to remove one of the most important barriers faced by the more than 17 million women in this country who work in business and industry for compelling economic reasons.

Although you may "see no need" to create a single column for most help-wanted advertisements, the Commission has concluded, after considerable public discussion and staff review, that the use of separate "Help-wanted, male" and "Help-wanted, female" column headings has a clear discriminatory effect. Advertisements placed under such headings permit employers virtually to pre-select their applicants by indicating an explicit sex preference, regardless of an applicant's individual ability. Few women, however qualified, will pursue job openings appearing only in the "Help-wanted, male" column and too many employers use the "Help-wanted, female" column to advertise openings only at the clerical level. Where specific job requirements make applicants of one sex unsuitable for employment, the employer's right to advertise for "men only" or "women only" is of course recognized and protected.

Far from being a "nuisance" to employers and job seekers, the Commission's ruling would remove the necessity for employers to double-list advertisements seeking applicants of either sex. Moreover, the ruling would insure the job hunter that all openings in areas of his or her interest and training would be listed in one place, rather than divided into columns which imply an employer preference.

The denial of equal job opportunity inherent in sex-segregated classified columns is a good deal more disturbing than the fashion trends which apparently trouble your "more serious worriers."

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH J. KUCK,  
Commissioner.

NEW YORK CHAPTER, NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN,

December 18, 1968.

Re: "Unsexing the Classifieds," Editorial,  
December 6th.

MR. HEDLEY DONOVAN,  
Editor-in-Chief,  
Life, Time & Life Building,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. DONOVAN: Paragraph two of this editorial presented a very clear picture of the discrimination against women that not only still exists today, but is actually increasing (women are more and more concentrated in the lower-paying, menial jobs; the gap between men's and women's median salary is increasing).

However, the final paragraph, trumpeting forecasts of a dread "unisex," is completely irrelevant to the matter of advertising jobs.

Jobs Have No Gender. One does not have to be a Feminist (or even a "militant lady") to understand that the qualifications for a

job are talent, ability and the appropriate training, not sex.

Ads have no sex either. If there were only one column, it would not be a "uni-column" of "male and female ads"—it would simply be a column of jobs, listed alphabetically by category—an efficient and convenient system for advertisers and job-seekers, regardless of sex. (And much less costly for the advertisers who now have to place two ads, one under female, one under male.)

If you stopped to think about it, Mr. Donovan, we think you would conclude that most jobs—done by Clerk of the Board to the clerk—are performed using hands, brains and ability, not sex (except in a very few instances, for which BFOQ exemptions are provided).

Those jobs for which sex is a BFOQ will sort themselves out quite easily—men just aren't equipped for modeling bras, for example.

As you must know, the New York newspapers (as a result of our complaint with the New York City Commission on Human Rights) already have only one column; this happened on December 1st and we're all still here to discuss it.

Change is threatening only before it happens; within a few months, people might be saying, why hasn't it always been done this way?

Sincerely,

JEAN FAUST,  
President.

Love,

New York, January 20, 1969.

MY DEAR MRS. GIFFERTS: We appreciate your taking the time to send us your frank comments in response to our December 8 editorial on "Unsexing the Classifieds."

We reserve our editorial page for the editors' views on important issues of the day—conclusions arrived at after careful consideration of all the facts and all the conflicting points of view involved in any important issue. We welcome an exchange of opinion with our readers and are glad to have this opportunity to discuss the points you raised in your letter.

Life applauds the sincere efforts of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as well as the work of other women's organizations and individuals, to challenge the exclusion of women from executive positions and differentiation in wage scales. We realize that the movement to remove sex qualifications from help-wanted advertisements is representative of the larger movement toward total equality of employment opportunities. Our argument, as presented in this editorial, was that combined help-wanted ad columns would be inconvenient and annoying to both employer and prospective employee.

I hope that my answer reassures you of our continuing concern with the achievement of equal employment opportunities.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) LINDEN FARBER,  
For the Editors.

#### GONZALEZ BILL EQUALIZES FEDERAL RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today a bill which would equalize civil service retirement annuities in an attempt to balance off some of the inequities found in the retirement system that have arisen largely within the past 15 years. Many beneficial changes have come to the retirement

system. However, during the 1950's and 1960's legislation was passed which was not retroactive as in previous legislation—and thus, resulted in a marked difference in benefits of Federal employees who were employed when the laws were passed and those who just happened to retire as a civil servant a few years earlier. This bill would merely try to correlate the benefits which have been sprinkled along the last 15 years in varying pieces of legislation in order to smooth out the inequities found in the civil service retirement system.

The National Association of Retired Civil Employees strongly supports this bill because, as they question:

How can present Federal employees have any assurance that they, too, will not be forgotten as soon as they leave the active working force? How long can the morale of the present active working force be sustained under such conditions?

The bill's provisions are as follows:

Section 1 would extend the reduction of annuities formula for a surviving spouse as contained in the 1962 amendments to all who retired prior to that date. This would make the deductions from civil service annuities the same for all past, present and future retirees. Section 2 would recompute the annuities of those retiring prior to July 18, 1966, on the basis of age 55 and 30 years of creditable service so as to restore the deductions presently being made for those years the retiree was under age 60 at the time of retirement. Section 3 would permit all deferred annuitants who were separated from the service prior to July 31, 1956, to elect to have deductions made in order to provide for a survivor annuity. Section 4 would restore the survivor annuity in those cases where it has been discontinued because of the remarriage of the surviving spouse prior to July 18, 1966. Section 5 would permit those retired prior to July 12, 1960, to have those periods of service computed that were in excess of the maximum years of service creditable for retirement prior to July 12, 1960. Section 6 would extend the benefits of the "annuity floor," to those retired on account of disability after October 1, 1956, to those retired prior to October 1, 1956. Section 7 would extend survivor annuities to certain "forgotten widows" not now eligible because they were married to the employee less than 5 years, or because the employee had less than 10 years' creditable service. Section 8 of this bill would make some provisions for expenses of last illness and burial of those retirees who retired prior to the effective date of the Federal Group Life Insurance Act of 1954. Sections 9 and 10 are technical. Section 11 provides that this act may be cited as "The Civil Service Retirement Annuities Equalization Act of 1969."

The bill I introduced during the 90th Congress was considered along with other such bills during 2 days of general subject hearings on retirement in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, but no bill was reported out. But it is my hope that this Congress will progress more diligently toward erasing the many inequities that are quite obvious in the present civil service retirement system.

#### FAITH LIGHTENS GRIEF AS EIGHTH DISTRICT MOURNS

### HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I can speak for all of the official delegation from Washington which attended the funeral services for our late colleague, Representative Robert "Fats" Everett, when I say that it was a dignified, warm, and exceptionally fitting tribute to our deceased friend and fellow legislator.

Last Wednesday, I inserted into the RECORD a copy of the funeral eulogy of the Reverend Dr. Scott Johnson, pastor of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of

Today, I wish to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a very poignant article written by Mr. Eugene D. Rutland, describing the funeral for the Memphis Commercial-Appeal in the January 29 edition of that newspaper. Mr. Rutland's article is called, "Faith Lightens Grief as Eighth District Mourns." I believe my colleagues will find it most interesting as it typifies the high regard and esteem everyone in Tennessee held for Fats Everett. The article follows:

FAITH LIGHTENS GRIEF AS EIGHTH DISTRICT MOURNS

(By Eugene D. Rutland)

UNION CITY, TENN., January 29.—The misty skies of a dreary winter afternoon seemed to set the mood for 1,500 persons who gathered here Tuesday for the funeral of Representative Robert A. Everett.

But for mourning friends of the ever-jovial "Fats" Everett there was another mood—of hope and salvation—in the music and the message of the funeral service.

When the Army guard was dismissed, the organist played "Ring Those Golden Bells," a hymn of gladness and expectation.

Dr. Scott Johnson, pastor of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church chose a similar theme, reading from Isaiah 41:10.

"Fear thou not, for I am with thee: Be not dismayed, for I am God. I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. For I, the Lord thy God, will hold thy right hand, saying unto thee, fear not, I will help thee."

The pastor recalled numerous instances of kindness and consideration from the 53-year-old Eighth District representative who died Sunday in the Veterans Hospital at Nashville.

"He asked me to call him 'Fats' as all his friends did.

"This characterized his life—humility and an absence of pride. 'Fats' describes not so much his physique as it pictures his heart. Magnanimous was his soul in his winning zeal to help others.

"Here he harvested his deepest satisfaction and his highest job, be it for widow, teenager, governor or clergyman."

He offered Representative Everett as an example to youth who aspire to heights of political achievement and public service. Mr. Everett early in life sought voters out of which he could cultivate friends, where too often others seek friends out of which they may cultivate voters, the minister said.

The pastor had words of comfort from the Bible for the representative's mother, Mrs. Lella Ashton Everett, and he closed saying "For 'Fats,' life's gavel has struck its final adjournment; it was a great and productive session—the rush and fervor of life is

over—the office phone comes to rest on its cradle.”

As the organ sounded the benediction—the funeral procession moved out toward the family plot at East View Cemetery and beside his father, Charlie Everett. The last prayer was said as the body was lowered.

Four servicemen folded the flag that had draped the casket—and Col. Lloyd Burke of Stuttgart, Ark., Medal of Honor winner, gave Mrs. Everett the flag.

The church where the 2 p.m. service was held, began to fill at 10:30 a.m. Sunday school rooms circling the sanctuary, a balcony, a basement fellowship room and chapel, were all pressed into service, providing seats for 1,000 persons. Several hundred other persons were gathered for the services.

There were no reserved seats except for the family, Gov. Buford Ellington and his staff, and the 22 members of the official Washington delegation.

A profusion of more than 500 floral tributes framed the church interior and lined the sidewalk entrances. The flag-draped, solid bronze casket was flanked by an honor guard of the 51st Engineer's Battalion of Fort Campbell, Ky. A large white Stetson hat made of 350 small white mums stood at the right of the casket, a reminder of one of his Tennessee trademarks from the Barry White family of Union City.

The entire Union City police force, the Obion County Sheriff's Department, and 20 highway patrolmen directed by Capt. N. L. Huffman of the Memphis district, guided traffic through town. Flags were at half staff on all county and city buildings—closed for the day—and in front of downtown businesses, closed from 2 until 3.

The 2,085 students in the five Union City schools paid tribute to Representative Everett during the hour of his funeral.

Supt. J. H. Rochelle said, "memorial services differed in each school, but all had a brief prayer service and some listened to the radio broadcast of the services."

Among the hundreds of friends attending the services were Senators Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) and Howard Baker (R-Tenn.), the entire Tennessee delegation in the House of Representatives, numerous close associates of Representative Everett from other states' House delegations, former Representative Clifford Davis (D-Tenn.) and former Govs. Gordon Browning and Frank Clement.

## TAXPAYERS REVOLT

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the entire tax system of this Nation relies on the public's confidence that the system is fair and that everyone is paying according to his ability. Due to the persistent and well-known inequities and loopholes in the system, taxpayer confidence is being eroded.

My good friend and former colleague in the Congress, former Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph W. Barr, in his valedictory before the Joint Economic Committee, in great candor and timeliness, ominously warned of a "taxpayers revolt" if the Congress does not effect major tax reforms to close these loopholes.

I wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to Mr. Barr's testimony given before the Joint Economic Committee on January 17, 1969, in which he first used the "taxpayer revolt" phrase.

I am pleased to insert this excellent testimony at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH W. BARR,  
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Joint Economic Committee: I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this distinguished Committee. I think it extremely important that the members have the economic rationale for the financial plan President Johnson has recommended to the Congress—a plan that is responsible and realistic in terms of the country's needs and resources, and that is consistent with our responsibilities to keep the dollar strong and respected.

Before getting into the body of my remarks, I want to take a moment to pay tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, to the Vice Chairman, Mr. Patman, and to the members of the Committee. Under your leadership, the work of this Committee has contributed greatly to the tremendous growth of public interest in economic issues, to better informed public attitudes on economic policy, and to the record economic progress the United States has achieved.

The economy is now in the 95th month of the most sustained and vigorous period of economic expansion in our country's entire history. There is no need for me to enumerate here the many economic records established during this period of unprecedented prosperity. I believe that in his State of the Union Message and in his Economic Report to the Congress the President clearly established that the economy is now stronger and more vigorous than ever before, with production, employment, and after-tax income, including both wages and profits, all at record highs, far above the levels of a decade ago.

And I want to emphasize that this isn't just a dollar prosperity. The purchasing power of the average American—the real goods he can buy with his dollar income after taxes—has actually increased by 31 percent between 1960 and 1968. This, gentlemen, is the basic definition of economic progress.

Perhaps an even more significant aspect of our economic well-being is that it is probably being shared by a broader segment of our population than during any previous time of great prosperity. Not only have business profits soared to record highs but the unemployment rate has been sharply reduced—particularly among minority groups who have not adequately shared in economic gains of the past. Much remains to be done in this key area of national policy, but it is clear that significant progress has been made in removing barriers and expanding job opportunities for our underprivileged citizens.

However, we must recognize that serious economic problems must still be overcome. The increase in consumer prices in the past year of nearly 4 percent is certainly larger than we can tolerate for very long. Although a small balance of payments surplus was achieved in 1968, vigorous efforts must continue to maintain this record in the current year.

Today I want to go beyond the over-all indicators of a prosperous economy and in a sense see whether the financial underpinning of our economy will support continued sound expansion in the years to come. I also want to review briefly a few items of major, unfinished business that will bear heavily on our future economic growth and, in some instances, that of the entire Free World.

Probably the most important single component of this financial underpinning of our economy is the Federal budget. A properly designed budget should reflect what the country needs, what it can afford and what the Congress can be expected to do. In my judgment President Johnson has presented to the Congress a budget that fully meets this standard. In fiscal 1969 the budget is expected to be strongly in the black, with outlays of \$183.7 billion, revenues of \$186.1 billion and a surplus of \$2.4 billion. For fiscal

1970 we have projected an even larger surplus of \$3.4 billion.

In fiscal 1970 budget receipts are estimated at \$198.7 billion, an increase of \$12.6 billion over the estimate for fiscal 1969. Outlays in fiscal 1970 are projected at \$195.3 billion. The estimated increase in fiscal 1970 Federal revenue is due almost entirely to anticipated economic growth. For calendar 1969 we have projected a gross national product of \$921 billion, personal income of \$736 billion and corporate profits of \$96 billion.

Now there is nothing inherently good or bad in itself about a budget surplus or deficit. The test is whether it contributes to the economic strength of our country. And a budget does this only when it is consistent with current and prospective economic realities.

In the context of the economy as we see it, a Federal budget surplus for fiscal years XXXXX and 1970 is necessary for several important reasons.

First, a budget surplus will tend to strain over-all private demand during a time when our productive capacity is straining hard to meet the demands thrust upon it. Second, a budget surplus means that during this period the Treasury will not on balance be competing for funds in our already hard-pressed credit markets. In fact, in fiscal 1969 and 1970 taken as a whole, the Treasury will actually be adding funds to the private credit markets in contrast to the situation in XXXXX when \$2.1 billion had to be drawn from private investors. This healthy situation means greater freedom for the Federal Reserve to establish effective monetary policies, and more ready access to private savings by private users of credit and state and local governments—borrowers who have had a rough time in past tight money periods. In this context the home-building industry in particular should greatly benefit.

A third important reason for maintaining a Federal budget surplus at this time is that it will strengthen the hand of our negotiators during the critical period in which we will be working to improve and modernize the international monetary structure.

The Federal Government influences economic activity and the distribution of income not only through direct expenditures and loan programs but also through special tax provisions. A dollar foregone through a special tax provision is no different than a dollar spent through a budget outlay. In other words, these tax expenditures use budget resources in the same way that direct expenditures or net lending do. In most cases, the special tax provisions are alternatives to direct expenditures or net lending to achieve the same purpose.

The Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for fiscal year 1968, which was issued this week, contains for the first time a detailed description and discussion of these tax expenditures and estimates of the amounts involved. To bring this material up to date, the Treasury staff has prepared an analysis of tax expenditures related to the budget for fiscal year 1970 which I am submitting as a supplement to my statement. The revenue costs of the special tax provisions are presented alongside the budget outlays. This makes it possible to get a more complete picture of total government expenditures for various functions. You may be surprised to find that tax expenditures approach or even surpass the budget outlay for certain functions.

The purpose of this special analysis is to present information which will help us to use budget resources most effectively. We can obtain more efficient use of resources by the Federal Government if explicit account is taken of all calls upon budget resources. In this way the importance of different budgetary objectives and the effectiveness of alternative uses, whether through direct expenditures, loan subsidies, or tax expendi-

tures, may be fully understood, examined, and re-evaluated periodically.

I should inject a note of warning at this point. As the Committee knows, the whole subject of tax expenditures is highly controversial and the figures presented in this Treasury report are themselves certain to be controversial. The figures may vary depending on the assumptions used, and we do not claim that our figures and assumptions are the last word. Perhaps the Committee might want to have its staff analyze this document—perhaps in conjunction with the staffs of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Appropriations Committees. The staff of the Treasury will be pleased to cooperate. Many of the provisions in the Tax Code are virtually the same as appropriations and should be considered by the Congress as they review the various Federal programs.

Let me turn now to four areas where I believe there is urgent need for action by the United States or by those nations whose economic future is closely linked with our own.

#### THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM

We have an income tax system which has demonstrated its strength—\$128.3 billion of revenues expected in fiscal year 1970—and its flexibility. The income tax is one of our country's strongest assets, and we must strive to improve it and perfect it.

Our income tax system needs major reforms, as a matter of importance and urgency. That system essentially depends on an accurate self-assessment by taxpayers. This, in turn, depends on widespread confidence that the tax laws and the tax administration are equitable, and that everyone is paying according to his ability to pay.

We face now the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms in our income taxes. The revolt will come not from the poor but from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes of \$7,000 to \$20,000, whose tax payments now generally are based on the full ordinary rates and who pay over half of our individual income taxes.

The middle classes are likely to revolt against income taxes not because of the level or amount of the taxes they must pay but because certain provisions of the tax laws unfairly lighten the burdens of others who can afford to pay. People are concerned and indeed angered about the high-income recipients who pay little or no Federal income taxes. For example, the extreme cases are 155 tax returns in 1967 with adjusted gross incomes above \$200,000 on which no Federal income taxes were paid, including 21 with incomes above \$1,000,000.

Judging from taxpayers' letters to the Treasury, I would say that many people are upset and impatient over the need for correcting these and other situations which demand our attention. In this connection, I should point out that the 10 percent surcharge has made many taxpayers more aware of the inequities in our present tax system and more demanding that reforms be adopted.

I believe public confidence in our income tax system is threatened and that tax reform should be a top priority subject for the new Administration and the 91st Congress.

As you know, we at Treasury have been working on tax reform proposals for more than two years, and they are now ready. They will be turned over to Secretary-Designate Kennedy and, upon request, to the Congress.

I feel that the enactment of major reforms to substantially improve the fairness, simplicity, and neutrality of our income taxes are essential to continue and strengthen public confidence in our tax system.

#### THE NEED FOR RESTORING THE U.S. TRADE POSITION

The international trade position of the United States is rapidly deteriorating. It is

essential therefore that we make a forceful policy response to restore our trade account to a position of strength. Short of this, we will find a continuing upsurge in the already growing protectionist sentiment apparent in the country.

The answer to our trade problem does not lie in an overhauling of our tax system through the introduction of a value-added tax either in addition to or in lieu of our present taxes. The adverse domestic effects of such a move would far outweigh any small trade advantage which we might gain.

What we might well consider instead is our own system of border adjustments, encompassing both a tax on imports and a payment to exporters. The level of these adjustments would be unrelated to our domestic tax system. The rates would be set at whatever level is necessary to achieve our objective—a healthy trade surplus. This system should be established under the strict control of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or other appropriate international body.

#### THE NEED FOR ACTION ON THE SDR FACILITY

I would urge the member nations of the International Monetary Fund that have not yet completed action on the Special Drawing Rights Facility to do so promptly. Their ratification of the Proposed Amendment to the IMF Articles of Agreement establishing the SDR Facility will bring closer the day when the world will be assured of an adequate growth in monetary reserves.

The SDR Facility will be created when 67 member nations having 80 percent of the weighted votes in the Fund have ratified the Amendment, and when members having at least 75 percent of the quotas in the Fund have deposited with it an instrument of participation.

The United States completed action on the SDR Facility last July 15. However, as of January 10 of this year, only 29 members of the Fund having 47½ percent of the total votes had ratified the Proposed Amendment.

After years of intensive negotiations, nations have neared establishment of a method for creating the monetary reserves needed by a rapidly growing world economy. We are near the goal of the most important reform in the international monetary system since the Bretton Woods Agreement of 1944. I earnestly hope that other nations and their governments will make it possible for the world to reach that goal within a period of weeks or months.

#### THE NEED FOR SUPPORT TO MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTIONS

I am also deeply concerned about two items of unfinished business in the field of multilateral development finance. Both—the replenishment of the International Development Association and the provision of special funds for the Asian Bank—involve institutions that I have been intimately involved with over the years. What we in the United States do in regard to these two institutions can have a profound effect on the well-being and the very lives of millions among the two-thirds of the world's population that has little to possess and still less to hope for.

As a freshman Congressman, I helped write the legislation for our participation in IDA. I have seen it in action in the field, in Asia in 1963 and in Africa in 1967. I know it is capably guided by the World Bank under Robert McNamara's sure hand.

IDA is, most importantly, serving in a growing way the primary function we had in mind in the late 1950's—it is mobilizing a greater share of development resources from the other advanced countries. It is putting these resources to work in an efficient and effective manner. Eighteen other countries put up a total substantially greater than our own. Our share in the effort has been reduced from 43 percent at the outset to 40 percent currently, meaning a cumulative transfer of the burden of about \$150 million.

The contribution proposed for the United States—\$180 million in each of three years—will have no adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments, because we have obtained internationally agreed safeguards to ensure this.

But the entire IDA replenishment package cannot become effective unless the U.S. makes its contribution. I consider it of the highest urgency for the Congress to demonstrate again its consistent attitude of bipartisan support toward IDA by acting on the legislation that has been re-introduced in recent days.

While IDA's operations are world wide, those of the Asian Bank are concentrated in the area of the world that has been torn by intense conflict and wracked by human misery for all too many years. In December 1965, I was privileged, along with Eugene Black, to sign the agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank, thus placing XXXXX firmly on the path of constructive multilateral development in Asia. Many members of the Congress and Congressional staff XXXXX participated actively in the events leading up to the creation of the Asian Bank. It is now in being, with a distinguished staff and with an effective loan and technical assistance program moving forward.

However, the Bank needs additional resources—beyond its regular funds for conventional lending—for special lending programs on favorable terms in fields such as agriculture and transportation. The XXXXX budget proposes a \$25 million U.S. contribution to Asian Bank special funds in 1969 and 1970, and I consider this action, already long delayed, as crucial to Asia and our total interests there.

These funds will help to encourage regional cooperation and peaceful development in southeast Asia. Like our IDA contribution, we would be putting up only a minority share; Japan and other advanced countries will bear the major burden. And this contribution, too, will have no adverse balance of payments effect since it will finance U.S. goods and services.

I sincerely hope that both these vital programs will promptly receive the Congressional support they deserve.

You have in front of you a set of charts with the heading "Fiscal Policy in Perspective for 1969." These charts set forth the economic rationale for the financial plan which President Johnson recommends to the 91st Congress, and I would like at this time to review them with you.

#### R. F. K.'S MISSILE CRISIS MEMOIR IS PRIMER ON USE OF RESTRAINT

### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the late Robert F. Kennedy played a major role—perhaps the major role—in helping the United States to avert nuclear disaster at the time of the Cuban missile crisis. Urging caution and restraint during that direct confrontation with the Soviet Union, Mr. Kennedy argued convincingly for finding a means of allowing Premier Khrushchev to remove the Cuban missiles without losing face. President Kennedy, with his brother's invaluable aid and advice, found that means.

Marquis Childs, writing in the Washington Post on Robert Kennedy's memoirs of the Cuban missile crisis, has emphasized the importance of the late Senator's advice. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put Mr. Childs' column in the RECORD at this point:

R.F.K.'S MISSILE CRISIS MEMOIR IS PRIMER ON  
USE OF RESTRAINT

When good men die their goodness does not perish but lives though they are gone.

That line from Euripides says something about one of the tragedies marking the ill-starred year of 1968. The assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy in Los Angeles was a senseless act that left the Nation and the world so much the poorer. It threw a lurid light on the undercurrent of violence threatening to destroy the very structure of order and stability.

Kennedy at 43 had acquired his share of critics and enemies. Abrasive, often pugnacious, sometimes so withdrawn as to seem sullen or indifferent, as attorney general for three years he had been a sort of hatchet man for his brother, President John F. Kennedy. His ambition seemed to outrun both his experience and his capacity.

But, whatever his faults may have been, the legacy he has left of courage and wisdom is of incalculable value. An important part of that legacy is the book, "Thirteen Days," which Kennedy completed before his death. More than a memoir, more than simply another piece of history, it is a short, concise primer of how to steer a safe course through a terrible storm that promised from hour to hour to end with nuclear annihilation.

The new President could not do better than keep a copy close at hand should there be another nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union.

"Thirteen Days" is the story of the Cuban missile crisis of October, 1962, told by the member of the Ex Comm group who more than anyone except the President charted the course. Ex Comm was the committee within the National Security Council the

members of which worked almost without ceasing through the 13 days and nights to force the Soviet Union to remove the missiles secretly placed in Cuba without precipitating a nuclear holocaust.

Because he was the president's brother he was naturally closer to him than any of the Ex Comm group. But the contribution he made during those incredibly tense days when the shadow of doom hovered over all mankind was far more than brotherly support. In the debate he argued throughout for a peaceful means, short of an attack on Cuba costing thousands of lives, to compel Premier Nikita Khrushchev to take out the missiles. He contended, with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara as an ally, for flexibility, for giving Khrushchev a chance to back down without losing face.

The lesson, above all, in "Thirteen Days" is that the military invariably urges military action as a quick and simple remedy. And if their view is not countered by a free and thorough exchange with all the elements involved in a crisis, then this quick and simple remedy is likely to be resorted to.

"The discussion, for the most part, was able and organized," Kennedy wrote, "although, like all the meetings of this kind, certain statements were made as accepted truisms which I, at least, thought were of questionable validity. One member of the joint chiefs of staff, for example, argued that we could use nuclear weapons on the basis that our adversaries would use theirs against us in an attack. I thought, as I listened, of the many times that I had heard the military take positions which, if wrong, had the advantage that no one would be around at the end to know."

Kennedy was arguing for a blockade of Cuba that would stop Soviet ships carrying

missile equipment and probably additional nuclear warheads. A blockade was ordered at the same time that troops, planes and guns were moved into place to act if the Soviets defied the blockade and tried to force their ships through. Exchanges with Khrushchev continued as the tension rose to an almost-intolerable level.

After five days when the blockade seemed to have only limited effectiveness, the Joint Chiefs of Staff returned to the attack. They recommended an air strike on the next day to be followed up with an invasion, pointing out that they had always argued that a blockade would be far too weak a measure and that direct military action was the only move the Soviets would understand.

"We won't attack tomorrow," the President said. "We shall try again." This was the critical decision at a point when nerves were frayed to the breaking point and when the simple remedy of the military seemed the only way out even though it was certain to bring a reprisal and very probably nuclear war. When a Russian submarine was reported about to challenge the American blockaders with force Kennedy wrote:

"I think these few minutes were the time of gravest concern for the President. Was the world on the brink of a holocaust . . . his hand went up to his face and covered his mouth. He opened and closed his fist. His face seemed drawn, his eyes pained, almost gray. We stared at each other across the table. For a few fleeting seconds it was almost as though no one else was there and he was no longer the President."

It might have been. That is so frighteningly clear. It might have been if Robert Kennedy had not argued for patience and delay. That is the legacy putting us all immeasurably in his debt.