

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1969.

Robert W. Komer, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1969.

POSTMASTERS

All the postmaster nominations still pending in the Senate which were submitted to the Senate since the 91st Congress convened and prior to January 21, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONSUMER EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the District of Columbia school system, in cooperation with the neighborhood legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, is innovating a consumer education program which I feel should serve as an example to be followed by other communities across the Nation.

The basis of the program is a law course being offered to the elementary and junior high students in the 30 schools in the District. The course, "You and the Law—Rights and Responsibilities," is designed to teach youngsters the rudiments of the law so that they will know when creditors are taking advantage of them. The children, in turn, will have sufficient background in credit buying to be able to give advice when their parents purchase goods on credit.

An article describing the program appeared in the January 7 edition of the Washington, D.C. News. I would like to share it with my colleagues, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHILDREN TO LEARN LAW TO HELP PARENTS

D.C. schools and Neighborhood Legal Services will try to keep Washington parents from being gyped in credit buying and home purchases by giving their children a basic course in law.

Lawyers and school officials hope the 1,500 elementary and junior high students in 30 schools who take the "You and the Law—Rights and Responsibilities" course will remember what they have learned when their parents decide to buy a house or a car. Juvenile and family law as well as Constitutional safeguards also will be covered.

The law program is scheduled to start in February and March with Neighborhood Legal Services lawyers supervising what is to be taught.

Beginning today teachers are undergoing two days of orientation for the course.

A similar program has been carried on informally for three years in 11 Southeast sixth grade classes by Dr. Katherine Nutterville, an 80-year-old VISTA volunteer assigned to Neighborhood Legal Services.

The expanded law course has no specific curriculum, said Mrs. Irene Rich, program coordinator. If it is successful, parents, teachers and students may write a permanent curriculum over the summer, she said.

Under the pilot program, each class will pick a problem people in its neighborhood will face and learn how to solve it. "For example it might be how to buy a television," Mrs. Rich said.

The 30 schools carrying the program in-

clude two from the affluent area west of Rock Creek Park.

CONGRESSMAN OTTINGER DISCUSSES "CHALLENGE FOR TODAY: A LIVABLE CITY"

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the first anniversary meeting of the New York State Association of City Councils was held last weekend in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

As a former member of Buffalo's common council, I am well acquainted with the problems faced by our cities today, and I am very much interested in the success of this organization. Together, through this organization, members of the city council of our cities in the Empire State may be able to help each other and, at the same time, to work collectively to deal with these problems.

The new State association is restricted to cities outside Metropolitan New York City of 30,000 or more population.

One of the main speakers at the Buffalo meeting was my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER). Following is the text of his remarks:

CHALLENGE FOR TODAY: A "LIVABLE" CITY (Address by Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER before the New York State Association of City Councils, Buffalo, N.Y., January 17, 1969)

I am pleased and honored to join with you at this first anniversary meeting of the New York State Association of City Councils. Your membership has one of the most challenging—and, potentially, one of the most legislative responsibilities in the country today.

The formation of this Association is a welcome advance toward strengthening the role of local officials in meeting the great new challenges of urban—and suburban—America today.

The constituency you represent now comprises the overwhelming majority of our people—and our national problems. To a very great extent, the future of this country is going to depend on our effectiveness in resolving these problems and creating a livable and economically stable economy.

It is my conviction that an essential ingredient in any resolution will be to strengthen and enlarge the powers and the responsibilities of the people who are most responsive to the needs of our urban population, the local officials. This is the reason that I am so enthusiastic about the formation of this Association and the role it can play.

Let's take a simple problem: transportation. If the metropolitan complex is going to work it needs a fast, efficient system for moving people around.

A modern highway system is essential to a strong and growing national economy, but experience and reason both combine to prove that automobiles and highways aren't the answer to the city's transportation problem.

I am reminded of a remark that New York Traffic Commissioner Wylie made at his final press conference upon his retirement. He was asked whether he had any answer to Manhattan's traffic congestion. He thought for a while and then said, yes, he did, and he thought maybe it was the only answer. "Make all the north-south streets one way going north and in 24 hours it would be Westchester's problem."

As a Westchester representative, I can't say I'm too enthusiastic about that idea, but I do recognize a strong element of truth in it.

The answer to urban and suburban traffic congestion is to get the cars off the city streets and the only way to do that is to offer people a better way to get around.

Every local official recognizes this and would give high priority to mass transit if he could.

But the local official has relatively little power under the present system and is dependent upon the mercies of the state.

In 1967, we New Yorkers authorized a \$2½ billion transportation bond issue which was to be the panacea for our transportation problems. Today, two years later, we've made virtually no progress, and what we have done has been going in the wrong direction.

Of the \$523 million in bonds and notes that have been issued, 90 per cent has gone for new highways. Barely 10 per cent has been committed to the kind of mass transportation that is really needed by the new urban suburban civilization we live in today, and almost all of that has gone to make up the deficit without improving service on the fast deteriorating Long Island Railroad.

From every corner of the State, citizens are protesting against the deprivations of new highways. Here in Buffalo, it is the Kenmore Expressway. In my own district, it is the Hudson River Expressway. I know there are citizens who have a suspicion that the State's answer to difficult problems is to pave them! But the State officials who have the authority are not listening, are not responsive to the real needs.

This attitude that "big brother knows best" is reflected in almost every State program affecting our cities.

In 1968, Governor Rockefeller introduced his proposal for dealing with the problem of our inner cities. What he called for was not a program of State aid to help our cities act to resolve their own individual and unique core city problems. No. He called for an Urban Development Corporation with the power to condemn private or municipal property and then build what ever the corporation thinks is a necessary project for the city. Of course, local officials can participate in hearings and present plans, modifications and alternatives, but any of you who have participated in Transportation Department hearings know how effective that is.

We are trying to approach the problems of the new urban-suburban society with governmental tools designed for a world we have left behind. The answer is not to grant unlimited powers to the State. The State must be held to strict standards which will assure full participation in planning and execution of projects to the officials who are directly responsive to the people who make up our new social structure; to give a meaningful say to the mayors and managers, the councilmen, aldermen and supervisors—and through adequate hearing provisions, to the people affected. There must also be adequate pro-

vision for court review to hold the State to the specified standards.

One result of this present course is that we have focused a disproportionate amount of time and resources on bricks and mortar solutions to the urban problem and far too little on another aspect that is quite as important in the long run—the question of whether we will be able to create a liveable environment.

By "liveable" I don't mean just pleasant, I mean an environment that is capable of supporting healthy human life.

No social institution devised by man has ever imposed a greater demand on our natural resources than our cities, and none has ever assaulted those resources so mercilessly. I'm not talking just about the traditional resources such as timber, wildlife and minerals, I mean such resources as land, air and water.

For example, it seems hard to conceive that we could ever use all of the fresh water available to us—especially sitting here in Buffalo next to Lake Erie, a potential resource that can be measured in cubic miles. Hard to believe? Yes. But the official report of the Federal Water Resources Council proves that we are within thirty years of doing just that. The Council reported that, by the year 2010, the demand for fresh water in this nation will match the total available supply. After that, the demand will grow while the supply remains fixed.

This isn't a problem for the distant future. Over half the people alive today can expect to be alive when we pass that point of no return and children and grandchildren alive today can expect to live well beyond it.

Here in the northeast, the tremendous concentrations of people and the continuing deterioration of resources confronts us with an even more imminent crisis. In spite of the fact that we are a water rich area, we will reach our finite limit within ten years.

To meet this challenge, we must begin immediately to take the steps necessary to conserve and expand our supply. How long will it take to clean up Lake Erie? Where will the people of Buffalo go for the 150 to 200 million gallons of water they draw from the lake each day if we fail to reverse the present pollution?

We have waited far too long to begin the battle to abate pollution. We must accelerate this effort. But we must also start planning for recycling and reuse of water, for desalination and the other creative efforts that are essential to expand our water supply.

You who are faced with dealing with the real sources of pollution, the inadequate municipal sewer systems and antiquated treatment plants, know what a monumental task we face just in pollution abatement alone. I am sure that you are also very much aware of how halting and inadequate our progress has been to date.

In 1965, the people of this State authorized a \$1 billion Clean Water bond issue. As of today, less than \$50 million of that has been issued for treatment plants. We aren't even catching up on the problem.

Furthermore, there's good evidence that the direction we are now taking will fall far short of the mark. We have to have treatment plants, of course. But sewage treated to the presently acceptable level is a form of pollution itself. It returns to the water poor in oxygen and high in the kind of nutrients that encourage the growth of algae. Unless we take our sewage one step further and restore "life" to the water, we will end up with a new type of pollution at least serious as the type we are trying to eradicate.

In dealing with each of the threats to our environment—filthy air, polluted water, refuse, noise—we have to recognize that the environment is a very complex and interrelated system. Everything we do can have a significant impact on other crucial environmental factors—often an adverse impact.

Take those highways I was discussing earlier. Do you realize that highway con-

struction has a significant impact on water resources? Seems hard to believe, but it does.

One of our most important water resources is the aquifer, the underground supply. This is continually replenished by rain seeping into the ground—or it would be except that more and more of the rain water doesn't get into the ground. It falls on highways and pavements or other run-off areas, it collected in storm sewers, carried directly into rivers and then lost, irretrievably lost in the ocean.

How much water do we lose that way? Well, major U.S. highways alone cost us well over 335 billion gallons a year and the highways that are planned for the next 30 years will cost another 1.5 trillion.

Planning adequately to protect our environmental resources from exhaustion, to keep the waste products of our new urban civilization from destroying us, is a very complex and important job. It has to be started right now. I believe that those who are most directly concerned, the local officials, must provide the impetus and play a key role in the actual planning and action.

Now, as you know, the power to plan is circumscribed by the power to pay, and the power to pay is subject to the power to tax. Unless the local official is given greater access to greater financial resources, his increased role in planning will not be effective.

Yet, the tax resources of our cities are actually shrinking, and alternatives are largely pre-empted by the State and Federal governments.

Here in Buffalo, for example, one-third of the real property is tax exempt. This includes the property of seven railroads, which was removed from the city's roles by the State's Railroad Relief Act, and the campuses of the two State universities. To varying degrees the same diminution in tax resource is true in each of the cities you represent.

This imposes intolerable fiscal limitation upon our urban areas.

Mayor Lindsay has again renewed his plea for Urbanal under which the State would share income tax revenue with metropolitan governments. Some such mechanism is essential if we are to be successful in restoring to the cities effective control and direction of their own programs without further adding to the already oppressive burden of local taxation.

To the extent the State directly undertakes urban projects, much more of a voice must be given to the people affected and their local representatives.

The agenda facing you as individual legislators and as members of this organization is tremendous. What is needed is a broad revision in our political structure, the establishment of a whole new set of priorities and responsibilities.

But as big and demanding as the job is, it is one that must be done.

It is no more nor less than adaptation for survival.

Now, for the first time, as a result of our increase in population and our technological progress, we are touching the finite borders of our environment. However, unlike other species, we have a unique ability to control that environment and an almost limitless capacity for adaption—if we act.

The actions that we take now affect not only the future of this nation, but ultimately the very continuance of civilization.

GILBERT LEGISLATION FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation to permit handi-

capped persons to claim income tax deductions of \$600 for disability and \$600 for transportation to and from their place of employment. My bill would also grant a similar tax deduction for a handicapped spouse.

The bill rigorously defines and limits the degree of disability which would entitle recipients to this benefit. I propose the measure not simply because it is humanitarian but because it makes sound economic sense.

Handicapped taxpayers frequently have greater expenses than nonhandicapped taxpayers. They may need special clothes, special tools, special medical apparatus to enable them to work. Giving them an extra tax deduction encourages them to keep at their jobs. It offers them an incentive for being productive, helps to keep them from dependency on their families or on the welfare rolls.

Similarly, handicapped persons normally cannot get to work by the standard means of transit. Often they cannot ride buses and trains but need taxis. Or they have to drive specially made cars. By offering a tax deduction for transportation, it saves their wages for personal use and provides extra encouragement for continuing work.

I regard our tax structure as medieval in failing to recognize the importance of extending special benefits to the handicapped. I am convinced that the Federal Treasury would be more than repaid for these leniencies—while enabling handicapped persons to retain their independence and self-esteem.

Mr. Speaker, much of the inspiration for the legislation comes from the wonderful work done in my district by the Ruth Kirzon Group for Handicapped Children, a volunteer organization dedicated to helping disabled young people. The women who serve so selflessly in this group are an example to the Federal Government.

I will request immediate hearings on this legislation, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that it can become policy for taxpayers in the current year.

OPPOSITION TO PAY RAISE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget which was submitted to the Congress on January 15 contained a proposal to raise the salaries of the top officials of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. Unless the Congress takes some action within 30 days, the raises become effective automatically under provisions of Public Law 90-206.

Two years ago when the proposal for a Presidential commission to study and recommend salaries came before the Congress, I opposed it. I am still opposed to any commission or any other small group of people not directly responsible to the people having the power to raise salaries.

A recent national poll showed that the American public's respect for the Congress has fallen to a new low. The prin-

cial reasons for the lack of trust in Congress are actions such as those being taken on these salary increases. The Commission was designed purposely to insure a raise for Congressmen and other top Federal officials without the Congress having to go on record as voting for or against the raises. It is no wonder the public does not trust the Congress.

Now, I am not going to be hypocritical about this matter. I can use the additional salary which is being proposed. I have extra expenses just like every other Member of the Congress. While maintaining a home for my family in Sylacauga, I also have to have a place to live in the Washington area. One of my daughters is in college this year, and another goes next year.

Aside for my personal expenses, I imagine I send as many flowers, buy as many complimentary ads, donate to as many charities, and entertain as many constituents as most of the Members of this House do. And unlike many here, I have no law practice and no family business to supplement my congressional salary. So I make no bones about the fact that I could use the raise.

But there are two reasons why I oppose these substantial salary increases. First, I oppose them on the basis that our country is being confronted with a financial crisis. The 90th Congress raised taxes under the guise of fighting inflation. Now we are being told that the 10-percent surtax will have to be extended past the date it was scheduled to end. I opposed the original tax, and I am sure I will oppose the extension of it. But I cannot understand how the Members of Congress can say to the taxpayers, "We must take away some of your money to prevent you from spending it and increasing the inflationary trend in the country," while at the same time increasing their own salary and their own spending power by 40 percent.

Second, I oppose the method by which the increase is being proposed. As I have already said, I voted against the creation of the Commission to study salaries. If Members of Congress feel that they and other Federal officials deserve this increase, then let them publicly express their feelings by debating this matter on the floor of the House and then let us have a record vote on this issue. I frankly do not believe Congress deserves a raise until it exhibits some fiscal responsibility in handling the taxpayers' money.

It is not my intention to embarrass anyone on this matter. Every Member of this House must live with his own conscience and must answer to his own constituents. I certainly do not intend to go to my people and say simply that I would have voted against the raise, but the 30 days passed and no vote was taken. I want them to know, and I want my colleagues to know, that I did all I could to defeat this raise. I am joining with several other colleagues in introducing a resolution which would void the salary increases as proposed by the President. It is my hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will agree to bring this resolution to the floor for a vote. Then if the House still sees fit to approve the raises by a record vote against my resolution, the House will at

least have acted with honor and not by underhanded methods.

Even if it disapproves the President's proposal, the Congress could still act on salary increases through regular legislative procedure. I would even support smaller increases for some of those Federal officials covered by the report. But if salaries are going to be raised, let the Congress do it responsibly and not through devious methods.

Finally, I want to anticipate the argument of one of our colleagues who reportedly will have forms available whereby any Member can refuse the raise if it does become law. I feel that I am as valuable to my district as any other Member of Congress is to his, and I expect to receive the same compensation as any other Member. If a majority of the Members of this Congress feel that a raise is due, then I certainly am not going to waive my right to receive the same pay as they do. And, quite honestly, I believe the people of my district would think their Congressman was stupid to refuse a raise just because his opposition to it had failed.

H. RES. —

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby disapproves all of the recommendations of the President of the United States, with respect to the rates of pay of offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 225(f) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 643; Public Law 90-206), transmitted by the President to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

NO ACADEMIC GHETTOS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Roy Wilkins, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, spoke out against the actions of a small but vocal minority within the Negro community who are trying to force our colleges and universities to be run on an apartheid basis. Recognizing the current struggle for leadership within the Negro community, I personally respect the courage and integrity displayed by Mr. Wilkins in issuing his statement.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon called upon the American people to stop shouting at each other so that they could begin listening to each other in the quest for racial justice within our society. I believe that Mr. Wilkins' attempt to put an end to some of the racially motivated shouting on our Nation's campuses is a good step in that direction, and I personally commend him for his action.

On January 15, the New York Times gave editorial endorsement to Mr. Wilkins' remarks in an editorial entitled "No Academic Ghettos." I enter this editorial into the RECORD at this point so that my fellow colleagues will have the opportunity to read it should it not already have been brought to their attention:

NO ACADEMIC GHETTOS

Roy Wilkins has shown characteristic courage in calling on black college students to abandon their self-destructive campaign for Negro separatism on the nation's campuses. But even more to the point is Mr. Wilkins' attempt to stem the spineless retreat by many white administrators and faculty members under separatist pressure from a radical and immature minority among Negro undergraduates. Those who stand ready to rationalize the irresponsible demands for all-black courses, departments, dormitories and campus subdivisions are in obvious need of the warning by the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that they may face court actions challenging the establishment of "what are, patently, Jim Crow schools."

The disease of what can only be described as a militant black withdrawal into campus ghettos is spreading too rapidly to be taken lightly. It has led to virtual warfare at San Francisco State College and other California institutions.

It is the underlying cause of disruption at Brandeis University and at Swarthmore as well as the skirmishes at Queens College. It has led to the cancellation under fire of a dramatic presentation at Yale. And increasingly, as was the case at a recent student-faculty conference on the future of Columbia University, it has resulted in refusal by Negro students to participate in exactly the kind of concerned colloquy that alone can lead to full equality of the races in the academic community.

White bigots have long poisoned the nation's policies and practices through propagation of the myth that Negroes really prefer to stand apart. This is not the time to replace a pathological lie with a pathological ideology. Mr. Wilkins' proud warning against a return to "the lonely and dispiriting confines" of separatism's "demeaning prison" must be heeded by black and white alike.

PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF MILK PROGRAM IMPERILS NATION'S NUTRITION EFFORTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the outgoing administration, in its budget proposals for fiscal 1970, has seen fit to seek a reordering of priorities in the Nation's food programs and the termination of the special school milk program. At a time when we are accumulating an ever-increasing body of knowledge indicating severe problems of hunger and malnutrition, the Congress has been asked to eliminate one of our most efficient and effective nutrition programs. More importantly, perhaps, is the fact that this action was taken apparently without the knowledge of the impact of existing programs or the dimension of the malnutrition problem.

All of the evidence accumulated in recent months indicates that present food supplement programs are totally inadequate, not just because of insufficient funding, but also because the programs have been administered in such a way as to exclude large numbers of people most in need of help. In addition, a check of the record reveals substantial confusion on the part of executive agencies responsible for the programs. Spokesmen

for the Department of Agriculture have repeatedly expressed their belief in the value of phasing out the commodity distribution program to needy families and replacing it with the food stamp program. And yet the new budget proposes an increase in funding for the commodity program approximately twice that proposed for the food stamp program.

The desire to increase the Federal effort in the school lunch programs is commendable, but this action is to be taken at the expense of the special milk program, and the net impact of the recommended changes will be a substantial reduction in the nutritional benefits provided for the Nation's schoolchildren.

In 1968, and again in 1969, approximately \$103.5 million was appropriated, providing some 3 billion half pints of milk annually. The budget proposed for 1970 provides for no new appropriation; with some \$14.7 million carried over from prior years, the program will be carried on at a sharply reduced rate and then phased out entirely.

The Department of Agriculture and the recently departed administration have argued that this elimination of the milk program is justified on the grounds that other nutrition programs for children are being greatly expanded, so that a larger portion of the Nation's young people will receive lunches through the school lunch program. They also suggest, that the transfer of funds will not result in any reduction in the amount of milk actually consumed because each new lunch provided for in the budget will include milk. I find, using information from the budget, that this is not the case; indeed that the elimination of the milk program coupled with the increase in the lunch and breakfast programs will actually reduce the amount of milk consumed by approximately 2 billion half pints annually. Once the \$14.7 million remaining in the milk fund is expended, the consumption of milk by the Nation's schoolchildren will be cut back even more sharply.

It has been estimated that some 66 percent of the 51 million schoolchildren have benefited from the milk program. Only 44 percent will benefit from the school lunch, special assistance, and breakfast programs after they are expanded. Approximately 94,500 schools and institutions have participated in the milk program. Under the proposed expanded nutrition programs only 82,000 schools will be included.

I am unable to comprehend the reasoning behind the changes in the proposed budget. The national nutrition survey now underway under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare points to severe problems of malnourishment, especially among younger age groups. Other studies, in particular "Their Daily Bread: A Study of the National School Lunch Program," have pointed up the inadequacies of our present efforts:

(1) Of 50 million public elementary and secondary school children, only about 18 million participate in the National School Lunch Program. Two out of three children do not participate.

(2) Of 50 million school children, fewer than two million, just under four per cent,

are able to get a free or reduced price school lunch.

(3) Whether or not a child is eligible for a free lunch is determined not by any universally accepted formula, but by local decisions about administration and financing which may or may not have anything to do with the need of the individual child. And generally speaking, the greater the need of the children from a poor neighborhood, the less the community is able to meet it.

With respect to the special milk program, "Their Daily Bread" reported the following:

(1) The great majority of schools in the communities surveyed are included in the special milk program.

(2) The federal government reimburses more than half the cost of the first pint of milk served with lunch and slightly more on every half pint served after that. This means that out of what the children pay on the balance, plus special reimbursement based on the number of half pints served free, there is enough money to serve milk free to needy children—a far higher percentage than receive a free lunch.

From these two factors alone, it is easy to see that the milk program is working well.

In spite of all of these findings, and in spite of the fact that elimination of the milk program will reduce the nutritional services provided our schoolchildren, the authors of the new budget have asked us to abdicate our responsibilities and accept their suggested priorities for Federal nutritional efforts. I, for one, am not prepared to support these recommendations. In the past I have worked actively for basic improvements in programs designed to insure the fulfillment of the nutritional needs of every American. I intend to support such efforts this year, including the expansion and upgrading of the school lunch program.

Nonetheless, until such time as the responsible executive agencies can guarantee that all of the Nation's schoolchildren, and in particular those living in poverty, will receive nutritionally adequate and nourishing meals, no effort should be made to eliminate already proven programs designed to provide badly needed dietary supplements. Specifically, no action should be taken that will reduce the milk consumption of the Nation's children by some 2 billion half pints annually. I am confident that the Congress and the new administration will see fit to restore and hopefully increase the appropriations for so necessary and desirable a program.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF RICHARD BUELL OGILVIE, 37TH GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS, SPRINGFIELD, ILL., JANUARY 13, 1969

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 13, Richard Buell Ogilvie was inaugurated as the 37th Governor of my beloved State of Illinois. He has had a distinguished career of public service. He has already proven himself to be not only a man of vision, but a man who gets things done.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD his truly admirable inaugural address. It will stand as a classic among inaugural addresses, not only for its eloquence, but for the truths it expresses of the problems of our times, our common goals and for its inspirational appeal for their achievement by a united effort. While recognizing we are faced with the "challenge of change" our Governor reminds us that there are certain basic principles and traditions that do not change and to which we should adhere.

I predict Governor Ogilvie will prove to be one of the greatest Governors in the history of the great State of Illinois.

The inaugural address follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF RICHARD BUELL OGILVIE, 37TH GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS, SPRINGFIELD, ILL., JANUARY 13, 1969

Governor Shapiro, fellow citizens of Illinois: We are gathered here today in the city of Lincoln in a time of paradox, a time that embraces the best and the worst.

We are plagued by a war, by poverty and ignorance, and by increasing violence and crimes against our people.

Yet the words of Theodore Roosevelt still ring true that "no people on earth have more cause to be thankful than ours. We are the heirs of the ages."

For it is true that more Americans than ever before are sharing an unparalleled material prosperity. We are sharing freedom under a unique government which has survived nobly while kingdoms and dictatorships and even other republics have toppled.

And, as seldom before, Americans are exercising a right vital to our way of life—the right to criticize ourselves and our conduct of our government.

Voices are raised in dissent and protest, and there is a crisis of alienation among us.

Within the boundaries which respect the rights of others, the voices must be heard. For there is much to learn to build a better land for all.

But lawless conduct beyond these bounds tears down; it does not build. And it strikes at the foundation of this unique government which is part of our spiritual heritage.

The black man, the youth and the philosopher who protest are demanding change, and they confront our conscience the way slavery, the sweatshops and other hypocrisy of earlier times stirred Americans.

Change of all kinds envelops us, and change itself sometimes seems to be the only certainty we have. The challenge of change is to harness it to bring man into harmony and balance with himself and his world.

Because of scientific change, we can defy age and disease and the heavens. We can fly into space, yet often it takes longer to cross our cities. We can build miraculous computing machines, yet we are balked in our attempt to bring education to all our children. Our minds form concepts of limitless extent, yet we must grope to find solutions to crime.

We should recognize that there is another certainty besides change—the unchanging basis of our unity, our institutions and our common beliefs. And that is our commitment to an America which Judge Learned Hand said may never be "except as the conscience and courage of Americans create it."

This unchanging belief and hope is the root of the present crisis of dissent and alienation.

We can't stand prosperity—when too many are still poor. We cannot fully accept the explosion of knowledge—when it pushes some ever higher and others into deepening ignorance. We are uncomfortable at the gap

between what we believe and what we have achieved.

But none of us should forget that we share common traditions and common aspirations, and we shall share a common fate.

We are gathered here today in affirmation of this unity and this common faith in our capacity to achieve our highest aims under self-government.

The occasion of our gathering is timeless and familiar, but the challenge is ever new. It is a time, as President Wilson said, when "men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do."

I am proud to stand before you as your governor. And I am deeply conscious of the demands on the office of governor to serve with equal devotion the hopes of Cairo and Chicago, of young and old, of black and white.

As we begin this new administration in Illinois, let us bow to the past and to those who time of service has ended. Let us look to the future, too, but above all, let us commit ourselves to the present—and to present action.

None of us can predict with certainty the full nature or extent of the problems we will face in the next four years. But we can establish how we will perform.

We can determine now the nature of our conduct, the quality of our response, and the character of our stewardship.

We shall hold no objective more important than to mobilize the full force of this state government against poverty and ignorance.

For these are the twin scourges of our society. They are the roots of crime and of the decay of our cities.

In this effort, we shall take the initiative—searching our problems and solutions, rather than waiting to react when situations have become crises.

As a vital part of our concern for social problems, we shall move to exploit our economic potential for the benefit of all the people, and in so doing we shall improve our already prestigious economic position among the states.

Further, we shall preserve and restore our natural resources. For we are seemingly at war not only with ourselves, but also with nature. We have the power to destroy nature, and we have already done so to an alarming degree. This process must be stopped—in fact, rolled back.

We are not content to stop short of that America which our conscience and courage can create. And our expectations are ever rising.

We expect more of life, and we expect more of government, both for ourselves and for the less fortunate. With your support, this new administration can match its efforts to our collective expectations.

Our goal is simply this: To enlarge the opportunities and satisfactions of life in Illinois.

Bearing this in mind, let us work together, putting aside partisanship in a common effort to achieve common goals.

Let our actions be based always on respect for individual dignity.

Let us re-dedicate ourselves to individual opportunity and to individual responsibility, the great human developers.

For our part, we in this new administration pledge to be responsive to the needs and the will of the people. Our purpose must be to serve.

We pledge to create effective checks on official arbitrariness and abuses.

We pledge to operate this administration in a spirit of full disclosure, assuring public access to public information.

And we pledge to work for diffusion of official power and responsibility so that state and local governments—the governments closest to the people—can succeed in partnership with the federal government.

In state government itself, self-discipline and innovation must go hand in hand.

State government must be reorganized to become a management tool for accomplishment. It must be sharpened to become the agent for constructive change instead of the custodian of an accumulation of separate and unresponsive agencies and programs.

There is no use in shuffling the boxes around on an organization chart if Illinois begs in Washington and quarrels with its own cities.

We must have a strict system of priorities under annual budget controls that will help us do our most important jobs well, while letting other tasks wait their turn.

We have sought—and continue to seek—men in government who are devoted to work, animated by principle, and committed to success.

They must find better ways of doing the traditional jobs of state government, and they must have the perception to recognize new needs and goals.

All of us must discipline ourselves so that we can work effectively with all sections of the state, to avoid bickering our way into stalemate.

We are going to think not in terms of human misery, but in terms of increasing the potential for human happiness.

We are going to attempt to turn life's dead-end streets into new avenues of opportunity.

Our prisons and mental hospitals must not be ends in themselves, but rather they must be means to repair and renew human lives.

Above all, we must put an end to the historic split between Chicago and the rest of the state. This dichotomy has cost us dearly in wasted bitterness and squandered effort.

More than ever before, the different parts of Illinois, like the different parts of the nation, are united in their interdependence. No single section can stand apart from the rest. We are all Illinoisans together, and together we must make progress in the cities, in the suburbs, in the towns, and on the farms.

All our goals, in short, must be positive—to heal where there is hurt, to rebuild where there is damage, to succeed where we have failed.

In the days ahead, we have one special and immense opportunity. And that is to create a new constitution that will help us achieve present and future goals.

The constitutional convention can write a new document that will live and grow, and will provide a rational basis for fair taxation and fiscal responsibility. No other task before us will demand such a moratorium on partisanship and such an exercise in citizen involvement.

In the convention, in new legislation, in all our acts and thinking, we must work together. We must stay together.

And now, on this day of dedication, I ask you all to join in a new partnership for Illinois.

We ask more of government, more of life itself. And we must give more of ourselves for what we seek. This is the sacrifice demanded for success.

For myself, I ask for your prayers. For Illinois, I ask for your time, your talent, your ideas, and, yes, your criticism.

All of us meeting here today might well remember Lincoln's admonition to a clergyman who said he hoped the Lord would be "on our side."

Lincoln replied: "The Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my constant anxiety and prayer that I and this nation should be on the Lord's side."

So let it be for us today. For what each of us will do will be judged by our consciences and our Maker.

The final judgment will be the sum of each of our days—of what we did, or did not do, day by day.

Together we can seek the best we believe in for Illinois. This is our land, and the people shall prevail. This is our America that Carl Sandburg called—

"Seeker and finder,
Yet ever more seeker
Than finder, ever seeking its way
Amid storm and dream."

And now, confident in our dream and in our abilities, let us seek the Illinois of tomorrow. Together, we will not fail.

DEDICATION OF CENTURY II IN WICHITA, KANS.

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wichita, Kans., on January 11, 1969, dedicated and opened a new civic center known as Century II. It was my pleasure to be present at the dedicatory ceremonies for this magnificent new public facility.

Wichita citizens voted in 1961 to build a library and civic center and approved a \$15 million bond issue to achieve their objectives. Their affirmative action has culminated in the opening of a center which will enrich and enhance education, culture, the arts, and entertainment throughout Kansas.

I hope that many of my colleagues in the Congress will have an opportunity in the future to visit Century II in Wichita.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts of the dedication address by Mr. Robert Gadberr, vice president of the 4th National Bank and Trust Co. of Wichita. His remarks follow:

DEDICATION ADDRESS BY ROBERT GADBERRY, CENTURY II, WICHITA, KANS., JAN. 11, 1969

Carl Sandburg, who has captured so well the spirit of America and the hopes of man, reflects with considerable insight in *Remembrance Rock*. "God made man a changer. He can change himself into a fish and dive deep and stay under water unafraid of any sea animals. He can change himself into a bird and travel farther with heavier cargo, wider wings, fiercer claws and beak than any bird. God must have wanted man to be a changer. Else God wouldn't have put that awful unrest in him."

Apollo 8's recent lunar excursion was successful not because man sought to prove the Buck Rogers comic strips of my generation to be prophetic; the mission was not undertaken just because it would be prestigious in the struggle for supremacy with any other world power; billions were not gulped into a program of such magnitude because we hoped to reap direct dividends from such a national investment. It was none of these. This exciting space chapter which we have witnessed was not economic, it was not essential, it was little understood by most of us. Neither was it the clever or careless caprice of a few. Rather, it was dreamed and dared—and done—because man is a changer.

Man's reach is not limited to what lies above or below the earthly plane. In fact, so much more is changed every day, in each new generation, right where we are. Russell Conwell's famous "Acres of Diamonds" told the poignant story of man searching endlessly in unfamiliar and unfriendly places—digging for diamonds that were not there. Failing, the digger returned like a Prodigal Son, beaten

and begging, only to find acres of diamonds in his own backyard.

This is a moment of realization, of digging, of reverent reaching for a new dimension in our corporate and cultural life, for the changing nature of mankind has unearthed new acres of diamonds in our own backyard. Yes, Man is a changer. And this time, men of Wichita have changed not alone the skyline of a city, but here in Century II men have changed the matrix for our new-found capacity for commerce and culture, for architecture and art.

Our vision may be somewhat dimmed for we Americans have an insatiable appetite for the spectacular, for things of size and speed. We grow dizzy here today with the recitation of the immensity of this new "Wonder of the West."

Our master of ceremonies, Carl Bell, related to me that during those hurried and hurried days of preparing preliminary figures for the bond proposal—in the cross-current of public pros and cons—one enthusiastic supporter called to insist that "it should be large enough to house both national political conventions at the same time." This, I think, would not be, as the poet wrote, "a consummation to be devoutly wished," however commendable his public spirited insistence on both adequacy and bipartisanism in planning.

Incidentally, that was but one voice from many choruses that rose in the community. Agreement was not automatic. Size, location, financing, services, the color of the dome—all these were the subject of much debate. But cultural interests, civic leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, a progressive City Commission formed a catalyst and a city, heeding the wisdom of an Old Testament proverb, "Where there is no vision—the people perish" voted on May 23, 1961, to build a new library and civic center.

Even the most optimistic had their doubts. Industrial layoffs and a dragging economy should have exerted a negative pressure. A community that was less than enchanted with its immersion in the needed but less artistic demands of schools and sewers, roads and reservoirs, could hardly be expected to vote fifteen million dollars for a library and Civic Center. But man is a changer! And men wanted to erase the Forum and construct in its place that which we proudly dedicate today—Century II.

This is historic ground in this site. Here is the original homestead of Wm. Greiffenstein, once called "The Father of Wichita." In the emerging peace of the frontier at Wichita's birth, it is said that Indians frequently pitched their tepees in Greiffenstein's yard. The latter platted Wichita. His original homestead on the banks of the Arkansas was bought for the city in 1890 for the sum of \$6,000. The purpose was not for building a convention hall. That may have been the far vision of a few but the near look was to commercial needs. The land was bought for an open market where wagon hay could be bought and sold and for truck gardeners to sell their produce.

Enabling legislation in 1909 gave the City of Wichita the power to vote bonds for an auditorium and market house. Bonds in the amount of \$150,000 were voted, a contract let in March, 1910, and just ten months later, January 25, 1911, the Forum was finished.

The Forum—in 1911—ranked ninth in the United States in seating capacity. So, our forbears were changers, too, and their visions were viable.

Fifty-five years to the day—January 25, 1966—groundbreaking ceremonies for Century II were held. Blueprints for the new became the death knell for the old. Savages of destruction without ceremony or sentiment demolished the Forum, insensitive to the memory of circuses, conventions, concerts, exhibits, sporting events and religious services it had hosted. No fragments of the

Forum remain like the worn and ragged remnants of the Seven Wonders of the ancient world, the Temple of Diana or the Colossus of Rhodes. Even the remains of those wonders would be less noteworthy if they did not remind us of the eternal soul of a culture and a civilization.

So it will be with Century II! However well constructed; however unique its design; however adequate to the physical demands, its promise is not in brick and mortar. Its great value is not in the economic bargain it represents at \$18 per square foot. Other cities have spent two and three times that square foot cost for like space. Parenthetically, I should add, the architect estimates this \$12-600,000 project would cost 25% more if it were bid today.

And we cannot measure her worth on the basis of whatever modest assessment is required to supplement her direct revenues. None of these is the yardstick by which we measure the greatness of Century II for vision and culture, whatever their importance and influence, are difficult to measure.

We do not just dedicate a building today—we discover new purpose. It is not so important that five thousand may gather here to witness some sporting event. It is important that we teach our children and each new generation of the contribution of competition in a free enterprise society. And to see that sportsmanship is a companion to the competitive spirit of America. It is not important how many may gather here in convention. But how essential it is that we provide physically for the meeting of men who can assemble here in the mutual exchange of ideas, the vitality of a free society.

Exhibition Hall is not a matter of square footage but it will be the parade ground of man's unending genius for the new and the better.

It is not the number of concerts or recitals performed here that is important. But how thrilling it is to contemplate how a gently-drawn bow across the strings of some stringed instrument might inspire some boy or girl to musical excellence. Numberless are those who because of the grandeur of music will be inspired to seek a perfection in whatever they profess or practice.

And the visual arts—which I would hope could be developed here by the citizens of Wichita—might display again the rewards of human expression. Or the drama of the Theatre may awaken in others some new hope for solution to the tormenting problems of each succeeding generation.

Aldous Huxley in "Ends and Means" said, "The finest works of art are precious among other reasons because they make it possible for us to know if only imperfectly and for a little while what it actually feels like to think subtly and feel nobly."

Here—in Century II—we can feel noble. Men will walk here with pride and purpose. Men will laugh and men will cry here. We will convene in great numbers; compete in smaller numbers. All of this because there were men of vision who built a building we call Century II. It is ours, but belongs more to generations that will follow. They will share with us the exhilaration we sense in the genius of builders and the expression of artists.

Wm. Faulkner, writing "A Fable" said, "Man will survive because he has that in him which will endure even beyond the ultimate worthless tideless rock, freezing slowly in the last red and heatless sunset, because already the next star in the blue immensity of space will be already clamorous with the uproar of his debarcation, his puny and inexhaustible voice still talking, still planning; and there too after the last ding dong of doom has rung and died there will still be one sound more: his voice, planning still to build something higher and faster and louder; more efficient and louder and faster than ever before."

We hear that voice and we glimpse that vision because man is a changer.

What wonders have been wrought in that change! Change that takes the shape of Century II, but change that will mould the dynamic and creative soul of a city.

ONE MAN'S RECOLLECTIONS ABOUT NIXON FAMILY

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, now that Richard Milhous Nixon is our President, all of us are keenly interested in his background.

I am proud to say that President Nixon's mother and father were once residents of my congressional district, and the President paid his parents frequent visits.

Mr. Harry McLaughlin, a noted reporter from my congressional district, has had the good fortune of visiting the Nixon home, and he has written a very interesting account of his association with the Nixon family. This article appears in the January 19, 1969, issue of the Sunday Harrisburg Patriot, entitled "One Man's Recollections About Nixon Family."

Because Mr. McLaughlin's piece presents some interesting highlights on the family of President Richard Milhous Nixon, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ONE MAN'S RECOLLECTIONS ABOUT NIXON FAMILY

(By Harry McLaughlin)

Tomorrow, Richard Milhous Nixon becomes the nation's 37th president.

His inaugural address more than likely will reflect his ideas and feelings toward his fellow man, and to those who know him well, it will come as little surprise if he mentions, at least briefly, his family training as a boy and young man.

He might even reflect upon the influence of his mother and father on his outlook of life. He comes from a closely-knit family, and that will be evidenced at the inaugural events. On hand for this historic day will be 179 relatives of the President-elect and of his wife, Pat.

Nixon's loyalty for family also extends to friends, new or old. He figures loyalty and friendship is a two-way street, and it isn't something that changes with election disappointments or victories.

He learned that lesson from his mother and father, Mrs. Hannah Milhous Nixon and Francis (Frank) Nixon. Their friends and neighbors of Menges Mills, York County, will attest to this attribute.

The elder Nixons, who died several years ago in California after selling their York farm, never forgot the Menges Mills postmaster and his wife, the Carl Stambaugh; or the Donald Sterners, and his mother, Mrs. Florence Sterner, or this writer's family. Neither did the president-elect or his family.

My memories of Mrs. Nixon, whom I affectionately called "Mother Nixon," are quite vivid. She was a modest, religious, soft-spoken woman, who in her own quiet way, accomplished what she set out to do.

I met the president's mother in the early 1950's at the Menges Mills farm in the first of a dozen or more sessions, all professionally arranged in my role as a newspaperman. I

appreciated her trust in me because at the time, her "Richard" (as she always referred to him) was under strong political criticism from some national newspaper reporters and columnists, especially Drew Pearson.

"I won't say anything that could hurt Richard," Mrs. Nixon repeated frequently. However, one sensed she was deeply "hurt" by published unflattering remarks about the family. The then U.S. senator's mother could not allow herself to be quoted.

When Nixon was elected vice president in 1952, after a hectic campaign involving his personal financial situation, his mother took the late York photographer, Bob Motter, and me, on a personal tour of the Nixon home in Washington, to refute certain Pearson remarks. We were in the company of Mrs. Florence Sterner, who then was her Menges Mills constant companion and "dear friend."

Photographer Motter and I were the only newsmen permitted into the Nixon home upon the vice president-elect's return to Washington from California after the 1952 election, and we were present only because of "Mother Nixon's" invitation. The exclusive photo shown in this column was taken by Motter only minutes after Mr. and Mrs. Nixon arrived home that historic November, 1952, day to rejoin his mother and daughters.

He and Pat were greeted by their daughters, Julie and Patricia; his mother, and Mrs. Sterner, Motter and this writer, inside the residence.

To the surprise of the Sterner family, the Stambauchs, to Motter, to the McLaughlins, "Mother Nixon" arranged inaugural invitations, and the "red carpet" treatment was extended to each of us that year.

The Stambauchs and Sterners were also "extra special" friends of other members of the Nixon family. The elder Mrs. Sterner spent many evenings with the elder Nixons, and usually they argued the merits of President Truman's administration.

Carl Stambauch, a Democrat, who was postmaster during the seven-year stay of the Nixons in Menges Mills, also owned and operated the community store which was frequented daily by members of the distinguished family.

"Tricia and Julie like the ice cream cones, and they usually ate the ice cream while sitting on the front steps of the store. The farm was only a little more than a mile from the store, a good walk for them. Mother Nixon was baby-sitter for the vice-president's girls while he and Pat traveled around the world, and especially during the two vice presidential campaigns. The elder Nixons moved east after Richard was elected a congressman in 1947 to be near him, the postmaster recalled.

The president-elect's younger brother, Edward, graduated from West York High School in 1948 and was the York County high school high jump champion in his senior year. Last fall, he returned for a campaign visit to the farm and to the school, and laughingly discussed his track talents with his coach, C. C. Richards, who is still a teacher at the high school.

Edward also spent a lot of his leisure time at the Menges Mills store, Stambauch said.

When the president-elect spent weekends and summer vacations at the farm, he often used the Stambauch store telephone because the York Telephone and Telegraph Co. had refused to install one at the farm because of installation technicalities.

In 1957, "Mother Nixon" again informed her son's staff that she wanted the Sterners, Stambauchs, and the McLaughlins, to be her guests at the inauguration. We all expressed surprise, of course, but we were pleased, needless to say.

I recall my most serious interview with the mother of the 37th president came during the period when it appeared that her son might be removed from the 1952 ticket because of extensive criticism.

"How do you feel about the criticism?" I asked her. "They are unfair," she answered. Could she be quoted for publication? "I'd better check with his staff first," she said.

Permission was granted by Nixon's staff and her historic remarks proved to be a real "scoop." She later sent the famous "my son" telegram to Gen. Eisenhower.

"Mother Nixon" was a fine writer of letters, and they always were done in long-hand. Those addressed to the McLaughlins are now secure in a downtown bank safe deposit box, along with personal notes and letters from the president-elect and members of his staff.

Although both elder Nixons have died, members of the presidential family continue to honor her memory in relation to York County.

The Stambauchs, who suffered a Christmas Eve tragedy when their son and daughter-in-law were killed in the ill-fated Bradford airplane crash, earlier decided to reject a Nixon inaugural invitation. When another Nixon brother, Donald, telephoned from Washington and urged them to attend, they accepted. Edward also insisted.

"I remember you telling Mother and me in 1961 during a visit to the farm that Richard would be elected president some day," Edward told Postmaster Stambauch.

The Stambauchs will be housed with the Nixon family, and their 179 relatives, in a Washington hotel, and attend all the events, including the ball, with the entire Nixon clan.

The Nixon family is also responsible for "special" invitations extended to the Sterners, the Sterling Myers family (now owners of the former Nixon farm), and the McLaughlin family, including my daughter, Mrs. Donna Bieda, a Windsor Manor Elementary School teacher. Our first indication of a personal non-political Nixon invitation came in a Dec. 12 letter from Miss Rose Mary Woods, a long-time friend.

INCENTIVES TO LOCATE RURAL INDUSTRIES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which I believe provides the cornerstone for the application of the treatment of the many wounds that our cities and Nation are presently suffering. Those are the severe problems of masses of people living in our cities and whose numbers and needs overtax the facilities for education, for recreation, for jobs, for transportation, for garbage collection, and for mass transportation; and finally, the breakdown of the maintenance of both mental and moral structures. This bill is one designed to provide an incentive for the location of new plants and industries in the least congested parts of our Nation.

Both parties, during this past campaign noted the real need for the maintenance of people in our countryside areas. Both parties have then suggested the need for this type of congressional dictate.

Very simply, this bill gives authority and encouragement to private enterprise to build new industries in cities of under 10,000 and to train and employ people who are less advantaged now, or may not have found a satisfactory method of pro-

viding for the needs of their families or responsibilities.

I would like to convey to you my deep concern and interest in this matter as the logical partial solution to the whole array of crises that are facing our Nation today. I urge your consideration and early action on this bill.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FREEDOM LOVING UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it fitting to pay tribute to all freedom loving Ukrainian people both here and abroad.

The Ukrainian Americans who have contributed so much to the growth, development, and culture of the United States, are dedicated to seeing the restoration of freedom and national statehood to their homeland, the Ukraine and other captive nations whose people are oppressed under the domination of the Soviet Union.

Yesterday marked the 51st anniversary of the Proclamation of Freedom and Independence of the Ukrainian Republic and the 50th anniversary of the Act of Union which united the Western Ukraine with the Ukrainian National Republic.

A half century ago thousands of persons thronged St. Sophia Square in Kiev to hear the Act of Union read.

It was a momentous day as the act stated:

From today on, there shall be united in one great Ukraine the long separated parts of Ukraine-Galicia, Bukovina, Hungarian and Dnieper Ukraine. The eternal dreams, for which the finest sons of Ukraine lived and died, have been fulfilled. From today on there shall be only one independent Ukrainian National Republic. From today on the Ukrainian people, freed by the mighty upsurge of their own strength, have the opportunity to unite all the endeavors of their sons for the creation of an indivisible, independent Ukrainian State for the good and the welfare of the working people.

The freedom and unity in the Ukraine was short lived however, as Russia and Poland stepped in and easily overcame the new nation. By 1920 the independent Ukrainian state was completely in the hands of its enemies.

Since this time, the Ukraine has been under Communist yoke but within the hearts of its people here and abroad the love of liberty and freedom is strong.

Because of this love of liberty and desire for freedom the Ukrainian people have paid a high price. There have been mass deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, intellectuals have been abused and jailed, there have been mass trials and then ruthless persecution of suspected Ukrainian leaders. But despite cruelty and systematic genocide by the Soviet oppressors, the spark of freedom still smolders in the hearts of Ukrainian patriots.

It is appropriate that on this day, that we live in this great United States that

is dedicated to the principles of justice, liberty, and freedom, remember and honor the courageous people of the Ukraine. May their goal of independence, unity, and freedom someday be achieved.

BRIGHTER ON THE FARM FRONT

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Kansas is a leader among States in agricultural exports. Her produce joins that of other States in promoting a consistent balance-of-payments surplus in commodity exchange of about \$1 billion per year.

In fiscal 1968, Kansas was sixth among the States, providing \$296 million in commodities for sale abroad. Nationwide our farmers and ranchers produced \$6.3 billion in commodities for export, over \$4.7 billion of which was marketed commercially.

If the Nation cannot proceed without this cushion of hard currency sales, so also is Kansas dependent upon the continued availability of markets and production potential. In Kansas, agribusiness generates over \$5 billion in business activity annually, from an investment base of some \$8.2 billion.

As we begin substantive deliberations this year, it is incumbent upon the Congress to insure continued expansion of agricultural exports through programs such as Public Law 480, commonly called food for peace. The foundations so carefully constructed in past years must serve as a base for future market development.

The trend is upward, and this trend was dramatized by a recent editorial appearing in the Topeka Daily Capital. Because agribusiness is crucial to the economy of all America today, and instrumental in our hopes for an improved balance-of-payments position tomorrow, I know the editorial will be of interest and comfort to my colleagues. I therefore insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, Jan. 15, 1969]

BRIGHTER ON FARM FRONT

A forecast that potential exports of Kansas farm products could markedly increase the next few years was cheering news.

Dr. Paul L. Kelley, head of Kansas State University's economics department, told the Kansas State Board of Agriculture U.S. farm exports could double from \$6 billion to \$12 billion or more before 1980.

Exports of feed grains, one of Kansas' major crops, could be helped by sales to nations of Western Europe and Japan, together with sales to emerging nations, he said.

A major factor in prices farmers in Kansas and elsewhere might receive from exports will be the type of trading policies the United States develops in the decade ahead.

If these policies are realistic and based on the need to bolster our agricultural economy as well as to aid nations abroad they will be instrumental in providing greater farm income in Kansas.

Although farm prices have been discouragingly low in recent months, additional and growing foreign markets could be of great help in making them rise.

Dr. Kelley also was optimistic about domestic market prospects and forecast that one of the most important factors affecting Kansans could be rising beef production in the state.

He predicted a "vast new beef belt in the next decade" with production possibly doubling by 1978, together with a 30 per cent increase in Kansas hog production by 1980.

Although the number of Kansas farmers has sharply declined in recent years, agriculture still is a major source of income in the state, as modern techniques are used to produce more and more food.

The welfare of Kansas is to great extent dependent upon farmers and stockmen receiving good prices for their products. That the prospect looks better is heartening.

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a voting representative for the District of Columbia in the U.S. Congress.

I have served for 10 years in Congress as a friend of the District on the House District Committee, and I could not be more certain that it is the full right of the citizens of Washington, D.C., to have elected representation in the Congress, especially in the consideration of such fundamental matters as taxation, and other matters that have such a direct impact on their daily lives. Nothing should prevent the election of such a representative in the Congress. It is a question of right and an action which is long overdue.

I, for one would welcome this new member with great enthusiasm, not only because he rightfully belongs in the Congress, but because I believe he would be of tremendous assistance to the Congress when it deliberates on District affairs. He would provide for the citizens of the District a strong voice in the House. He would be intimately aware of the many problems affecting the 800,000 citizens of the District of Columbia. He would provide close, regular and continuing liaison between the Congress and the local community. He would have a knowledgeable voice in presenting to the Congress the District's position on such vital areas as taxation and school needs. Most of all he would have a vote.

I am fully aware that the constitutional status of the District is unlike that of the 50 States and the territories in a number of respects, the most fundamental difference being that it is established by the Constitution as the permanent seat of the Federal Government and subject to continuing congressional control. The Federal interest must be paramount and inviolable. Nonetheless, there still is no justifiable reason that I know of why the District taxpayers should not have direct congressional representation in the Congress over such vital issues that affect their daily lives.

Realizing, of course, that the constitutional amending process is a lengthy one, and in order that the District might have an interim voice while awaiting the ratification by the States of the proposed amendment, I am also introducing a bill which would provide the District with a nonvoting Delegate to the House. This Delegate would fill the void and serve as the District's voice in Congress during the amending process. This provision would, of course, require only a law. My bill would provide for the election of this nonvoting Delegate by the residents of the District of Columbia and require that he be appointed to serve on the House District Committee.

I urge my colleagues on the Judiciary and District Committees to rapidly move on this much needed legislation in order that the citizens of the District of Columbia may obtain their voice in Congress at the earliest possible time.

JUDGE ANTHONY C. MITCHELL,
EMINENT NEW JERSEY JURIST,
RETIREES

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening of this week the Camden County Bar Association sponsored a testimonial dinner at the Cherry Hill Inn, Camden County, N.J., in honor of Judge Anthony C. Mitchell, recently retired from the bench. The dinner was attended by more members of the bar than any similar occasion in the history of the Camden County Bar Association. The attendance was in itself a tribute to Judge Mitchell and a very real expression of the affection, admiration, and esteem in which he is held by all members of the bar. Affectionately and popularly known as "Tony," Judge Mitchell has earned the respect of not only the lawyers of south Jersey, but of the entire State of New Jersey. His later success, as a member of the New Jersey bench, was indicated in his youth and early manhood.

Judge Anthony C. Mitchell was born in Clinton, Mass., on August 8, 1898, and received his preliminary education in that city. He attended Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., and received his A.B. degree in 1920, graduating magna cum laude.

He left his native State and decided to teach school for a few years. In the mid-1920's he moved to Merchantville and became active in the real estate business for several years.

Subsequently, he attended Rutgers Law School, and received his LL.B. degree in 1934. He served his clerkship with the late Judge Samuel M. Shay in Camden, N.J., and was admitted to the bar in 1935 and became a counsellor-at-law in 1939. He commenced the practice of law in association with Firmin Michel & John Penn in Camden, N.J.

During World War I Judge Mitchell served in the U.S. Navy.

During his time as a legal practitioner he served the public in many capacities

for a number of years, including first assistant prosecutor of Camden County, county treasurer of Camden County, president of the New Jersey State Board of Tax Appeals, and in 1956 he was appointed a county court judge of Camden County. During his judgeship he presided over many publicized criminal cases, and was one of the outstanding criminal judges in south Jersey. The judge retired from the bench in August of 1968.

Before Judge Mitchell's appointment to the bench, he also served as attorney for a number of municipalities in Camden County and their agencies.

He is married to the former Rose Mary Smith, of Johnstown, Pa., and resides with his family at 209 West Maple Avenue, Merchantville, N.J. They have three children: Ann, a schoolteacher in the Merchantville schools; Thomas, who is completing his last year at Dickinson School of Law, and Carol, who is a student at Hood College.

Mr. Speaker, the Member of this House now addressing this body is of a different political party than was Judge Mitchell before his appointment to the county court. This Member of Congress found himself in many campaigns opposing candidates supported by Tony Mitchell while he was active in politics. We debated the issues head to head in many campaigns. We opposed each other in the courtroom when Tony was a prosecuting attorney and I was the defense attorney. I have appeared before Judge Mitchell during his years on the bench. In some of the cases I was successful; in others I was unsuccessful.

During all our years of association and during all our experiences I have always found Tony Mitchell the same—forthright, frank, honest, courageous. Tony Mitchell called a spade a spade; you always knew where you stood with Tony.

Added to his many other qualities is a great sense of humor and the ability to "take it as well as hand it out." The bar, the bench, the citizens of Camden County are richer as a result of Tony Mitchell. All of us regret his retirement. All of us who know him expect to see continued constructive activity for many years from Tony Mitchell. All of us pray that he will enjoy good health so that we in turn may enjoy his friendship in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for every member of the south Jersey bar and every citizen of south Jersey when I say to Tony Mitchell, "Congratulations on your lifetime of service to your community and your State. You have our best wishes for great happiness and continued good health in the years ahead."

REMEMBERING UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Herald-News of January 15, 1969, in the

congressional district which I represent. It shows that the glorious days of Ukrainian independence are not forgotten. I am sure that we all join Father Orestes Iwanluk and the parishioners of St. Mary's Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Clifton in the fervent hope and prayer that the people of the Ukraine will live again under freedom.

The article follows:

CLIFTON CHURCH TO MARK 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE ON JANUARY 22

CLIFTON.—St. Mary's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 73-81 Washington Ave., will celebrate the 51st anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine at a Mass at 10 a.m. next Wednesday.

The celebrant is the Rt. Rev. Orestes Iwanluk, archmandrite and pastor of the church.

Facts about the Ukraine have been given by Father Iwanluk, as follows:

In the central part of Europe is located a beautiful sunny and fertile land called the Ukraine. Geographically, the Ukraine represents an area of over 250,000 square miles. The Ukrainian ethnographical territory stretches from the Carpathian mountains in the west to the River Don and the foothills of the Caucasus in the east. In the west, the Ukraine borders on Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland; to the north on Byelorussia; to the east on Russia and the peoples of the Caucasus. In the south, her long and well-developed coast on the Black Sea gives her access to the Mediterranean. Great Ukraine with its capital at Kiev; Western Ukraine with its capital at Lvov; Carpatho-Ukraine with its capital at Uzhhorod, and Bessarabia, and Bukovina with its capital at Czernivtsy.

"The population of the Ukraine is over 55 million, of whom 50 million are Greek Orthodox and five million, Greek Catholic. The Ukraine is one of Europe's richest and industrially most developed countries. The Ukraine, still known as the granary of Europe, has become the breadbasket and sugarbowl of the Muscovite empire.

"In 1917, with the overthrow of the Czarist regime, the Ukrainians who for centuries had been desperately fighting the Russian domination over their country, took the chance and hoisted their banner of freedom. They proceeded to form a Ukrainian National Republic.

"On Jan. 22, 1919, all the Ukrainian territories joined together and proclaimed a free and independent Democratic Republic of the Ukrainian people. But the Russian Bolshevik government in Moscow declared war on the Ukraine, and the superior forces of the Red Army invaded the Ukraine in 1920.

RUTHLESS TERROR

"The years of the new Soviet regime in the Ukraine were marked by ruthless terror on the part of the occupying troops. The purges and large-scale deportations were conducted under the personal supervision of the highest Communist officials. They schemed to eliminate the Ukrainian separation and anti-Communist attitude by the mass killing of the Ukrainian people. They deliberately staged the famine which took eight million Ukrainian lives in 1932-33.

"They must be held responsible for this terrible genocide, the barbarous destruction of Ukrainian learning, science and religion, the forced collectivization, the persecutions of millions of innocent and peace-loving Ukrainian workers, peasants and intellectuals.

"Both Ukrainian orthodox and Catholic churches were destroyed. Metropolitans, bishops and clergy-priests were imprisoned, subjected to forced labor or killed.

"A country with a distinct culture and

political history, the Ukraine has developed under strong western influences. It is not and has never been an organic part of Russia, but is conquered land whose people have been subjected to a government imposed and controlled by Muscovite rulers, old and new.

"During the last world war, the Ukrainians organized the Underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army which started fighting both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks in order to regain freedom for the Ukraine. Even today, 20 years after the defeat of Germany, the Ukrainian people are still fighting against the Moscow troops and against the Soviet rulers.

"The emblem of the Ukrainian national state is the Trident, The Ukrainian national colors are blue and yellow. On Jan. 22, the Ukrainian people in the U.S., Canada, Great Britain, Australia, Germany, France and other countries will celebrate the anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic."

AIMED TO DISCREDIT

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared on January 19, 1969, in the Herald-American and Call-Enterprise, a semiweekly newspaper serving the 23rd District of California, seems to have touched upon the focal point in the controversy over the appointment of Walter J. Hickey as Secretary of the Interior. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I want to bring this discussion to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The column follows:

CURRENT COMMENT: AIMED TO DISCREDIT

(By Warren Butler)

There is a despicable campaign in progress to discredit Governor Walter J. Hickey of Alaska as he prepares to answer the summons of President-elect Nixon to take office as the new Secretary of the Interior of the United States. The underhanded character of the campaign is clearly indicated by a cartoon in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which depicts Governor Hickey smoking and tossing a lit match in the forest as the well known Smokey Bear looks on. Were the cartoon published depicting a private citizen not involved in any public position it would be clearly libelous as no such incident took place. It is pointedly designed to hold the man up to personal ridicule and public contempt.

Were it not for the fact that Governor Hickey already held a public office and faced the inquiry of the United States Senate prior to a vote on his confirmation to the new office such a cartoon would not be a privileged publication and no newspaper would dare to touch it.

DEVELOPMENT ADVOCATE

All this campaign has been based on an alleged remark from Hickey that there has been too much conservation for conservation's sake. The fact is that Hickey has been an ardent advocate of the development of Alaska's natural resources in opposition to those who want to keep it a complete wilderness. As a builder by experience he knows what development can do for people in giving them employment and strengthening the country economically.

His views have made him the target of a strange political combination. One is the so-called New Left which supposedly champions the cause of the little people with small incomes. The other group, while they call them-

selves conservationists, are more accurately described as preservationists and they consist mostly of the rich and super rich individuals. They are laughingly described by many people as the "deep breathers".

GOOD PROTESTORS

These are the people who regularly shoot protests about water conservation projects regardless of whether anyone needs the water or not. They particularly oppose hydroelectric power projects regardless of the benefits to people generally that are involved. They say that atomic power should be developed instead and then they oppose the sites proposed to be used for atomic reactors.

Hickel has been a target of attack by these people because he favors development of the gigantic north slope of Alaska which is the center of a concentration of some of the richest natural resources in the world including vast oil deposits. The area is now devoted mainly to hunting by Eskimos and white men rich enough to do their hunting by airplanes at an estimated cost of \$2500 per polar bear.

One can have considerable sympathy for the Eskimos who have had this area to hunt in for centuries. But the needs of the vast population of this planet in our times hardly justifies this kind of preservation.

REAL CONSERVATION

Genuine conservation makes sense. It was a great advance in this country when the laws were so designed as to make it worthwhile to replace forests with new growth and the policy is beginning to pay off economically. We are making much progress in providing for restoration of land after strip mining. We have a big soil conservation program, not to return it to a state of nature but to make properly feasible its continued use to produce for all of us.

One of the very great problems of our economy is to develop oil resources in this country to furnish employment to American citizens and to keep vast imports (that could upset our economy) within reasonable limits. Making these oil resources available also gives us reassurance in case we are attacked by an enemy, as any modern war floats on a sea of oil.

Natural resource development here in the west is of special importance as without it we can have little additional development and what civilization we do have could wither and die away.

Of course we want to curb pollution of air and water and no sensible person loves beer can litter. But to have the good life it is essential that we develop our resources in a sensible manner. And the recreation that nature's bounty makes possible should be enjoyed by all, not just a few rich men. Instead of permitting a few people to fish in the wilderness we need the modern fish hatcheries that permit millions to enjoy this sport. The needs of people must be met. Otherwise we are just kidding ourselves.

Let's give the new Secretary of the Interior a chance to prove himself.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC MARKS 51ST ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, the military invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by military forces of the Soviet Union represents another bloodstained chapter in the long and continuing record of Communist aggression against the forces of freedom every-

where. As we reflect upon the present plight of Czechoslovakia, I believe it is especially appropriate to bring to the attention of the world again the ordeal of the people of the Ukraine who have been the victims of Soviet oppression for more than half a century. They will not rest until they have regained their freedom.

I include as a part of my remarks, the following letter which I received from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky of Steele, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.:

January 22nd will mark the 51st Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Golden Anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all the Ukrainian lands were united into one independent and sovereign state of Ukrainian Nation. The Independence of Ukraine was proclaimed in Kiev, the capitol of Ukraine on January 22nd 1918 and the Act of Union took place one year later, on January 22nd 1919, also in Kiev.

The Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by a number of foreign Governments including that of Soviet Russia. The latter, however, almost simultaneously with the recognition, declared war and began a large scale invasion of Ukraine. For almost 2 1/2 years the Ukrainian people waged a gallant struggle in defense of their country, alone and unaided. The free Ukraine was subdued to a puppet regime of the Soviet Socialist Republic.

The freedom loving people of Ukraine have not accepted the Soviet-Russian domination and have been fighting for the re-establishment of their independence by all means accessible to them for the past 50 years.

During World War II the Ukrainian people organized a powerful underground resistance movement known as the Ukrainian Partisan Army (UPA) which fought not only against the Nazi regime but against the Soviets as well. Stalin and Khrushchev unleashed a bloody persecution and reprisals against the Ukrainian people in the late 1940's. Relentless and harsh persecution of the Ukrainians continued after the death of Stalin and after the ouster of Khrushchev from the top leadership in the Kremlin. The Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership is bent on keeping the Soviet-Russian Empire intact by persecution and deportation of Ukrainian youth and Ukrainian intellectuals. Over 200 young Ukrainian University professors, poets, writers, scientists, lawyers, literary critics and radio-TV commentators were arrested recently on charges of anti-Soviet propaganda. Recently the International and U.S. Press has been providing a vast amount of documentation on the suppression of the Ukrainian culture.

Briefly the Kremlin rule in Ukraine can be described as follows: Exploitation of Ukraine's economic resources for the benefit of Moscow and its imperialistic ventures in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Genocide and systematic deportation of Ukrainians to central Asia. Arrest and trials of Ukrainian patriots defending freedom of their country. Terror and assassination of Ukrainian leaders outside the Ukraine. Persecution of all religions in Ukraine. Enforced Russification, aiming at the cultural and linguistic genocide of the Ukrainian people.

All the available evidence of the western observers shows that the ever-increasing tempo of repression has failed to intimidate the Ukrainian people and the Russian leadership in the Kremlin feared that Ukraine would actively support the liberal movement of their satellite country of Czechoslovakia. Since the Kremlin leaders were convinced the liberal ideas of Czechoslovakia would help the Ukrainian liberals and other Captive Nations.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President

of the United States have expressed their concern over the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR by enacting the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" in July 1959.

The Ukrainian-American community in our state and in the whole United States will observe the forthcoming fifty-first Anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence and the 50th Anniversary of the Act of Union in fitting and solemn celebration.

Therefore, since it is almost 75 years that Ukrainians came to our state and made a substantial contribution to its development, we kindly request that you attend the ceremonies in commemoration of this anniversary and make your statement on that day. This anniversary provides an appropriate occasion not only for the U.S. Government and American people but the free world to demonstrate their sympathy and understanding of the aspiration of the Ukrainian people. We extend our sincere thanks and appreciation for the favorable response in the past on this and other matters and we hope you will continue to help the Ukrainian Nation.

THE NUKES ARE IN HOT WATER

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the January 20 issue of Sports Illustrated, there appeared an article which, from the viewpoint of a conservationist, described the impact that nuclear powerplants have on surrounding bodies of water and the animal and plant life therein.

Although one does not have to agree with everything the author asserts and implies, I think it is of value because it is well written and is indicative of the growing body of literature dealing with man and his environment and natural resources.

In short, it is a focus for both utility executives and conservationists to begin a rational discussion of what might be a tremendous problem in the future.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the article inserted in the Record, as follows:

THE NUKES ARE IN HOT WATER

(NOTE.—Utility companies are going full steam ahead on the construction of nuclear plants, but the threat of thermal pollution may force a cooling-off period.)

(By Robert H. Boyle)

What literally may become the "hottest" conservation fight in the history of the U.S. has begun. The fight is over nuclear power plants and the damage they can inflict on the natural environment. The opponents are the Atomic Energy Commission and utilities versus aroused fishermen, sailors, swimmers, homeowners and a growing number of scientists. More than 100 nuclear plants are on the drawing boards, and before the fight (or war, to use a more appropriate term) is over, almost every major lake and river and stretches of Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coasts are likely to become battlegrounds.

There are several objections to nuclear plants, but the immediate uproar is over thermal pollution caused by hot-water discharges from the plants. In order to compete economically with so-called fossil-fueled plants, which are fired by coal, oil or gas, nuclear plants must be of much larger capacity. Despite their size, they are not as efficient as fossil-fueled plants in utilizing the steam heat produced, and they thus require enor-

mous amounts of water to cool the waste heat. In consequence, the plants are being built next to natural bodies of water, thus assuring a continuous flow. The water is passed through a condenser where it becomes anywhere from 11° to 25° Fahrenheit hotter from absorbing the waste heat, and it is then shot back into the body of water from which it came. A one-million-kilowatt nuclear plant, typical of those being planned, requires 850,000 gallons of water a minute for cooling, and in the course of a day this means that almost 1.2 billion gallons of water will be drawn in, heated and spewed out again. That is quite a lot of water. To give an idea, a nuclear plant only half the size now being built at Vernon, Vt. will use more than half the minimal flow of the Connecticut River. With nuclear plants proliferating, estimates are that by 1980 the power industry will require one-sixth of the total freshwater flow from the entire U.S. landmass for cooling. If one sets aside high spring flows, the industry will be using about one-half the flow during the other three seasons of the year.

Thermal pollution from a single nuclear plant can do all sorts of damage to the receiving waters. For instance, thermal pollution decreases the dissolved oxygen content, increases the toxicity of pollutants, makes water turbid (which prevents adequate sunlight penetration), spurs the growth of noxious blue-green algae (the stink of it literally can peel the paint off nearby houses), increases the metabolic rates of fish and other organisms, changes their behavior or interferes with their reproductive cycles, and often kills them outright.

Every species has its own fatal temperature, and fish which are virtually unable to regulate their body heat, live within relatively narrow temperature spans as compared to man or other mammals. Even if a fish is able to survive in water a few degrees below the lethal temperature, it may not be able to thrive because its functions are impaired. In addition to the dangers posed by the hot-water discharge, there are other problems. Small fish or eggs or other organisms can be sucked up the intake pipe and given a fast trip through a condenser, where they are cooked or battered to death. According to a study by Dr. Joseph A. Mihurky of the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, up to 95% of the organisms that passed through a power plant on the Patuxent estuary in Maryland died. A plant near a fish spawning or nursery ground could be deadly. Moreover, in order to keep the pipes and condensers from becoming fouled by barnacles and mussels, plant personnel periodically clean them out with acids, detergents or chemicals such as chlorine. These powerful biocides are then flushed into the receiving waters. In salt or brackish water, heavy metals leached from the condenser are a problem. Copper concentrations can turn shellfish green and make them unfit for consumption.

Given the nature, threat and extent of thermal pollution, one might expect that the appropriate state or federal agencies concerned with water quality or wildlife would be attempting to cope with the problem by insisting that all nuclear plants be provided with cooling devices (to simplify, a closed-circuit system similar to an automobile radiator would suffice) that would offer no thermal, physical or chemical damage to aquatic life.

But for the most part, this is not the case. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of the Interior cannot even attempt to take any action until after a plant has been built, damage inflicted and a protest mounted. In an effort to remedy this, the FWPCA is now in the midst of a bureaucratic wrangle with the Atomic Energy Commission, which licenses all nuclear plants. The FWPCA wants the

AEC to deal with thermal pollution during licensing hearings, but the AEC absolutely refuses to do this on the grounds that it lacks statutory jurisdiction. The AEC maintains that it has jurisdiction over radiological hazards only, and if fish are dying from thermal pollution or if a river or bay is rank from algal blooms caused by hot water, well, it is just too bad, but there is nothing the commission can do. This attitude has seemed unreasonable to many persons, including Senator Edmund Muskie, whose Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution has held extensive hearings on thermal pollution. But the AEC is a power unto itself and not about to be moved. Indeed, it has been said that although Glenn Seaborg, the chairman of the AEC, won a Nobel Prize in chemistry for finding that the impact of neutrons on uranium produces plutonium, he has yet to discover hot water. Alleged lack of jurisdiction aside, the AEC apparently is not interested in preventing thermal pollution because, in the words of Harold Price, its director of regulations, this "would impose a burden on the nuclear that is not imposed on the conventional power plants." Since Price's statement, the Federal Power Commission, which has the say-so over fossil-fueled plants, has taken thermal pollution into account, but the AEC attitude remains the same. If the AEC seems strangely solicitous of the financial investment that power companies would have to make (about 5% to 10% of total construction cost) to stop nuclear plants from frying fish, or cooking country and the public, it is worth noting that for years the commission has served as a training ground for utility personnel.

The power companies themselves usually refuse to recognize that thermal pollution exists. In fact, the very term thermal pollution is avoided these days by power officials, who use instead more benign terminology, such as "thermal addition" or "thermal enrichment." As McGregor Smith, chairman of the board of the Florida Power & Light Company, which is planning two reactors on Biscayne Bay, told the Muskie subcommittee with some heat (if that is the word): "The term 'thermal pollution' is so misleading and so injurious to the development of nuclear power that, for the good of the country and the public, it should be discarded. A better, more meaningful and fairer term would be 'thermal effect.'"

On other occasions, power officials have denied that thermal effect/addition/enrichment/pollution defile waterways. This was the case with Melvin D. Engle, chief mechanical engineer for the Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, who wrote an article, *Condensing Water—How Does It Affect the River?*, which appeared in the January 1961 issue of *Mechanical Engineering*. The gist of the article, which dealt with the company's Martins Creek plant, a large, coal-fired plant on the Delaware River, was that "power plants are good neighbors," because a study conducted for the company by the Lehigh University Institute of Research under the direction of Dr. F. J. Trembley revealed "no harmful effects to fish or plant life." A copy of this article was submitted to the Muskie subcommittee last year by Tor Kolifat, a partner in Sargent & Lundy, a Chicago engineering firm which has designed many of the nation's private utility plants, after he testified to substantiate a point about the Delaware. What Kolifat did not produce, as was later made evident by Professor Frank Parker of Vanderbilt University, was another article in the May 1961 issue of *Mechanical Engineering*, by the Lehigh scientists involved in the Martins Creek study. They charged Engle with misstatements that "contradict research findings as reported to the company, or which present 'facts' not established by the research, or which are misleading because of omission or distortion of parts of the data." For instance, Engle wrote there

were "no fish kills" from the hot water discharged, but the Lehigh scientists pointed out, "This contradicts the research findings of fish kills in the heated water the river as well as in the effluent canal, as given in three different progress reports. These reports included direct observations of fish in the river actually seen dying with symptoms known to be associated with heat death."

Given the intransigence of the AEC and the utilities which the commission is supposed to police in the public interest, it is no wonder that opponents of thermal pollution have become angry. One of the fiercest battles has been fought in the northwest, where six nuclear plants are planned for the Columbia River, the first a one-million-kilowatt nuke to be built by Portland General Electric Company at Rainier, Oreg., near the mouth of the river where the fishing is still good. Originally, the Columbia was a surging cold-water river, but in the past 30 years it has become a quiet staircase of dammed warmwater lagoons.

To many fishermen, the nuclear plant at Rainier promised to be the straw that would break the Columbia's back. The Washington State Sportsmen's Council immediately launched a program of resistance to the nuke. Last spring when E. C. Itschner, a vice-president of Portland General Electric, said that the hot water discharged from the nuclear plant would raise the river temperature only three-tenths of 1°, L. H. Mabbutt, then president of the council, branded the statement "a fairy tale." Mabbutt pointed out that the plant would be on a tidal stretch of the Columbia, and instead of moving down and out the hot water would slosh back and forth, putting a thermal plug near the mouth of the river.

In September, Dr. Richard W. Van Driel, the new president of the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, denounced Portland General Electric for issuing bids for construction of the Rainier plant "without permit or license of any kind or plans for the protection of aquatic resources." Dr. Van Driel noted, "The public has a right to know what the plans are for disposition of the heat from these huge plants before licenses are issued and before financial commitments are made."

Three months ago Portland General Electric announced it would install a cooling system at its Rainier plant. Says Dr. Van Driel: "We're not relaxing one bit. We've still got to be on guard. We won't let the pressure off."

Three thousand miles to the east a savage fight rages over nuclear plants not far from New York City. Despite localized heavy loads of organic pollution, many northeastern rivers and estuaries still support immense stocks of fish. Knock out one or two key estuaries and goody fish. For instance, the striped bass spawned in the Hudson River eventually spend part of their adult lives on the north Jersey coast down to Barnegat Bay and in Long Island Sound, administered by the states of New York and Connecticut. Thus, nuclear plants on the Hudson, the Jersey shore or one either side of the Sound may imperil bass, the most sought-after fish in the region, and as of now unchecked nukes are in operation or under consideration in all three areas.

The Hudson, the basic source of supply, is the most endangered, and it offers the classic case in nuclear fish kills to prove the point. In the fall of 1962 a relatively tiny nuclear plant (265,000 kilowatts) began operation at Indian Point, a former park, on the river 40 miles above the Battery. This Consolidated Edison Company plant fronts on important grounds for both young striper hatched up-river and for mature bass that migrate from the coast to spend the winter before spawning in the spring. During the first six months of operation, the Indian Point Plant killed tons upon tons of fish.

Although an attorney for Con Ed later admitted to a congressional committee investigating the kill that "the Indian Point thing was bad, there is no question about it," the company was not required to pay any indemnity—the standard fine for a private citizen is \$27.50 or more for each fish—and soon applied to the AEC for a license to build a larger plant next door to the first. This plant will be completed next year, and a third one next to the others is scheduled for operation in 1971. When all three units are in operation, they will shoot back 2.1 million gallons of water a minute into the Hudson at a temperature 16.4° hotter than the river. Con Ed also has plans for a fourth unit near Indian Point, and last spring the company announced it was going to put more nukes at unspoiled Montrose Point two miles south of Indian Point. This came as a surprise to the Catholic Kolping Society, which owns a 52-acre estate there and has no idea of selling, even though the Con Ed blueprint called for this land to serve as the heart of the project. It probably also came as a surprise to Chairman Charles Luce, who, only a month earlier, had written a stockholder that Con Ed could not put another nuke on the river, because it would "heat the waters of the Hudson too much." The Kolping Society has since refused offers from Con Ed to pack up and get out, and Con Ed has threatened to institute condemnation proceedings.

Besides Indian and Montrose Points, other nukes are rumored for this stretch of the Hudson, which would boost the total number to eight or nine, easily the greatest single concentration of plants in the world.

When directors of the Hudson River Fishermen's Association met with Con Ed officials last May to point out that hot-water discharges from proposed nuclear plants would violate state standards for tidal salt-water, Arthur Pearson, a senior engineer for Con Ed, said that the utility was going to get the state to classify the lower Hudson as a freshwater stream. This was apparently too much even for state officials, who now are simply trying to rejigger temperature standards to benefit all the utilities.

Long Island Sound is also in for a rash of plants. The United Illuminating Company of Bridgeport has a plant at Millstone Point, Conn. that will begin operation in a year, while the Connecticut Yankee nuke at Haddam Neck, 20 miles up the Connecticut River from the Sound, has been operating since 1967. Last Aug. 8, *The Middletown* (Conn.) Press reported that a party of canoeists going down the Connecticut had taken temperatures of 97° near the plant while 1,000 yards upstream the water temperature was only 72°.

The United Illuminating Company plans a huge nuke in Westport, Conn. on wild Cockeone Island, a short distance offshore from the Westport town beach and the largest public beach in Norwalk. United Illuminating does not even serve the Westport-Norwalk area, and the company was not very illuminating about purchasing the island, keeping its ownership secret for more than a year. Public outcry has induced State Representative Edwin Green of Westport to introduce a bill in the state assembly, which, if passed, will amend the present law and give a town's power of condemnation priority over a utility company's right of eminent domain.

On the other side of the Sound, Long Island Lighting Company is planning two nukes at Shoreham, and the company is also seeking to acquire a site on Lloyd Neck, where a local organization, the Lloyd Harbor Study Group, composed largely of energetic housewives, is ready to do battle. On the western end of the Sound, Con Edison recently acquired David's Island from the city of New Rochelle. Four one-million-kilowatt reactors are to go there with no cooling devices, because, as a Con Ed executive erroneously says, "the water in Long Island

Sound is changed daily by tides." The city fathers are immensely proud of the deal because of the tax revenues they claim New Rochelle will reap, but opposition has developed in the form of two new organizations, Citizens for a Second Look and the Long Island Sound Association, which Dom Pirone, who fishes for striped bass in both the Hudson and the Sound, helped to organize. The Long Island Sound Association is not only attempting to coordinate all nuclear opposition on the Sound but has joined forces with the Hudson River Fishermen's Association and other groups outside the area, including the Citizens Committee to Save Cayuga Lake in upstate New York.

The Cayuga Lake fight is interesting because it pits a utility, the New York State Electric and Gas Corporation, not against housewives, however energetic they may be, but against a bristling platoon of Cornell faculty. The controversy started last winter when a local paper reported that the utility company was planning to put a nuke to be called the Bell Station on the east shore of Cayuga, 16 miles north of Ithaca. The Bell Station was to be an 830,000-kilowatt plant, and to cool the condenser, the plant would take in and shoot back 750 million gallons of water a day 25° hotter than the bottom temperature of the lake. Dean Arnold, a research fellow in biology at Cornell, called the company to ask for more information, and he was told, "We are not in the habit of discussing our plans with the public." That was enough to fuel indignation at Cornell.

The Citizens Committee to Save Cayuga was formed and responded in a number of ways. Most importantly perhaps, it had 17 Cornell scientists, led by Dr. A. W. Eipper, prepare a paper to state the case against the plant. The paper, "Thermal Pollution of Cayuga Lake by a Proposed Power Plant," points out that Cayuga, like the other four Finger Lakes, is very deep and cold. From top to bottom, it is stratified into warm and cold layers during the summer and mixes throughout the winter when it turns over. During the turnover, dissolved oxygen in the upper layer is imparted to the colder bottom layer, and the bottom-dwelling species, such as lake trout, are able to live only because of this once-a-year replenishment of oxygen. The Bell nuke, however, would draw cold water from 100 feet below the level, heat it, and then discharge it at the surface. This would be ecologically disastrous to the life forms naturally acclimated to Cayuga. For one, it would upset the oxygen mixing cycle so that the lake trout would be hard put to survive, and for another it probably would turn Cayuga into a floating salad bowl of weeds and algae. In sucking up water from near the bottom, the plant would ingest nutrients that are inert from lack of sunlight. But spewed out and released into the upper layers, these nutrients—nitrates and phosphates—would become active fertilizers for plant growth. Four towns use the lake for drinking water, and blue-green algae, which imparts a disgusting taste to water, could only be eliminated at great cost. If need be, the committee is preparing to go to court to stop the utility from fouling the lake.

Any court case brought in New York State to prevent a utility from thermally polluting waters is likely to prompt the state itself to appear on the side of the polluter. The present state administration is nuclear happy, more so than any other state in the Union. A resident of Washington State who objects to thermal pollution only has to do battle against a weak state water-pollution agency and the AEC, but a New Yorker is forced to fight both the AEC and the State Atomic and Space Development Authority, a newly created bureaucracy that has so much muscle it makes the AEC look like a 97-pound weakling. This authority

came into powerful existence last May when Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, a firm believer in nukes for reasons not yet clear, pushed a bill through the closing session of the state legislature. The governor is an overwhelming figure in the state, not only by virtue of his office, but because he is the major contributor to state election campaigns, and he underwrites individual candidates as well. When Rockefeller says a bill is a must, he gets a quick response. No public hearings were held on the bill; indeed, it was just about impossible for an outsider to find a copy. The bill went through in record time; some legislators have since privately admitted that they did not even bother to read its provisions. Briefly, the bill gives the atomic authority immense powers and specifically charges it with "the maximum development and use of atomic energy. . . ." It is to have enormous sums of money at its command to subsidize public and private plants, and has the power to condemn any land in the state. Moreover, the authority is not subject to any of the state public service or conservation laws. In the language of the bill, all such laws are "deemed to be superseded," and should any provision of these laws seem to be in conflict with the authority this provision shall be "deemed to be superseded, modified or repealed as the case may require."

As a result of the power industry's refusal to recognize thermal pollution, a number of persons who were originally willing to live with nuclear power have begun to raise other questions. And with good reason. For instance, David Lillenthal, the first chairman of the AEC, expressed grave reservations in his book, *Change, Hope, and the Bomb*, about the potential hazards posed by nuclear plants. Then there is the Scientists' Institute for Public Information, which has shown serious concern for insufficient safeguards and the emission of pollutants during normal plant operation. SIPI's membership includes some of the most distinguished and respected names in science. The purpose of SIPI, which has its headquarters in Manhattan, is to provide scientific information to the lay citizen who is interested in nuclear energy and environmental contamination. SIPI publishes a magazine, *Scientist and Citizen*, where articles have dealt with the release of various radioactive pollutants such as Krypton 85 and Iodine 131 from nuclear plants, and the effect such emissions may have, say, on the human body. Indeed, the whole frightening problem posed by nuclear plants is succinctly dealt with in a new book, *The Careless Atom*, by Sheldon Novick, associate editor of *Scientist and Citizen*. Last September, several members of SIPI, including Dr. Barry Commoner, director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University, appeared at a conference at Stratton Mountain, Vt., sponsored by the Conservation Society of Southern Vermont, on the subject of nuclear power and the environment. The Federal Power Commission, the Fish and Wildlife Service and state and local agencies sent representatives to speak at this dispassionate, coolly clinical forum, but the AEC, which had been invited to attend, refused.

All the protests against the nukes have not been without effect on the federal level. Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts plans to reintroduce a bill in the current session of the Senate which would call for a two-year moratorium on nuclear plant construction. During this period, siting studies would be conducted, a thoughtful overall policy made on power requirements and hazards eliminated. Representative Richard Ottinger of New York will introduce a similar measure in the House.

Curiously, the power industry couldn't seem to care less. It's still full steam ahead. A recent article in *Nuclear News*, a trade publication, made a joke out of thermal pollu-

tion. A supposed ecologist was quoted as saying, "Who says a shift in wildlife balance is bad? If an accidental 5° rise will kill salmon in the Columbia, why not a 20° rise—on purpose—to create an Amazonlike home for species of greater importance? Angelfish bring far more per pound than salmon. What sportsman would settle for trout when he could catch piranha?"

Qulps like this do not prompt laugh-ins by fishermen or other concerned citizens, but it is surprising that in its search for suitable tropical fish to replace salmon *Nuclear News* did not mention the leaf fish (*Nucifurax polyacanthus*), which will eat only living fish and demands seven meals a day. As the late A. J. Liebling wrote more than 30 years ago after observing the leaf fish in the New York Aquarium, "It has a profile like a public utility executive and an appetite to match."

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ACRO
TEAM

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, California is justifiably proud of its record in both amateur and professional sports. We have provided more major league baseball players than any other State. We have more professional athletic teams in all sports than any other State. And I suspect that some enterprising sports-writer might well prove that if California had been competing as an independent nation in the Mexico City Olympics, it might have defeated every other country except, perhaps, the Soviet Union.

And Long Beach, Calif., is probably the most sports- and recreation-minded city in that sports- and recreation-minded State. Long Beach played host to the 1968 Olympic trials in the aquatic sports and gymnastics, building the \$3.7 million, 3,000-seat Belmont Plaza Olympic pool especially for the swim trials.

One of the newest championship additions to the athletic picture in Long Beach is the southern California acro team, a group of 40 girls aged 5 to 22 who comprise the outstanding women's gymnastics team in the United States.

They call themselves the Scats and they are coached by Bud Marquette, former national and Olympic coach. In addition to being the 1968 junior and senior national champions, the Scats placed two girls on the 1968 U.S. Olympic team—Wendy Cluff and Cathy Rigby. Through their efforts, the U.S. team placed higher in the all-around category than ever before in U.S. Olympic history.

This remarkable group of young ladies has been invited to compete in the United States in the World Gymnastrada at Basel, Switzerland. In order to finance the trip, they are attempting to raise \$35,000 through private, tax-deductible donations.

This is an outstanding group, and its record of 112 victories and only two defeats indicates it will be a credible representative for the United States at Basel. I am certain all my colleagues will join me in wishing the Scats every success in their fundraising drive and at the Gymnastrada competition in Switzerland.

A DISGRACE

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, at long last the disciples of violence and confusion in this country have exposed themselves fully to the American people. The actions of the self-styled pacifists, champions of the poor, and crusaders for a new order last weekend during the ceremonies to inaugurate a new President have shown that they are not interested in solutions but in conflict. They have made it clear that their objective is revolution and the destruction of America. They want to put an end to everybody's freedom but theirs. They have made it clear that they have no constructive goals, but want to deprive others of what most of us have honestly earned through sweat and toil.

Many Members of this body pleaded with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior not to issue the permit for such a demonstration. Ensuing events proved that those of us who took this stand were right.

The actions of the dissidents over the weekend were disgusting in the eyes of the Nation and the world. For the first time since they have become the focal point of national news the public was made aware of their obscenities, and they stopped at nothing.

They besmirched the parade route with their foul mouths until mothers held their hands over the ears of their children to save some shred of respectability for a solemn and sacred occasion. In their depraved madness they tried to disrupt various events by vicious acts of sabotage and by throwing manure at decent people honoring a great moment and a new President. They painted Vietcong slogans across the front of Constitution Hall. They threw tacks across the public highway to endanger property and safety. They attempted to tear down the American flag; and in fact, did burn a number of flags.

Thank God, their excesses have at last exposed them for what they are—brutal, vicious, depraved apostles of the worst type of society akin to that espoused by the Fascists, the Nazis and the Communists.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the message has now been made clear to the Members of Congress, to our courts, and to our law-enforcement agencies. America wants no part of these stormtroopers and that, henceforth, there will be no negotiations for permits to destroy our sacred institutions, no tolerance of criminal acts in the name of free expression.

Legitimate dissent will always be protected in our country, but from this day forward let us serve notice that those who engage in treason and anarchy will be dealt with as traitors and anarchists.

The following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 22, states the case clearly against coddling these criminals.

A DISGRACE

For the first time in our memory the lunatic fringe tried with some success this week

to disrupt the inauguration of a President of the United States.

They didn't quite get to President Nixon. But the automobile in which he was riding with his wife was the target of a dozen or more missiles thrown by about 400 of those so-called "demonstrators" who had assembled near Fourteenth street and Pennsylvania avenue. Despite the presence of police, National Guardsmen and paratroopers, the hoodlums shouted obscenities and made obscene gestures toward the President and Mrs. Nixon. At that point, it appears, there were no arrests.

Later on, 82 arrests were made. This was after these "demonstrators," about 1,000 in all, had split up into gangs and taken to the streets. To screams of "kill the pig," they knocked down and beat a policeman. Stones, some as big as paving blocks, were hurled at police cars, breaking windshields and denting car bodies. Windows in several establishments, including St. John's Church, were broken. Then came more attempts to bait the police with obscenities and gestures. And most of this within a block or so of the White House.

As the police moved in several "youths" shouted: "It's just like Chicago," which it wasn't. Police, doubtless under orders, were notably restrained, a fact attested by the minor and relatively few injuries inflicted.

This, however, is beside the point. Police restraint is a good thing after the street fighting starts. No one would urge that these hoods should have been mercilessly beaten. But the fact remains that their performance was an outrage.

The right of protest and of peaceable assembly is one thing. Violence is something else again. And violence ought to be choked off at the very outset. The authorities knew, for the most part, who the potential trouble-makers were and where they were. They should have been rounded up and taken away before, not after, they got out of hand.

To have done this, of course, would have brought forth anguished cries about violated constitutional rights. But there is another right at stake here—the right of a newly-chosen President to be inaugurated in the Nation's Capital without becoming the intended target of crackpot violence. If we are going to temporize with this sort of thing, if the lunatic fringe is to get the kid-glove treatment, the threat to future inaugurations surely will increase.

A GREAT AMERICAN DIES

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following column written in tribute to a great American, Mr. Virg Hill, who just died. As a reporter and columnist for an Arizona newspaper, his articles on government and politics were astute and always worth reading and mulling over. We shall all miss him. The column follows:

A GREAT AMERICAN DIES

Virg Hill will not write of the Arizona political scene again. Arizona will be poorer for his passing. Virg had the unique ability to write something positive about the worst of us and to see the merits of both sides of all issues. He had an uncanny knack of getting through the verbiage and pomposity that inundates all political issues and to come up with the issue unadorned.

His keen wit and articulate but gentle

needle made him much in demand for public speaking, a capability not found in many journalists.

How many political figures in Arizona have sought his council will never be known, for he was not one to boast of his influence. I know that all those that did receive an honest and forthright appraisal and any confidences were respected in a manner that is almost certainly unmatched in the history of political journalism.

His approach was genuinely nonpartisan, his concern was genuinely Arizona and his method was all Hill.

His comparison of Arizona and Kansas politics were a delight.

If all representatives of the media had Virg Hill's ability and honor, this would be a better world.

STATEMENT BY HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, OF NEW JERSEY, ON H.R. 766

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 766, to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an established workweek, a new system of overtime compensation and night work differential for postal field service employees, and for other purposes. I take this time to explain my bill and request my colleagues to favorably consider this legislation.

Well over 3 years have passed since the Congress enacted Public Law 89-301 which most of us assumed and certainly hoped would end, once and for all, the archaic post office practice of giving our dedicated postal employees compensatory time off in lieu of overtime.

Indeed, it was my understanding that this law was further designed to establish a basic Monday through Friday workweek—most of the time, for most employees.

In other words, we passed a law to stabilize, insofar as possible, the working conditions in the Nation's post offices and, in particular, to insure reasonable overtime pay beyond the normal 40-hour workweek consistent with prevailing practices in the private sector throughout the Nation.

Public Law 89-301 has failed of its purpose, and has done so on a continuing and coast-to-coast basis. Not only do thousands of postal clerks feel disillusioned, but their morale has also suffered. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that we hear so much these days of inefficiency and unrest among the rank and file of postal employees.

As a matter of fact, it may interest my colleagues in the House to know that one postal union—the United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO—has brought action in the Federal courts of the District of Columbia seeking a ruling by the courts interpreting the law and a halt to the Department's alleged violations of its provisions. At the moment, an appeal by the union is pending in the U.S. District Court of Appeals here in Washington.

This is not a new issue. More than 3

years ago, I introduced legislation which, had it been enacted, would have ended most of this controversial rescheduling of career annual rate regular postal clerks and other employees. Unfortunately, Senate amendments to this version had to be accepted in the closing hours of the first session of the 89th Congress if we were to have any law at all.

Again in the 90th Congress, I introduced H.R. 5407 as an amendment to Public Law 89-301 when it was already evident that additional legislative action was needed to enforce the principles of the law. Unfortunately, this legislation died with the 90th Congress.

On the opening day of the 91st Congress, I again introduced new legislation to achieve these old but still worthy objectives. That bill is H.R. 766 and, in my judgment, it deserves the prompt and serious consideration of the Congress.

Simply stated, H.R. 766 would achieve these ends:

First. It would establish beyond all challenge a basic, permanent, Monday-through-Friday workweek in the postal service composed of five 8-hour days with overtime pay for all employees who work in excess of 8 hours in any one day.

Second. It would require payment of 150 percent of basic hourly pay—that is time and one-half—for all work in excess of 8 hours in 1 day and for work on Saturdays.

Third. It would require payment of 200 percent of basic hourly rates—that is double time—for work on Sundays and legal holidays. It further provides for 250 percent of basic hourly day pay for work on Christmas Day.

Finally, I have included in H.R. 766 something new, something not included in the previous versions, and yet again something that is long overdue—some 40 years overdue, I might add.

A final provision of my bill would increase from 10 to 20 percent the night differential paid to postal employees who work between the hours of 6 p.m. and 6 a.m.

I say this increment for the men and women who move the mails during the long, lonely hours of the night is overdue—for the 10-percent night differential was enacted by the 70th Congress back in May 1928, more than 40 years ago.

Surely times have changed sufficiently in 40 years of our history to warrant a more generous scale of pay for those dedicated employees—most of them family men—whose duties require them to apply their talents in the dark reaches of the night to the all-important job of keeping the mails moving.

We hear and read a great deal these days about the need for better postal service, for improved management techniques, for automation, and all the rest of it. I submit that a few simple changes, such as I have outlined and such as are embodied in H.R. 766, would go a long way toward achieving the renewed dedication and the pride of craftsmanship that are the principle keystones of any human enterprise and lacking which no human institution—including the postal service—can hope to fulfill its mission.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S POLICY FOR RURAL AMERICA

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon said in a recent article that today's rural problems are the urban problems of tomorrow. It is most encouraging as the new President takes office to know that he believes in equal opportunity for rural America.

President Nixon made this observation in the article which appeared in the magazine *Rural America*:

We are beginning to see that what we call the urban problem has its roots in our rural areas. What I here propose is that we deal with this problem at its source, instead of attacking it only at the point of its great visibility.

This has been my belief and philosophy for many years and I am delighted to learn of the strong position which President Nixon has taken on the matter of rural development.

In this connection I am placing in the Record the article from *Rural America*. The article follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—OUR POLICY FOR RURAL AMERICA

We are beginning to see that what we call the urban problem has its roots in our rural areas. What I here propose is that we deal with this problem at its source, instead of attacking it only at the point of its greatest visibility.

"It fares the land, to hastening ills a prey . . ." was written of the English countryside nearly 200 years ago. But it might be written of rural America today.

Our rural areas are being depleted of people. Since 1960 the farm population has been declining at an annual rate of about 6 percent. From 1960 to 1967 the farm population declined by 4,818,000. The Department of Agriculture anticipates further out-migration.

This out-migration from our small towns and rural areas is largely the result of an agricultural revolution. Inadequate and unwise farm policies have contributed to the trend. Witness the lowest wheat prices in 26 years. Our farm population has fallen from 18 percent of the total population two decades ago to about 5 percent today.

What becomes of these people? Most of them move into our great cities. Without necessarily desiring it and almost by default, we are becoming an urban society. Seventy percent of our people now cluster in cities that cover one percent of our land. If present trends continue unchecked, by the year 2000, 80 percent of our people will be living in urban areas and most of them will be crammed into five super metropolitan areas.

By generating a kind of "urban crush," this creates problems in the cities to which they go. By de-populating the countryside, this creates problems in the rural areas and small towns.

But move they must, if there are no nearby jobs.

Seemingly, almost everything has conspired to prevent the creation of jobs in rural areas:

Federal farm programs have cut our cotton crop to 10 million acres, compared with 43 million acres before the programs began. Tobacco acreage is now only half as great as 35 years ago.

Local communities have not had the re-

sources, the services and utilities needed to attract industry.

Industry, which has been urban-minded, has not sufficiently sought to decentralize.

The rural labor force lacks the wide range of federal employment services available to urban workers.

Education policies have discriminated against the poorer areas. For example, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides more than twice as much help per pupil to the counties ranking highest on the index of rural well-being as it does those ranking lowest (\$350 as against \$157). (Manpower Report of the President, April 1967, Page 116.)

WE MUST EXPAND OPPORTUNITY

Today's rural problems are the urban problems of tomorrow. The American people want a better balance between the rural and the urban sectors. There should be expanded opportunity for those who wish to live in the country to find decent work there, to have access to good education and health services, and to pursue a way of living that gives diversity and balance to our economy.

What the American people really want and will work for, they can have. We are not the helpless objects of blind economic forces; we are capable of shaping our own future.

The future vitality of our small towns and rural areas depends largely on sound planning. Our states and localities should make a greater effort to develop land use plans based on the community's available human and natural resources. This is an essential first step to diversify and to strengthen the economic base of our rural areas.

IMAGINATION AND PLANNING

Imaginative and comprehensive land use plans will open the way to the location of new industries in small towns and rural areas. Local, state and national tax policies can also provide realistic and effective economic incentives to attract industry. Improved transportation facilities, better schools, and more extensive public utilities in rural areas will also serve the same goal. The Federal Government can help in a very direct way by placing more emphasis on the dispersal of Government contracts to small towns and rural areas wherever possible.

An essential ingredient for broadening the economic base of small towns and rural communities is an improvement in the skills and education of the rural citizen. This creates an economic inducement to industry as well as a wider economic opportunity for the individual. In practice, it means better education of all kinds, at all levels: elementary, secondary and advanced; vocational technical and academic; continuing education for adults, apprenticeship, retraining and all the rest. It means on-the-job training as proposed in the Republican-sponsored "Human Investment Act."

What is here proposed is not a blueprint for the economy, with a certain calculated number of people on farms or a carefully computed balance between rural and urban areas. Rather, I propose that we redress the imbalance in education and opportunity which has worked to the disadvantage of the rural areas and threatens to make America predominantly urban.

To undertake the actions I propose does not introduce a rural bias; rather, it would overcome the neglect that has contributed to rural deterioration that in turn has contributed to the urban bias, largely unintended, that has been allowed to develop. I propose that we provide the equality of opportunity which will give our people a chance to develop the kind of society they want. If this is done, we can safely leave with the people themselves the decision as to the balance between rural and urban living.

OPPOSITION TO THE EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the executive, legislative, and judicial salary recommendations made by the President in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. Further, I add my support to the resolutions disapproving these recommendations.

My opposition is based upon principle and conscience, and not upon the amount of the increases, even though this also appears to be exorbitant. It should be noted that the 90th Congress last year approved the act creating the Commission whose report to the President formed the basis for the President's recommendations. It is my firm opinion that the 90th Congress acted unwisely and perhaps in the fringe of constitutional permissibility in establishing the Commission to which we have referred. By its action, the 90th Congress abdicated the responsibility given to the Congress under the Constitution to fix the salary of its own Members as well as salaries in the other branches of Government. The Commission was composed of leading citizens and their findings reflecting a present imbalance between Government and industry salaries are no doubt justified. However, this is not the issue.

This Nation of ours is going through a period of great inflation. The Secretary of the Treasury has even talked in terms of the desirability of unemployment increases as a means of controlling this inflation. It does not behoove the Congress to allow a raise of its own pay and the pay of other elected and appointed governmental officials in this time of spiraling inflation. Indeed, the Congress should provide leadership and example to Americans everywhere. Henry Clay once said:

Government is a trust, and the officers of the Government are trustees and both the trust and trustees are created for the benefit of the people.

This trust, in which we all participate, takes the form of a solemn contract of obligation between the Congressman—or other elected official—and those who have elected him to that office. When a man seeks public office, he should know full well what the pay and emoluments of that office are. By offering himself for election, he is agreeing to serve for that stipulated sum during the term to which he is elected. It is, in my judgment, a breach of trust with the people to increase the pay and the emoluments during a term covered by the most recent election. If pay is to be increased, let the increase begin 2 years from now in order that the trust not be violated.

Under the present circumstances created by the 90th Congress, no action is required on the part of this 91st Congress in order for the President's rec-

ommendations to take effect, but, as for me, I stand in opposition to the same and will support the resolutions of disapproval in this House.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT TRUST FUNDS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS AND DAY CARE CENTERS

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions to jointly-administered trust funds voluntarily established to finance educational scholarships for employees and their dependents, or to finance day-care centers for the young children of employees. I am pleased to report that 16 of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, have joined me in sponsoring this measure. An identical bill was passed by the House with broad bipartisan support in the closing days of the 90th Congress.

Section 302 of the LMRA prohibits payments by employers to employee representatives for purposes other than those set forth in section 302(c). Section 302's broad prohibition was enacted to prevent bribery, collusion, and other corrupt practices; it was not designed to outlaw labor-management cooperation for laudable ends, where adequate safeguards exist. Therefore, the Congress has approved in section 302(c) several exceptions to 302's general prohibition, including payments to funds for medical care, pension, vacation, and other programs. The legislation introduced today will add a seventh exception to section 302's prohibition, and will thus validate employer contributions to joint trust funds established to finance educational scholarships or child-care centers for the benefit of employees and their dependents. I should stress that this bill would not require such contributions, and would not require the establishment of such trust funds. Further, the bill specifically sets forth that no employer or labor organization shall be required to bargain about the establishment of these funds.

In my judgment, the merits of this bill are clear. It would encourage voluntary participation by the private sector of our economy in meeting two urgent needs: The financing of advanced education for the children of working parents, and providing adequate day-care centers for the young children of working mothers. It will help meet these needs not by appropriating Federal moneys, but rather by enlisting the wealth and creativity of our private enterprise system.

It is my hope that it will be possible to enact this bill into law with all reasonable speed. I believe it is an extremely constructive measure, which promises benefits to employers, employees, and to the Nation.

NEW BLACK UNITY: DR. KING
HOLIDAY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1969, I introduced a bill, H.R. 3807, to designate January 15, the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., a national legal holiday. In doing so I joined the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and several Members of the Senate including Senator BROOKE of Massachusetts. Support for this well-deserved tribute to a great national leader has been growing, not only in my own State of Illinois, but throughout the Nation. An article which recently appeared in the Chicago Daily News indicates the extent to which this proposal has the support of blacks, both militants and nonmilitants, in the Chicago area. I wish to include this article in the RECORD as an indication of the united and growing support for the Martin Luther King, Jr., national holiday idea.

Support for the January 15 legal holiday proposal is coming, moreover, Mr. Speaker, not only from blacks but from all segments of the community. This is because it is recognized that to honor Martin Luther King, Jr., is not only to honor a black man, although black he was, nor is it only to honor a great leader in the nonviolent civil rights movement in America, although the preeminent leader of that movement Dr. King indisputably was. Rather, the designation of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday as a national legal holiday would be a recognition of the greatness of this man as a dedicated and compassionate human being, as an inspired and inspiring leader of men, and as an apostle, in the truest sense of the word, of the cause of peace. The establishment of a Martin Luther King, Jr., national holiday would, in short, Mr. Speaker, indicate that this Nation has reached a point at which it can, without reference to a man's creed or the color of his skin, honor greatness where greatness is shown, recognize leadership where leadership has been so inspiringly exercised, and pay tribute to restraint, compassion and a sense of moral justice when those qualities are so sorely needed in this Nation.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I was advised that the Woodlawn Business Men's Association, an active, and integrated, Chicago businessmen's group, voted its support for the Martin Luther King, Jr., birthday-holiday proposal. Mr. Marshall Stern, president of the association, informed me on January 17, 1969, that the association had passed and sent to me and to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference the following resolution:

The Woodlawn Business Men's Association resolves that we are in favor of January 15th, the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., being designated as a national legal holiday.

It is my great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to include this resolution at this point in the RECORD, for I feel that it demonstrates far more eloquently than I could the support from both whites and blacks for the proposal to honor Dr. King's memory.

Another example of the meaning which a Martin Luther King, Jr., national holiday would have to citizens of all ages is the number of letters from younger members of my district urging this action upon the Congress. The significance of Dr. King's ideals to millions of Americans was forcefully brought home to me by the simple words of one young constituent:

He was fighting for our country too. I think that he was the first to talk about non-violence.

These two essential thoughts which Dr. King symbolizes in the minds of so many Americans—the struggle to build a better nation and the attempt to do it by peaceful means—are part of the reason that I have sponsored this legislation.

Yesterday I received a letter from Rev. Calvin S. Morris, associate director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's Operation Breadbasket. Operation Breadbasket, Mr. Speaker, is the outstanding example I have seen of self-help efforts among black Chicagoans. Reverend Morris sent to me petitions signed by members of the Southwestern Baptist Church, 8640 South Michigan Avenue, in Chicago. These petitions, addressed to the President and the Congress, urge that legislation to establish Martin Luther King's birthday as a national legal holiday—legislation such as I introduced last week—be passed. The petitions are signed by close to 75 petitioners, many of them residents of my district, the Second Congressional District of Illinois. Here is yet another example of the strong and growing support for the Martin Luther King, Jr., national holiday proposal.

The support which I have described here, Mr. Speaker, comes from groups ranging from the Catholic Interracial Council to the Concerned Transit Workers of Chicago. In this time of growing racial tension and distrust, no action by the Congress would provide more tangible evidence of our concern for the cause of peaceful improvement of race relations, and of our respect for nonviolent efforts by blacks themselves to erase the last vestiges of the cruel and shameful policies of segregation and discrimination, than the designation of a Martin Luther King, Jr., national legal holiday.

The newspaper article referred to follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Jan. 15, 1969]

NEW BLACK UNITY: DR. KING HOLIDAY
(By L. F. Palmer, Jr.)

The declaration of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday as a holiday by several black groups is an indication of the current mood of blacks and of a growing unity in the freedom movement.

The Rev. Jesse Jackson, national director of Operation Breadbasket, Monday called for black people to stay away from work or school Wednesday to mark the birthday of the man who introduced nonviolence as a weapon in the Negro's struggle for freedom.

The young minister said both President-elect Richard M. Nixon and the Congress have been asked to declare January 15 a national holiday in honor of Dr. King. The same request has been made locally to Mayor Richard J. Daley.

"But we don't need permission from downtown," Mr. Jackson said. "All we need is a commitment to our own needs."

Cooperating with the Southern Christian

Leadership Conference, the parent organization of Operation Breadbasket, are some 15 organizations.

Significantly, they include the same groups that banded together to provide support to the Rev. George Clements and the Rev. Rollins Lambert in the controversy over John Cardinal Cody's naming of a black pastor to St. Dorothy's Roman Catholic parish.

This is a confederation with degrees of militancy spanning the spectrum. By joining in a second project, the organizations are giving clear indications of a unity move.

According to the latest public school head count, announced last November, there are 306,848 black pupils attending the city's public schools. This is 52.9 percent of the total. How many will observe the holiday cannot be predicted.

There are 7,467 black teachers in the city system, about a third of the total. Among the groups supporting the Wednesday holiday is the Teachers Division of Operation Breadbasket.

The Chicago Urban League estimates that there are 400,000 to 450,000 black workers in the Chicago area.

Mr. Jackson said the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, who succeeded Dr. King as president of SCLC, issued the call for a national holiday. According to Mr. Jackson, Nixon has not "given his position" on a King holiday.

"We have asked the administration to enter into a coalition with us and we will wait until shortly after Mr. Nixon's inaugural," Mr. Jackson said.

"But we have decided we will be free, not according to the administration's time table but according to our own."

The black holiday also will be marked by a memorial service at Fellowship Baptist Church, 45th Place and Princeton, at 11 a.m.

The groups sponsoring the Wednesday holiday, aside from Operation Breadbasket, are the Afro-American Fireman's League, the Afro-American Patrolman's League, the Black Consortium, Black Panther Party, Black Priests Caucus Catholic Interracial Council and Chicago Conference of Laymen.

Also, Committee for One Society, Concerned Black Catholics, Concerned Transit Workers, St. Dorothy Parish Council, Inner City Priests Council, Martin Luther King Laymen's League, Black P Stone Nation, and Jobs Now.

OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF
SMALL BUSINESSMEN IN NATION
SUPPORT RURAL TAX INCENTIVE
BILL

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 91st Congress—January 3 last—I introduced H.R. 799, a bill to encourage rural development through tax incentives for industrial and commercial development.

As one who has fought through the years for increased emphasis on rural development, it is encouraging to note that the importance of building a stronger rural America has been endorsed by a poll of the membership of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., an organization representing more than a quarter million small businessmen.

In a news release the Federation reports that a recent poll showed that two-thirds of the Nation's small businessmen favor the tax incentive principle for rural development.

Because of the interest of my col-

leagues and the Nation generally in this subject, I am placing the news release of the National Federation of Independent Business in the Record.

The release follows:

[From the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., San Mateo, Calif., and Washington, D.C.]

(NOTE.—The Brief Facts: The scarcity of employment opportunities in rural and small town areas and the concentration of industry into crowded metropolitan centers are twin problems reflecting economic imbalance in the United States. One Congressional plan to stimulate location of new enterprises in "small town America" would provide tax incentives for businesses which establish new facilities in underdeveloped areas, providing that at least 20 new jobs are created. This tax incentive approach is favored by 63 percent of the independent business owners polled by the National Federation of Independent Business, and opposed by 31 percent with 6 percent undecided.)

THE RELEASE

A tax incentive program to induce economic expansion of rural and small-town America could prove a most effective solution to the twin problems of rural stagnation and urban over-concentration. More effective, perhaps, than massive government spending programs.

That's the prevailing opinion among the nation's independent business proprietors, revealed in a poll by the National Federation of Independent Business. Sixty-three percent of the businessmen endorse a Congressional proposal to give special tax treatment to firms which, when expanding, choose to put their new plants or offices in non-urban areas.

These businessmen see it as a no-expenditure approach to the problem of economic imbalance which is creating, on the one hand, "a rural wasteland" and on the other, "an urban slum".

Nationally, 31 percent of the proprietors oppose the plan and 6 percent are undecided.

In Tennessee, 66 percent approve the idea, 28 percent dissent, and 6 percent have no firm opinion. Federation membership is 263,149.

The proposal first made by Representative Joe L. Evins of Tennessee, Chairman of the House Small Business Committee, following committee hearings in 1967 has been reintroduced by him in the current session. Business owners then favored it by a 2-1 margin.

Its major provisions are a 7 percent tax credit for machinery and equipment costs (in addition to the present 7 percent investment tax credit now in effect) and quick amortization of real estate expenses for companies when they establish branch operations in "small town America", provided that at least 20 new jobs are created. Tax allowances for training new workers from the immediate area are also included.

Representative Evins believes this would help de-centralize the U.S. economy, which has crowded 70 percent of the population into little more than 1 percent of the land area.

He—and the businessmen—are concerned with the continued exodus of young people from small towns to large cities. The Economic Development Administration has said the continued migration of job-seekers results from "the push of poor rural conditions rather than the pull of urban economic opportunities."

For every 177 rural youths reaching working age, the Department of Agriculture has said, there are only 100 new jobs. More than half a million non-farm jobs need to be created in rural areas each year to halt the farm-to-city migration, experts say.

The rural job development program pushed by Representative Evins received bipartisan support late in the 90th Congress,

and it fits in with President Nixon's view that tax incentives to private enterprise can be an effective means of achieving social and economic goals. The additional seven percent tax credit on equipment plus the "tax recovery" of real estate costs in five years would be strong incentives for any expanding company.

Few of the independent businessmen who support the plan would be likely to qualify for its tax benefits, which would go mostly to big business. However, those in "small-town America" would gain indirectly by the location of new enterprises in their communities.

In view of the depressed farm prices during a period of inflation, the National Federation of Independent Business believes the rural-aid bill should receive prompt attention from the 91st Congress.

State tabulation follows:

STATE BREAKDOWN FIGURES—ENACT LEGISLATION TO ALLOW A 7-PERCENT TAX CREDIT TO ENCOURAGE REDEVELOPMENT OF RURAL AREAS

State	Percent in favor	Percent against	Percent undecided
Alabama	67	27	6
Alaska	70	27	3
Arizona	57	37	6
Arkansas	69	28	3
California	57	37	6
Colorado	66	29	5
Connecticut	57	36	7
Delaware	57	40	3
Florida	61	33	6
Georgia	72	25	3
Hawaii	68	29	3
Idaho	66	29	5
Illinois	60	34	6
Indiana	60	34	6
Iowa	69	25	6
Kansas	68	27	5
Kentucky	55	39	6
Louisiana	68	25	7
Maine	62	30	8
Maryland	62	31	7
Massachusetts	59	33	8
Michigan	60	34	6
Minnesota	72	22	6
Mississippi	70	24	6
Missouri	67	27	6
Montana	60	34	6
Nebraska	75	22	3
Nevada	62	31	7
New Hampshire	63	34	3
New Jersey	60	34	6
New Mexico	68	28	4
New York	64	31	5
North Carolina	61	34	5
North Dakota	76	18	6
Ohio	58	36	6
Oklahoma	70	28	2
Oregon	54	38	8
Pennsylvania	63	32	5
Rhode Island	56	44	0
South Carolina	64	31	5
South Dakota	73	24	3
Tennessee	66	28	6
Texas	63	32	5
Utah	66	26	8
Vermont	62	33	5
Virginia	67	26	7
Washington	61	33	6
Washington, D.C.	55	36	9
West Virginia	60	26	14
Wisconsin	61	33	6
Wyoming	69	27	4

GILBERT FULL OPPORTUNITY ACT

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the lessons we have learned in recent years is that this society cannot cure poverty, slums, and illiteracy by gimmickry. There are apparently no tricks for dealing adequately with the problems that have been building in our country for decades, perhaps even centuries. Our new President suggests that "black capitalism" may be a panacea, but it is

obviously only one facet of a massive, multipronged attack which is necessary to correct our deficiencies. I cannot over-emphasize that it will take a great deal of money and a great deal of energy to achieve a decent, just society. But I, for one, am determined to set nothing less as a goal. For that reason, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and others of my colleagues in sponsoring with enthusiasm the Full Opportunity Act of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, this act proposes to spend some \$30 billion a year to cure our domestic ills. On an absolute scale, this is a prodigious amount. But it is a fraction of our military budget. It is less than we spent on the Vietnam war in its peak years. It is a small percentage of the gross national income. And it is, in my view, an enormous bargain in the perspective of the magnitude of our country's domestic problems.

The measure proposes to create 3 million subprofessional public service jobs in schools, hospitals, law enforcement and recreation through Federal grants to governmental and nonprofit agencies. Let me emphasize that these are not make-work jobs. We need workers, even semiskilled workers, in our schools, hospitals, police forces and recreation departments. This will be the kind of program that, on one hand, meets the needs of the unemployed and, on the other, performs the kind of social services the country desperately requires.

This measure also proposes constructing one million low and moderate income housing units a year for the next 10 years. It also proposes extending the fair housing laws to cover every unit of housing in the Nation.

The Full Opportunity Act of 1969 also would funnel important sums of money into the schools of the ghettos, to compensate for the educational and domestic deficiencies from which so many talented and worthy young people in our slums suffer. The act would also provide substantial student loans for post high school education, whether college, technical or vocational.

The bill would raise the minimum wage to a level of \$2 an hour and set an annual floor on family income of \$4,000 a year. It would extend and provide rigorous enforcement of equal opportunity laws in employment. It would thus channel energies into productive work, without discrimination, and would see to it, at the same time, that every family in America is adequately provided for.

Mr. Speaker, the Full Opportunity Act has within it a plan for national rehabilitation in 10 years. It has a schedule of expenditures which, in some instances would grow, in others decrease, depending on the program. For instance, the primary school program would go from \$1 billion to \$5 billion annually between now and 1979. The employment program would decrease, over the same period, from \$16 billion to zero.

I am cosponsoring this legislation, Mr. Speaker, not as an idealistic gesture but as a realistic means of correcting the Nation's unhappy social condition. I suspect that some of my colleagues will be tempted to dismiss it out of hand as

too ambitious, but I say that they will be ill advised to do so. This is a program equal to the demand, not in excess of it at all. I urge my colleagues, whatever their political persuasion, to examine this as a practical measure. I think they will find that it is good, basic, unfrivolous, important legislation.

END OF WAR BRINGS POSSIBILITY OF SECOND HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE"

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the hospital ship *S.S. Hope* has been at work for almost 9 years now, quietly but effectively helping to raise the level of health in developing nations. In this time, more than 1,300 volunteer U.S. medical personnel have brought self-help teaching and treatment programs to hundreds of thousands of people on four continents.

Now there appears to be an opportunity to provide for a second *Hope*. This possibility is discussed in a recent editorial from the *New Albany (Ind.) Tribune* which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the *New Albany (Ind.) Tribune*, Dec. 6, 1968]

NEW HOPE FOR S.S. "HOPE"

Hoopes are riding on the outcome of peace negotiations in Paris. Hope will be buoyed in a very literal sense should the small-space talks eventually result in an end to the war in Vietnam.

This is project Hope, the nonprofit, non-government organization founded in 1958 to help raise the level of medical education in developing nations.

The project's famed hospital ship, the *S.S. Hope*, is on loan from the Navy, where it was called the *USS Consolation*. Since its christening in 1960, the *S.S. Hope* has conducted programs in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, Guinea, Nicaragua and Colombia. It is currently halfway through a 10-month medical teaching and treatment mission to Ceylon.

Project Hope now seeks to add a second ship and has received word from the Defense Department that it "would look with favor upon a request for an additional hospital ship after the cessation of hostilities in the Far East." Presumably, it would be one of the Navy hospital ships now in service in Vietnam.

The need for a second ship is underscored by the fact that the project has on hand invitations from 24 nations for a visit of the *S.S. Hope*.

At the rate of one country per ship per year, even a fleet of *Hope's* would have its work cut out for it.

BENNETT INTRODUCES MILITARY JUSTICE REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 the Congress passed the first military justice reform legislation in 18 years.

I was proud to be the sponsor of this law, 90-632.

While we successfully enacted into law this first revision in military justice since 1950, bringing a modern and more equitable statute to the military services, there are several other provisions which need to be included in the present law and for which I have been working for many years.

Today, I am introducing a bill to give Federal courts jurisdiction to try persons who are or have been connected with the Armed Forces when their discharge or civilian status allows them to escape prosecution for crimes they committed while under military control.

This bill, for example, would allow a trial for embezzlement, committed abroad, which would otherwise be impossible because of a discharge from the service.

Also, today there is no American court, military or civil, that has jurisdiction to try American dependents or civilian employees for serious crime committed abroad. This bill would provide that any person serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States, who commits a crime specified in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, shall be tried in the U.S. district court where found or first brought. The statute of limitations for noncapital crimes would be 3 years, with maximum sentences being those authorized for the same offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Soon after World War II several incidents of serious crimes by former military personnel were discovered, but the perpetrators of these crimes were determined to be immune from trial because they were no longer subject to court-martial or American civil court jurisdiction. To attempt to remedy this the Congress enacted article 3 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The need for enacting this bill I am now introducing is brought about by the Supreme Court's decision in the now famous case of *Toth against Quarles*, where the Court held courts-martial jurisdiction over ex-servicemen, as provided for in article 3 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice was unconstitutional. However, the Court did not preclude authorization of jurisdiction to the Federal district courts, and the provisions of title II of the bill would permit trial to take place in an American tribunal, where every constitutional safeguard would be guaranteed. In those cases where the alleged crime occurred abroad, the necessity of delivering or extraditing the accused for trial by a foreign government would be considerably less, since an American court would hereafter by this bill have jurisdiction to try the accused for the misconduct.

A copy of the bill follows:

A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to confer jurisdiction on United States district courts to try certain civilians who are or have been connected with the Armed Forces

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 803 (article 3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Subject to section 843 of this title (article 43), any person not subject to trial by court-martial who is charged with having committed, while in a status in which he was subject to trial by court-martial, an offense against this chapter punishable by confinement for five years or more, and who, while in such status, was not tried for such offense may be tried upon indictment for such offense—

"(1) in the United States district court for any judicial district in which any act or omission constituting an element of such offense was committed, if such offense was committed in the United States, or

"(2) in the United States district court for the judicial district in which such person is found or into which he is first brought, if such offense was committed outside the United States or on the high seas.

No person may be tried in any district court for any such offense if (1) the offense is one for which such person could not be tried by court-martial without his consent if he were in a status subject to trial by court-martial, or (2) such person has been previously tried in a State court for substantially the same offense. For the purpose of all proceedings for or ancillary to the trial of any person for any such offense in any district court of the United States, such offense shall be considered to be an offense prohibited by and punishable under the provisions of title 18, United States Code."

Sec. 2. Title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 47 a new chapter as follows:

"Chapter 48.—TRIAL OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO ACCOMPANY THE ARMED FORCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Sec. 951. Persons subject to trial; jurisdiction of United States district courts; offenses for which persons may be tried.

"952. Statute of limitations; maximum punishment; general provisions.

"§ 951. Persons subject to trial; jurisdiction of United States district courts; offenses for which persons may be tried

"(a) Any citizen, national, or other person owing allegiance to the United States who commit any offense referred to in subsection (b) of this section while serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces outside the United States shall be guilty of an offense against the United States and shall be tried for such offense in the United States district court for the judicial district in which such person is found or into which he is first brought.

"(b) The offenses for which any person described in subsection (a) of this section may be tried in a United States district court are those offenses specified in—

"(1) sections 877 through 881 of this title (articles 77-81) insofar as such sections relate to offenses referred to in clauses (2) through (5) of this subsection;

"(2) section 882 of this title (article 82);

"(3) sections 907 through 911 of this title (articles 107-111);

"(4) sections 913, 914, and 916 of this title (articles 113, 114, and 116); and

"(5) section 934 of this title (article 134) to the extent of crimes and offenses not capital.

"§ 952. Statute of limitations; maximum punishment; general provisions

"(a) An indictment may be found at any time without limitation with respect to any offenses referred to in section 951(b) of this title for which the death penalty may be imposed. Except as provided in section 843 (f) of this title (articles 43(f)), no person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished under this chapter for any offense, not capital, unless the indictment is found or the information is instituted within three years next after such offense shall have been

committed. No person may be tried under this chapter for any offense if such person has been tried for substantially the same offense in a foreign country pursuant to a treaty or agreement to which the United States is a party.

"(b) The maximum punishment which may be imposed in the case of any person tried for an offense pursuant to this chapter shall be the same as that applicable to persons subject to trial by court-martial for the same offense, but the provisions of chapter 47 of this title relating to the forfeiture of pay and allowances shall not be applicable in the case of any person tried under authority of this chapter.

"(c) Any offense for which a person is indicted and tried under authority of this chapter shall, for the purpose of all proceedings for or ancillary to the trial of such person, be considered to be an offense prohibited by and punishable under the provisions of title 18, United States Code.

"(d) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as depriving courts-martial, military commissions, provost courts, or other military tribunals of concurrent jurisdiction with respect to offenders or offenses that by statute or law of war may be tried by courts-martial, military commissions, provost courts, or military tribunals.

"(e) As used in this chapter, the term 'outside the United States' means outside the several States, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Canal Zone, and the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States."

Sec. 3. (a) The table of chapters at the beginning of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"47. Uniform Code of Military Justice.... 801" the following:

"48. Trial of Certain Persons Who Accompany the Armed Forces Outside the United States..... 951".

"(b) The table of chapters preceding chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"47. Uniform Code of Military Justice.... 801" the following:

"48. Trial of Certain Persons Who Accompany the Armed Forces Outside the United States..... 951".

Sec. 4. This Act shall become effective sixty days after enactment.

ON BEHALF OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, some 13 years ago, the faculty and the student body of Chico State College and the people of the city of Chico, Calif., decided to convert into positive action a conviction that true international understanding among the peoples of the world is the only way to real peace.

They recognized that while understanding between governments is important, it cannot be accomplished without understanding among peoples and in order to bring this about many individuals and community groups must accept the responsibility of furthering the cause of international understanding through individual efforts. The program developed in Chico should stand as a shining example of what can be accomplished in a small college community.

Thirteen years ago the General Douglas MacArthur Scholarship was established by the community to assist young students from foreign lands to continue their education in the United States. This education includes both formal studies at Chico State College, and just as important the education in the American way of life through what one of its most ardent supporters, Bill Lee, of the Chico Enterprise Record describes as a "hand-in-hand experience of friendship, understanding, and cooperation."

This has been accomplished only through the dedicated and untiring cooperation of many, many people. Without minimizing the efforts of all these people, it is appropriate, however, to make special mention of the contributions of Editor Lee, the Chico Enterprise Record and its publisher, Mr. A. M. Bramwell.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend this progressive community newspaper, its publisher, and its editor for its civic-minded contributions to this all-important cause of world peace. I know the community shares my views on their efforts.

A few days ago one of Bill Lee's outstanding editorials concluded:

Both the college and the community can be proud of and grateful for the work it is doing.

Let me add that the Nation can be proud of this community dedication to a better, more peaceful world.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Lee's editorial reviewing the 13-year history of the General Douglas MacArthur Scholarship program, an editorial entitled appropriately: "On Behalf of International Understanding":

ON BEHALF OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Since its inception in 1955, the General Douglas MacArthur Scholarship program at Chico State College has become one of the most promising enhancements of international understanding in the realm of American higher education.

Admittedly, the MacArthur program is small indeed when measured on the vast financial yardsticks employed by huge foundations such as those based on the Ford and Rockefeller fortunes.

But from the standpoint of proportionate impact, the grants in the field might well take a back seat to the local MacArthur Foundation.

For example, in its brief 13-year existence, MacArthur Scholarship awards have assisted dozens of youngsters from foreign lands in furthering their education here. A partial listing includes students from Hong Kong, Thailand, Tanzania, Jordan, Iran, the Azores, Nigeria, Japan, Korea, Taiwan (Formosa), India and Indonesia.

Yet the geographical scope and the amount of money involved are not the main distinguishing characteristics of the MacArthur Scholarship program. The unique nature of the program makes its awards—in the minds of recipients—mean a great deal more than mere financial assistance. Rather, through personal association with the campus and off-campus volunteers who play key roles in the MacArthur program, the youngsters from foreign lands undergo a "hand-in-hand" experience of friendship, understanding and cooperation.

This important relationship is, of course, impossible of attainment by the huge, depersonalized national and government founda-

tion with their salaried executives and staffs.

Significantly, the MacArthur Scholarship program enables the foreign students to become participants in—rather than wards of—the local campus and lay community. And this, in the final analysis, is what international understanding and cooperation is all about.

Included in the MacArthur program here are a number of activities of campus and community involvement. For example, an open-to-the-public International Dinner is held each year on or near the Jan. 26 birthday anniversary of the late Douglas MacArthur. The dinner is a popular one (last year's crowd exceeded 250) and acquaintances established during the dinner and program often lead to long-standing relationships which extend into the realms of friendship and correspondence years after the foreign students have returned to their distant lands.

A second feature is the annual selection of a "Most World-Minded Student." Picked from outside the ranks of foreign students themselves, the person receiving this honor is a young American who by his high interest and volunteer activities has contributed to the international spirit on the local campus.

At the present time, the MacArthur Scholarship Foundation is setting in motion another outstanding feature—selection of a "Most World-Minded Citizen" from among the ranks of adults in the college's geographical service area.

The award will be a permanent trophy to be kept on display at Chico State. It will be engraved with the name of each year's winner. A smaller trophy will be awarded personally to the honoree.

Any organization, club or service group in the area may nominate citizens for the award. Thus far, Mrs. B. W. Shaper and Mrs. Sidney W. (Rita) Shnyder, both of Chico, and Fred Butterbaugh, a Paradise teacher, have been nominated.

The nomination period will close Dec. 31. Thus, organizations intending to participate should act with dispatch. Information and nomination papers may be obtained by contacting Fayette Brown, chairman of the committee, in care of the MacArthur Scholarship Foundation at Chico State College.

The "Most World-Minded Citizen" award will be a new and important feature of the scholarship program—and a significant honor of its annual dinner.

The award will be based on the same principles as the scholarship program itself—international understanding, cooperation and peace. These factors pay special homage to the closing decade of General MacArthur's long life—the period during which he dedicated himself to the cause of peace and to the establishment of a free and democratic form of government for the people of Japan, the nation he had helped defeat.

In summary, the General Douglas MacArthur Scholarship program and its related activities add up to a powerful instrument for international understanding and cooperation. Both the college and the community can be proud of and grateful for the work it is doing.

SOME ESSENTIAL FACTS ABOUT CALIFORNIA—THE NO. 1 AGRICULTURE STATE

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently at a dinner here in Washington, given by the Agriculture Council of California to honor the California congressional dele-

gation, Robert McInturf, president, made some dramatic revelations regarding the condition of agriculture in California. I insert a portion of Mr. McInturf's remarks which should be known and understood by every Member of the Congress.

His remarks are timely and pertinent to the attempted boycott of California table grapes in some eastern cities. Some shaggy, indolent students and some fuzzy-thinking clergymen, who have never seen a grape grow or worked a day in their lives, are maligning an industry which provides the highest wages, the best working and living conditions of any grape pickers in the world, and trying to deprive people of one of the most delicious, delightful, and nutritious foods. I hope some of these social marauders will read the following facts and then ask themselves if they are really trying to strike against and boycott the right people, at the right place, at the right time. Most reasonable, knowledgeable persons think not. Remarks mentioned above follow:

REMARKS MADE BY ROBERT MCINTURF, PRESIDENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA AT DINNER JANUARY 14, 1969, HONORING THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The Agricultural Council of California, representing some 70 major agricultural cooperatives with approximately 100,000 farmer members throughout our state, is this year celebrating their 50th Anniversary of service to California agriculture. Although most of the Council's activities fall in the field of legislation, education and public relations within our State, they have found it necessary the past few years to also represent California Cooperatives and agriculture on a national basis. We want to thank each member of the California Delegation for their cooperation when we have called on them here in Washington.

Your dinner here tonight was made up entirely of products grown and marketed cooperatively in California. These are but a few of the 230 crops that are grown commercially in our state, and that have made it the number one agricultural state in the nation. Our number one industry, agriculture, accounts for in excess of four billion dollars gross income annually with one-third of this amount being marketed through our agricultural cooperatives.

We feel that the strength of our cooperatives in California has contributed significantly to the fact that only five of our 230 crops receive federal subsidies and the income from such subsidies accounts for less than two percent of our annual farm income.

It is interesting to note that while California agriculture continues to contribute over nine percent of the total gross farm income for the nation, its share of the net farm income has declined over the past ten years from nine and one-half percent to six percent. This means, of course, that the cost-price squeeze has been felt more keenly by farmers in our state than in any other state of the nation.

California farm workers enjoy the highest average farm wages with greater benefits than anywhere in the country, yet harassment of farm labor has been more acute in our state than in all other states combined. Although, we would like to be paying even higher farm wages, we have not yet figured a way to automatically add on 15 percent to the price of our commodity to supplement the wages of our employees, as is the case with many restaurants and was the case with this dinner served tonight. California agriculture, with its wide diversity of crops has

problems that are unique to our state. Legislation that would put California at a competitive disadvantage with other parts of the country could have a serious effect on the economy of our state.

The next few years will be critical ones for agriculture. Our industry has made this the best fed nation in this World, with the consumer spending a smaller percentage of his spendable dollar for food each year, in fact, a decline from 26 percent twenty years ago to 17 percent today. Agriculture can afford this subsidization of consumers only if its farmers, too, share in the fruits of their efforts.

PRESCHOOL CENTERS SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, together with Congresswoman MINK and several other distinguished colleagues, I have today introduced two bills which afford vast educational opportunities to both child and teacher. The first of these two measures provides Federal funds for improving the education service in public and private nonprofit child day care centers.

Under this legislation, day care centers, which now furnish primarily custodial care, would be expanded and equipped to provide a basic educational foundation for preschool children. This is essentially the function of the Headstart program, which has operated with increasing success since its inception 5 years ago. This measure would supplement Headstart by extending the opportunities for preschool education to those children not presently eligible because the income of their parents is greater than the limitation imposed by the Federal Government.

So many of our young people today are hampered in their ability to learn simply because they have not received a good foundation at the preschool level. Education is the cornerstone of advancement in our society, and although this legislation would not reach every one of our children, it would grant increased opportunities to many more of our youngsters.

Entitled the "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act," the bill would authorize \$300,000,000 yearly for distribution to the participating States who in turn would allocate the funds to child day care centers selected by a designated State agency.

At the other end of the spectrum, I have introduced a bill to provide funds for the continuing education of our professional teachers in the elementary and secondary levels through the establishment of study grants to selected teachers on sabbatical leave from their classrooms. With the tremendous strides made in elementary, secondary, and graduate education in recent years, it is only appropriate that progressive programs be made available to our Nation's teachers. Unfortunately circumstances often tend to impede our educators from continuing their quest for learning. This bill encourages experi-

enced teachers to supplement their education and practical classroom experience by providing them with a 12-month paid sabbatical grant once every 7 years.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have vigorously supported educational assistance on all levels and I firmly believe that we should extend this assistance to our teachers. It is essential that our educators have ample opportunity to profit from the continuous innovations in teaching curriculum and methodology and the rapid changes occurring in all areas of learning. When our teachers profit, our students profit, and our country reaps the largest profit of all.

GONZALEZ REINTRODUces BILLS TO CURB WAR PROFITEERING

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I reintroduced two pieces of legislation which are greatly needed to better protect our tax dollar from war profiteering. I am pleased that joining me as a cosponsor of these bills is my colleague from California, Mr. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

Few American citizens in this day and age give second thoughts to announcements that their Government is spending millions of dollars for another piece of military hardware. Most assume this is what it costs to keep our defenses strong. But such an assumption is probably false. The 40-plus billions of tax dollars that are being awarded for prime military contracts is what the Government pays for military hardware, by no means what it costs to produce that hardware. The truth is we have little idea how much it costs defense contractors to supply goods and services; we only know how much we are paying. It is the position of Adm. Hyman Rickover, who built our nuclear Navy, that the Defense Department is generally paying more to the domestic contractor than his legitimate costs and a fair profit would warrant.

Perhaps the most disturbing question I have encountered in trying to determine the true costs of defense hardware is whether the Department of Defense has the will to get value received for tax dollars spent. The Department of Defense sticks to a shaky position that profits on defense contracts are declining—even with the Vietnam buildup and even to the point that crucially important defense suppliers are going broke.

That the Defense Department would blithely continue to hold this position files in the face of our historic experience with wartime defense buying. All documentation shows that American defense contractors always make higher profits during the chaos and rush of wartime than they make in peacetime.

Specifically, Department of Defense officials are ignoring the best available evidence that profits on Vietnam procurement are rising significantly. The

latest bit of evidence lies in the report issued last month by the Renegotiation Board that they are experiencing an "exceptional upswing" in potential cases of excessive profits on Government contracts.

For the Department of Defense to admit that profits are rising would be to admit increased opportunities for profiteering, and would require at least entertaining the idea that procurement controls should be improved.

If the Department of Defense would say "we can't be bothered" by how much war profiteering exists, it would be most refreshing. But "unconcern" does not seem a very accurate description. It appears that certain defense officials are actively suppressing evidence of profiteering. John M. McGee, for example, was a petroleum inspector in Thailand until he claimed that the United States lost in theft at least 5.5 million gallons of petroleum products in 1967 due to bribery, forgery and Government laxity. He was transferred, although the General Accounting Office has substantiated his charges.

I stated that the Department of Defense is ignoring the best available evidence that profiteering is increasing. I do not claim that all studies are ignored by the Department of Defense, however. Those studies which discount rising profits are cited, no matter how suspect or slant they may be.

Nor do I claim that the studies and examples I have pointed to time and time again are anything more than the best available evidence. They are not conclusive, for the simple reason that nobody in or out of Government can say with authority what profits are being made on defense work. Meaningful figures have never been gathered. On half the defense contracts, no cost or profit data on the completed contract is required. And data from those types of contracts which require realized cost and profit figures are not reliable, to my mind, for they are susceptible to a variety of accounting tricks by those who might wish to disguise profits as costs.

I am reintroducing my resolution which would establish a special House committee to conduct a full and complete investigation of our military procurement. I do so because many dark recesses abound. It is impossible to determine just how much profiteering is going on. I believe the indications of increased profiteering are clear calls for creditable information. We must know the extent and methods of profiteering before we can prescribe a cure. It is my personal belief that the individual examples of profiteering which have surfaced are just the tips of icebergs—that the bulk of profiteering is still hidden below chilling waters.

I am also reintroducing my bill to strengthen the Renegotiation Board. It is the same bill I sponsored in the 90th Congress. Although Congress extended the Renegotiation Act last year, my bill still remains valid, for we only tightened renegotiation in one minor instance. It was a significant instance, however, if only symbolically. It was the first time since renegotiation was established un-

der the present Board in 1951 that Congress had not restricted and debilitated the powers of the Board in amending its charter. Also, the Board was extended for 3 years, instead of the usual two.

However, the Board should be made permanent, as my bill provides. The reasons are simple:

First. As the only independent agency which is single mindedly patrolling defense profits, it is doing a vital job efficiently and effectively. In the last fiscal year, the Board affected the return to the Treasury of \$39 million in excessive profits on Government contracts on total operating expenses of \$2.6 million.

Second. The Board will always have a job to do. It is doubtful that the defense budget will ever drop below \$70 billion a year. We have all heard reports of the weapons systems which are jammed up in the pipeline waiting for a drop in the involvement in Vietnam to release funds for them.

My bill would also restore the Renegotiation Board to its Korean war strength in 5 years. This would be recognition that we have been spending more on Vietnam than we did in the most expensive Korean year. I am confident the Board would be no less effective in rooting out excessive profits with restored, expanded jurisdiction. I explained my amendments in detail last year. For anyone who is interested, I am requesting unanimous consent that a list of my remarks on this subject be included at the end of this statement.

Admiral Rickover believes the activities of the Renegotiation Board should be further strengthened and expanded beyond the scope of my bill. He suggests that the Board review every contract over \$100,000 on a contract by contract basis, and that instead of lumping together all a contractor's work for fiscal year renegotiation, that groupings of sales with similar cost and profit requirements be renegotiated together.

Here is an example of the situation Admiral Rickover seeks to prevent. One of the Nation's largest defense contractors negotiated for a propulsion turbine for an aircraft carrier. The company demanded profits of 25 percent of the contract, although they had agreed to profits of 10 percent on an earlier turbine. Also, they claimed their costs would nearly double in the 6 years from the first contract. But in violation of the law, the company refused to certify that their cost estimates were "accurate, complete, and current." In effect, they refused to say their cost estimates were honest, or whether the costs were inflated in order to hide extra profits above and beyond the 25 percent written into the contract. Because the company was really the sole source supplier of an engine needed to power a ship for Vietnam, an Assistant Secretary of the Navy was forced to sign a waiver of the cost certification provision of the Truth in Negotiations Act. To me, this is just a sophisticated type of extortion.

This company is home free with an undetermined profit from the taxpayer. No law can touch them. The company is large enough that it must submit for renegotiation on a total, fiscal year basis.

But this only means the company will use the low profit it makes on the millions of electrical components it sells to the Government to mask the millions in profits it made on the turbine. Admiral Rickover proposes to renegotiate large contracts by themselves, and not lump mass produced switches with custom turbines.

I endorse the Rickover proposals, but I am not introducing them as legislation. I do not believe they have a chance of enactment at present. I could only get a minor part of my more modest changes accepted last year when the charter of the Renegotiation Board had to be extended. I do not detect sufficient interest, in an off year, for any strengthening of renegotiation. Further, the sharp departure from fiscal year renegotiation would in itself stir up controversy. These are the realities as I see them, cruel as they may be to the American taxpayer.

It is difficult to gain support for the Board. Fiscal year renegotiation and the statutory requirements of determining what constitutes excessive profits cannot be explained in a few words. Also, the legal structures that a filing with the Board be as strictly confidential as an income tax report mean that few examples of the Board's work are evident. Only in those few cases when a contractor appeals a Board determination to the U.S. Tax Court have details on their work become known, and only in relation to contracts awarded years earlier.

The Board is so generally unappreciated that it is understaffed. Failure of Congress to give the Board an exemption from the Revenue Expenditure and Control Act of 1968 means the Board will have fewer employees to police an increasing workload of Vietnam contracts.

I believe it is a tragedy that renegotiation languishes. The Board is an independent agency free from any taint of collusion with privileged contractors and free from self-serving denials that no profiteering exists. In addition, the Board is imminently fair to the contractors, for those who have appealed the amount of the Board's determination of excessive profits amount to less than 3 percent of the total who file.

I am reintroducing my bill to strengthen the Renegotiation Board in the belief it is fully capable of efficiently protecting more of the taxpayers' dollars from profiteering.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the list of my remarks on profiteering, under unanimous consent I include here an article on the Renegotiation Board by Mr. William Wyant of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE HENRY B. GONZALEZ IN THE DAILY CONGRESSIONAL RECORD CONCERNING THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD, AND WAR PROFITEERING

1966

Mar. 14, page 5513; Sep. 28, page 23218ff.

1967

Jan. 17, page H2733ff; Sep. 14, page H11962ff; Oct. 10, page H13191; Oct. 11, page H13319;

Oct. 12, page H13363; Oct. 17, page H13546ff.

Oct. 18, page H13671; Oct. 19, page H13739;

Oct. 20, page H13773; Nov. 30, page H16122ff;

Dec. 11, page H16635ff.

1968

Jan. 16, Cleveland Plain Dealer Favors Gonzalez Renegotiation Bill, H72-H76.

Jan. 22, Congressmen Vanik and Feighan Introduce Gonzalez Renegotiation Bill, H195-H199.

Jan. 31, Cleveland Plain-Dealer Urges Hearings On Gonzalez Renegotiation Bill, H672.

Feb. 21, Bill To Strengthen Renegotiation Board, H1274-H1275.

Mar. 12, Renegotiation Board Hearings, H1853-H1857.

Apr. 9, Future Of Renegotiation Board, H2716-H2718.

Apr. 29, Admlral Rickover Endorses the Renegotiation Board, E3480-E3481.

May 8, Debate on Renegotiation Board appropriations, H3499.

May 10, The Nation's Press Reports On The Renegotiation Board, E4074-E4077.

May 27, Debate on H.R. 17324 amending the Renegotiation Act, H4288-H4289, H4292-H4296.

May 28, Gonzalez Calls For Special Committee To Investigate War Profiteering, H4369-H4372.

June 4, Debate on H.R. 17268 amending the Defense Production Act, H4509, H4511-H4515.

June 19, Gonzalez Testifies On War Profits And The Defense Production Act, E5608-E5609.

July 16, Alarm About War Profiteering, H6763-H6764.

July 22, The GAO On Excessive Profit Determinations Of The Renegotiation Board, H7197-H7202.

Aug. 2, Gonzalez Refutes Secretary Of Defense On War Profiteering, H8162-H8165.

Aug. 29, Praise for Representative Charles Vanik's Fight to Curb War Profiteering, E7605-E7606; Growing Threat Of Our Military-Industrial Complex, E7617-E7622.

Sept. 5, Defense Profits: Are They Declining or Rising?, E7709-E7710.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 4, 1968]

CLAMOR GROWS FOR DAMPER ON PROFITS ON WAR GOODS

(By William K. Wyant Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 4.—Lawrence E. Hartwig, chairman of the Renegotiation Board, is a mild-mannered lawyer from Michigan who has been laboring since 1951 to keep contractors from gorging themselves at the federal honey-pot.

Hartwig's board, which has the task of slicing excessive profits from defense and other contracts, has been so starved by Congress and kicked around by industry that it could be called the Oliver Twist of Government agencies.

With a heavy load of Vietnam war procurement coming up for review, Hartwig has only 175 persons on his team. He has managed to pry loose authority to hire 27 more. However, in 1953, at the time of the Korean war, the board had 742 members.

Yet defense contract awards reflecting Vietnam sales past the peak for South Korea in fiscal 1967, reaching 44.6 billion dollars against 43.6 for 1952, the highest Korean year. For fiscal 1968, ended last summer, the figure was 43.8, a slight drop but still higher than the Korean maximum.

Hartwig, a 62-year-old Phi Beta Kappa member who plays golf when he gets a chance, was glad to get the extra 27 and a \$400,000 budget increase this year, bringing the board up to \$3,000,000. In 1953 and 1954, the budget was above \$5,000,000 annually but that was before Congress clipped the board's wings.

It is expected that as the big Vietnam spending comes home to roost—the build-up started in 1965 and there is a time lag of about two years—Hartwig will seek a substantial increase in force and more money for the 1970 period.

As things are, the backlog of unfinished negotiation cases has increased ominously. The carry-over in fiscal 1966, before Vietnam, was only 464 cases. In 1967 it jumped to 678 and in 1968, just ended, to 938. The estimate for the current year is 1263.

Hartwig, who has been with the Government since the early 1940's was named to the Renegotiation Board by President Harry S. Truman when it was organized after the outbreak of the Korean War. President John F. Kennedy designated him chairman in 1961.

The board is charged with reviewing the "reasonableness" of costs and profits not only in defense contracts but those of the Maritime Administration, the Federal Maritime Board, the General Services Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

There is no rule of thumb for what is reasonable. Contractors whose negotiable sales in the fiscal year total \$1,000,000 or more must file reports, much in the way they file annual returns with the Internal Revenue Service.

More than 80 per cent of the filings are quickly cleared as satisfactory. In fiscal 1968 the board had 4552 filings and assigned 827 cases to its two regional boards for further investigation. If a contractor disagrees with a finding of excessive profits, he may go to the United States Tax Court for relief.

Hartwig prefers the gentlemanly, reasonable approach. It is a matter of pride with him that the board is able to work out agreements with contractors most of the time. In 1963, for example, the board got agreement in 27 of its 46 excessive profit cases and had to issue a unilateral order in only 19. The orders become final if the contractors do not go to court.

The board blew the whistle on \$23,069,148 in excessive profits in fiscal 1968, compared with \$15,980,214 the previous year, but under federal law—just as in the case of the Internal Revenue Service—the names of the companies that will have to pay up are not disclosed unless they choose to make a legal fight.

The Renegotiation Board determined that McDonnell Aircraft Corp. of St. Louis, now McDonnell Douglas Corp., realized excessive profits of \$8,000,000 in 1965. McDonnell challenged the finding in court, and for that reason the issue became public knowledge.

From 1953 through 1968, the board made determinations of excessive profits totaling \$975,508,785. Of that total, \$682,230,000—about 70 per cent—was recouped by agreement and orders had to be issued on \$286,980,000.

Hartwig has pointed out that the board has had to issue only 399 orders to recoup from contractors, and only 152 of those went to the Tax Court. Through last June 30, the court had disposed of 120 of the 152 appeals. The board's decision was upheld in 72 cases, revised upward in six, and scaled down in 42.

Not only has the board been getting back about \$18 for each dollar it spends, through its own redeterminations, but the voluntary refunds and voluntary price reductions reported by contractors in connection with renegotiation proceedings have brought savings estimated at more than 1.3 billion dollars.

These statistics have been cited as eloquent testimony of the board's effectiveness and its tendency to use reason in dealing with industry. However, the board's recoupments in recent years have been less than one tenth of 1 per cent of negotiable sales to the Government.

Over the years, the Renegotiation Board has been enfeebled by congressional actions that diminished its jurisdiction and authority. Congress has not been willing to make the board a permanent agency, even though renegotiation statutes go back to World War

II, during which more than 11 billion dollars in excess profits was salvaged.

Hartwig pressed this year for "indefinite" status, avoiding the word "permanent." Congress extended the act for three years only. The trouble with this is that it exposes the agency to attack when its lease on life is up for renewal, and makes it tougher to recruit high-quality personnel.

Again in 1966—an evil year for the board—Congress raised the "floor" under which the board cannot look for unreasonable profits to \$1,000,000. It was originally \$250,000 and had been raised to \$500,000 in 1954. The purpose of raising the floor ostensibly was to help small business.

What has done more than anything else to pare the board's size has been the successive elevations in the "floor" and the broadening by Congress, in 1956 and other years, of the act's provisions making "standard commercial articles" exempt from renegotiation.

Hartwig tried to get the commercial exemptions eliminated this year and did manage to have the restrictions eased. These exempt transactions, which the board cannot look at, amount to several billions a year and have escalated more than a billion dollars in the Vietnam period.

A veteran public servant who has managed to survive under four Presidents and now has a fifth coming up, Hartwig is not the type who leads cavalry charges. He is a thoughtful man who reads Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes and Lafcadio Hearn. He tries to do the best he can with the legislation he has.

Champions of a stronger Renegotiation Board and a tougher environment for war profiteers are getting louder. Among them are Senator William Proxmire (Dem.), Wisconsin, Representative Henry B. Gonzalez (Dem.), Texas, and V. Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

These critics are challenging Secretary of Defense Clark M. Clifford's statement that profits on defense procurement have gone down rather than up. The fact is, Rickover says, that profits have gone up by 25 per cent and accounting methods are so loose "we simply don't know what we are doing."

There is increasing clamor that nothing short of a full-scale congressional inquiry will get the answers and bring needed action. A World War II B-17 bomber cost \$218,000 and its modern counterpart costs \$7,000,000. A World War II attack submarine cost \$4,700,000, its 1968 sequel costs \$77,000,000.

In a defense complex where \$1,000,000 is chicken feed, such escalation of costs promotes an uneasy feeling that there is a great deal more waste, mismanagement and chicanery than has come to light.

MR. MAGEE'S THOUGHTS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. JACOBS, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the views of Mr. Eugene Magee, of Indianapolis, Ind. I believe Mr. Magee's thoughts contain a great deal of merit and would be of interest to all Members:

DECEMBER 7, 1968.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I listened intently to your television presentation to an answer to youth education and development and I think you are on the right path. However, I feel you are overlooking the real cause of our youth problems.

Did it ever occur to you that the greatest means of education to our youth has been withheld from them, with our modern methods of production.

In Europe and in early America we have or had no juvenile delinquency, because the son played around his father's work bench and by the time he was 18 years old, he knew his father's trade and was filling his father's shoes. He had a purpose in life and would improve on it.

Today, a man goes to work in a factory. When he enters the factory grounds at the gate, the son is separated from the father and his association and education that his father could give him stops there. The son goes his way without purpose and see what we are paying for that separation.

I am aware that insurance companies' policies frown on such practices, and have a tremendous force on companies to keep people off their grounds, not employed by them, but is it going to solve the youth problem?

I would like to hear from you about the number of carpenters, that run small shops, where the sons can frequent, that have delinquency problems or any tradesman that can work with his son.

We are losing our greatest motive for education "show the old man I can do a better job than he can," that challenge is in youth and we are losing it. Let's get rid of that fence around a factory.

EUGENE J. MAGEE,
Indianapolis, Ind.

STARVATION IN NIGERIA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with a number of my colleagues in the House and Senate in cosponsoring a resolution which calls for a significant increase in the American contribution to efforts directed at saving lives presently threatened by starvation in Nigeria.

Like many other people in this country and around the world, I have watched the civil strife in Nigeria with a growing sense of horror and disbelief: horror at the rising death toll from starvation, variously estimated as high as 12,000 a day; and disbelief at the seeming callousness of the leaders of both Nigeria and Biafra and of a number of other governments which have either remained indifferent to the extent of human suffering or, in some cases, have actively fanned the flames of war. For authorities in Nigeria and Biafra, mass hunger has too often been viewed first and foremost as a military or political weapon rather than a human tragedy. For the principal arms suppliers to both sides—the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom for Nigeria and France for Biafra—political interests have taken priority over concern for the fate of the Biafran people. And for the United States—potentially perhaps the most powerful influence for peace in this conflict—political niceties have at times been put ahead of saving lives.

It is true that the United States has scrupulously refrained from furnishing arms to either side. It is also true that our Government has appealed publicly and privately to both sides to resolve their differences through peaceful nego-

tiation. And it is also true that the American contribution to relief efforts already exceeds \$26 million, represents about two-thirds of the global total, and was recently expanded further by the provision of eight additional planes to be used in airlifting food to the Biafran people. These are all praiseworthy actions. Yet in the face of continuing civil war and a steadily growing death toll from starvation, can we in good conscience argue that we have done all that should have been done?

Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the complexity of the political problems involved in this tragic situation. This is, after all, a civil war, in which there is a natural, and recently reinforced, reluctance to intervene in any way. It is a conflict for which the appropriate regional organization, the Organization of African Unity, has been attempting to find a peaceful settlement. And, of course, leaders on both sides of the struggle have put an incredible series of obstacles in the path of those who have sought to offer humanitarian assistance. The Nigerians have balked at air delivery of needed foodstuffs, fearing that an airlift would provide cover for greater arms deliveries to their Biafran foes. And Biafran leaders have objected to deliveries by land, fearing that Nigerian armies would follow relief convoys or that the foodstuffs themselves might be poisoned.

In these circumstances, it has been all too easy to find excuses for not taking action, excuses which are valid but totally insufficient in the face of the Nigerian tragedy. Concerned lest even humanitarian aid influence the outcome of this internal conflict, we went through months of labyrinthine negotiations on relief procedures while uncounted thousands of Biafrans, mostly children, died of starvation or were permanently crippled by deficiency diseases. Fearful of causing offense to the Nigerians, or the Biafrans, or the OAU, or the British, we have refrained from bringing the immense moral and political pressure of the United States to bear on the contending parties and their external backers in an effort to secure a negotiated end of the slaughter.

Mr. Speaker, I for one do not believe that we have met our full responsibility in dealing with the tragedy of Nigeria and Biafra. It is for that reason that I welcome, and wholeheartedly join, this initiative by my colleagues to stimulate a prompt and substantial increase in U.S. efforts to ameliorate the suffering caused by hunger in this troubled land. It is for that same reason that I hope this country will, in the days immediately ahead, apply its formidable persuasive powers to the Nigerian and Biafran leaders and to the nations still fueling the conflict with fresh supplies of arms, and will urge upon them the human necessity of bringing this terrible war to a swift and peaceful conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the resolution which has been introduced today:

H. CON. RES. 97

Whereas reliable reports indicate that there is a tragic loss of life in the Nigerian Civil War caused by starvation and disease in areas

controlled by the Federal Government and under the control of the "Biafran" authorities;

Whereas present relief operations are inhibited by poor roads, bad weather, inadequate transport, and the inaccessibility of certain areas to overland supplies; and

Whereas increased shipments of food and medical supplies are needed to reduce the tragic rate of starvation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense of the Congress that the President should act to increase significantly the amount of surplus food stocks and relief moneys as well as the number of aircraft and other vehicles of transportation as may be necessary for relief purposes to the Organization of African Unity, the International Committee of the Red Cross, or other suitable religious and charitable relief agencies now or hereafter operating in the area with the consent of the responsible authorities; and this material should be made available at the request of the participating agencies; and (2) the Government of the United States should solicit the cooperation of other nations in this humanitarian effort.

DO NOT ELIMINATE YOUTH FARES ON NATION'S AIRLINES

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the Washington Post yesterday that Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Arthur S. Present has issued a decision eliminating youth fares on the Nation's airlines. In my opinion, this is a bad decision that will benefit no one. I urge my colleagues in the Congress to join with me in seeking CAB action to rescind Examiner Present's decision.

For the information of my colleagues, I include my letter to Board Chairman John H. Crooker, Jr., in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1969.

Mr. JOHN H. CROOKER,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Universal Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CROOKER: Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "Prudence and justice are the compatible format necessary to formulate any dictate of society."

I write to you today to voice my strong objection to Examiner Arthur S. Present's decision regarding airline youth fares. I request that this ruling be reviewed and urge that it be reversed. This decision is not prudent justice, but justice run wild.

Mr. Present's charge that low cost fares for young persons discriminates against passengers over 21 fails to give proper consideration to the important fact that these young people are flying on a "space available" basis—if they did not purchase half-fare tickets, the seats would go vacant.

Prudent justice in this situation, in my opinion, would be influenced by the fact that most passengers over 21 are restricted by personal demands or schedule from flying space available; that a change to include all age groups in the standby fares would mean havoc for the reservation system; that the revenue loss resulting from elimination of the existing regulations could mean increased fares for all passengers; and that present youth fares contribute substantially to the cause of education.

The youth fare seems to me to have been a bright spot in a world that generally discriminates against young people. Insurance rates are twice as high for the individual 20 or 24 years old even if he is the safest driver in the Nation. (Statistics, you might say, justify higher rates because this category of drivers is accident prone. I submit statistics would also bear out my contention that people under 21 are less able to afford air travel. Is this not comparable justification for lower air fares on a standby basis?)

Persons under 21 cannot vote; persons under 25 cannot serve in the Congress; persons under 62 cannot receive Social Security retirement benefits; persons under 35 cannot be President of the United States; persons over 21 cannot enter our military academies; persons over 18 cannot serve as pages in the U.S. Congress. In each of these examples, certain age discrimination factors are involved.

I do not argue that all of these regulations should be changed. There are prudent considerations to support some of them. I do argue that there is equally prudent support for retention of the student fares.

We must, as a Nation, do all we can to encourage young people to educate themselves. Our government has acted in the last ten years to improve our education system and has spent billions of dollars in this cause. On the local level, all of us have seen examples of special prices to encourage young people to attend cultural events. The special youth fare has been an important factor in allowing young people to travel to institutions of higher learning. They also enable them to travel home more frequently to be with their families.

Further, travel alone is a form of education and I am certain many thousands of young Americans—students and non-students—have been enabled by the youth fare to see much more of their country. Surely, thousands have come to their Nation's capital who would otherwise have been unable to do so.

I ask you: What does prudence dictate in this decision?

Does it not tell us that thousands of our young people will once again turn to hitchhiking—a practice both illegal and dangerous?

Does it not tell us that young people will choose to crowd inadequate vehicles for exhausting trips on already overcrowded highways, straining their reflexes and health to make long trips as quickly as possible to reduce expenses?

Does it not tell us that Examiner Present's decision will be of benefit to no one?

Our young citizens have benefited from the current fares, and it has not been at the expense of adult, full-fare passengers because space available seats are empty seats.

Finally, strict, imprudent application of the non-discrimination ruling would threaten half-fare tickets for youngsters between 2 and 12 years of age (reservations can be made for these tickets), for military personnel, and for several other special fare categories now properly and prudently provided by our airlines.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress.

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

My reason was primarily my faith in

the education and maturity of our young people. But I am increasingly impressed by another factor—their political sophistication.

In Minnesota several young peoples' organizations—including the Young Democrats, College Republicans, Teenage Republicans, Minnesota Student Association, and Student Minnesota Education Association—have formed the Coalition for Lowering the Voting Age. The coalition is actively lobbying at the State legislature and with congressional delegation for State and Federal constitutional amendments lowering the voting age to 18.

I would like to give my encouragement and praise to the members of the coalition. They are demonstrating responsible citizenship.

The executive board of the coalition includes Gerry Sikorski, Sue Kline, Eileen Lach, and Bob Vorpahl from the Young Democrats, Jack Stone, John Tschohl, and Andee Ottum from the College Republicans, Paul Fogelberg from the Teenage Republicans, Wayne Gilbert from the Minnesota Student Association, and Michael Pelehr from the Student Minnesota Education Association.

Recently the Minneapolis Star gave editorial encouragement to the coalition. I enter that editorial at this point in the RECORD.

LOWER THE VOTING AGE?

Organization of a bipartisan Coalition for Lowering the Voting Age, which met with Gov. LeVander and which intends to lobby for a constitutional amendment to give Minnesota 18-year-olds the right to vote, is perhaps the best argument for the change.

It illustrates the growing political maturity, involvement, and skill among young people. The young adults who met with LeVander were, from all accounts, a credit to their parents, their schools and their state. As a matter of fact, youthful participation is a major aspect of today's politics, from extreme right to extreme left.

There are many socio-economic reasons for this, but the older generation can take pride at least in one, and that is the fact that education has improved. So apart from the maturing social and psychological factors that stem from the nonacademic world these days, the high school graduate has a chance for education that prepares him to be a responsible citizen. Whether he is headed for college or not—and it should be remembered that a majority of high school graduates do not go to college—high school graduation is the practical dividing point as far as the average 18-year-old is concerned. Draft eligibility, of course, may account for part of this psychological reaction.

The judgment about the relation between "maturity" and age has to be arbitrary, of course. Some people, we fear, never seem to grow up. There is, however, nothing magic about age 21 as such in the law, or in fact. Depending upon the subject matter and the level of government involved, age limitations vary all over the lot.

NOT YOURS TO GIVE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine recently sent me an article which I believe every Member of

this House will want to read. Our country is facing a financial crisis. Inflation is increasing. Taxes have been raised and we are being asked to extend the surtax. We have before us a budget of nearly \$200 billion. As we prepare to collect taxes and then spend those tax dollars, I think every Member should read this story from the life of Congressman David Crockett.

The article follows:

NOT YOURS TO GIVE

(NOTE.—From *The Life of Colonel David Crockett*, compiled by Edward S. Ellis (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1884).)

One day in the House of Representatives, a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches had been made in its support. The Speaker was just about to put the question when Crockett arose:

"Mr. Speaker—I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased and as much sympathy for the sufferings of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every member upon this floor knows it. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due the deceased. Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war; he was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that the government was in arrears to him.

"Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest corruption, appropriate this money as the payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity. Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money of our own as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give one week's pay to the object, and if every member of Congress will do the same, it will amount to more than the bill asks."

He took his seat. Nobody replied. The bill was put upon its passage, and instead of passing unanimously, as was generally supposed, and as, no doubt, it would, but for that speech, it received but few votes, and, of course, was lost.

Later, when asked by a friend why he had opposed the appropriation, Crockett gave this explanation:

"Several years ago I was one evening standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other members of Congress, when our attention was attracted by a great light over in Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. We jumped into a hack and drove over as fast as we could. In spite of all that could be done, many houses were burned and many families made homeless, and, besides, some of them had lost all but the clothes they had on. The weather was very cold, and when I saw so many women and children suffering, I felt that something ought to be done for them. The next morning a bill was introduced appropriating \$20,000 for their relief. We put aside all other business and rushed it through as soon as it could be done.

"The next summer, when it began to be time to think about the election, I concluded I would take a scout around among the boys of my district. I had no opposition there, but, as the election was some time off, I did not know what might turn up. When riding one day in a part of my district in which I was more of a stranger than any other, I saw a man in a field plowing and

coming toward the road. I gauged my gait so that we should meet as he came to the fence. As he came up, I spoke to the man. He replied politely, but, as I thought, rather coldly.

"I began: 'Well, friend, I am one of those unfortunate bells called candidates, and—'
 "'Yes, I know you; you are Colonel Crockett. I have seen you once before, and voted for you the last time you were elected. I suppose you are out electioneering now, but you had better not waste your time or mine. I shall not vote for you again.'

"This was a sockdolager. . . I begged him to tell me what was the matter.

"Well, Colonel, it is hardly worth-while to waste time or words upon it. I do not see how it can be mended, but you gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have not capacity to understand the Constitution, or that you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case you are not the man to represent me. But I beg your pardon for expressing it in that way. I did not intend to avail myself of the privilege of the constituent to speak plainly to a candidate for the purpose of insulting or wounding you. I intend by it only to say that your understanding of the Constitution is very different from mine; and I will say to you what, but for my rudeness, I should not have said, that I believe you to be honest. . . . But an understanding of the Constitution different from mine I cannot overlook, because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred, and rigidly observed in all its provisions. The man who wields power and misinterprets it is the more dangerous the more honest he is."

"I admit the truth of all you say, but there must be some mistake about it, for I do not remember that I gave any vote last winter upon any constitutional question."

"No, Colonel, there's no mistake. Though I live here in the backwoods and seldom go from home, I take the papers from Washington and read very carefully all the proceedings of Congress. My papers say that last winter you voted for a bill to appropriate \$20,000 to some sufferers by a fire in Georgetown. Is that true?"

"Well, my friend, I may as well own up. You have got me there. But certainly nobody will complain that a great and rich country like ours should give the insignificant sum of \$20,000 to relieve its suffering women and children, particularly with a full and overflowing Treasury, and I am sure, if you had been there, you would have done just as I did."

"It is not the amount, Colonel, that I complain of; it is the principle. In the first place, the government ought to have in the Treasury no more than enough for its legitimate purposes. But that has nothing to do with the question. The power of collecting and disbursing money at pleasure is the most dangerous power that can be entrusted to man, particularly under our system of collecting revenue by tariff, which reaches every man in the country, no matter how poor he may be, and the poorer he is the more he pays in proportion to his means. What is worse, it presses upon him without his knowledge where the weight centers, for there is not a man in the United States who can ever guess how much he pays to the government. So you see, that while you are contributing to relieve one, you are drawing it from thousands who are even worse off than he. If you had the right to give anything, the amount was simply a matter of discretion with you, and you had as much right to give \$20,000,000 as \$20,000. If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all; and, as the Constitution neither defines charity nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to any and everything which you may believe, or profess to believe, is a charity, and to any amount you may think proper. You will very easily perceive what a

wide door this would open for fraud and corruption and favoritism, on the one hand, and for robbing the people on the other. No, Colonel, Congress has no right to give charity. Individual members may give as much of their own money as they please, but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. If twice as many houses had been burned in this county as in Georgetown, neither you nor any other member of Congress would have thought of appropriating a dollar for our relief. There are about two hundred and forty members of Congress. If they had shown their sympathy for the sufferers by contributing each one week's pay, it would have made over \$13,000. There are plenty of wealthy men in and around Washington who could have given \$20,000 without depriving themselves of even a luxury of life. The congressmen chose to keep their own money, which, if reports be true, some of them spend not very creditably; and the people about Washington, no doubt, applauded you for relieving them from the necessity of giving by giving what was not yours to give. The people have delegated to Congress, by the Constitution, the power to do certain things. To do these, it is authorized to collect and pay moneys, and for nothing else. Everything beyond this is usurpation, and a violation of the Constitution.

"So you see, Colonel, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point. It is a precedent fraught with danger to the country, for when Congress once begins to stretch its power beyond the limits of the Constitution, there is no limit to it, and no security for the people. I have no doubt you acted honestly, but that does not make it any better, except as far as you are personally concerned, and you see that I cannot vote for you."

"I tell you I felt streaked. I saw if I should have opposition, and this man should go to talking, he would set others to talking, and in that district I was a gone fawn-skin. I could not answer him, and the fact is, I was so fully convinced that he was right, I did not want to. But I must satisfy him, and I said to him:

"Well, my friend, you hit the nail upon the head when you said I had not sense enough to understand the Constitution. I intended to be guided by it, and thought I had studied it fully. I have heard many speeches in Congress about the powers of Congress, but what you have said here at your plow has got more hard, sound sense in it than all the fine speeches I ever heard. If I had ever taken the view of it that you have, I would have put my head into the fire before I would have given that vote; and if you will forgive me and vote for me again, if I ever vote for another unconstitutional law I wish I may be shot."

"He laughingly replied: 'Yes, Colonel, you have sworn to that once before, but I will trust you again upon one condition. You say that you are convinced that your vote was wrong. Your acknowledgement of it will do more good than beating you for it. If, as you go around the district, you will tell people about this vote, and that you are satisfied it was wrong, I will not only vote for you, but will do what I can to keep down opposition, and, perhaps, I may exert some little influence in that way.'

"If I don't," said I, "I wish I may be shot and to convince you that I am in earnest in what I say I will come back this way in a week or ten days, and if you will get up a gathering of the people, I will make a speech to them. Get up a barbecue, and I will pay for it."

"No, Colonel, we are not rich people in this section, but we have plenty of provisions to contribute for a barbecue, and some to spare for those who have none. The push of crops will be over in a few days, and we can then afford a day for a barbecue. This is Thursday; I will see to getting it up on Saturday week. Come to my house on Friday,

and we will go together, and I promise you a very respectable crowd to see and hear you."

"Well, I will be here. But one thing more before I say good-by. I must know your name."

"My name is Bunce."

"Not Horatio Bunce?"

"Yes."

"Well, Mr. Bunce, I never saw you before, though you say you have seen me, but I know you very well. I am glad I have met you, and very proud that I may hope to have you for my friend."

"It was one of the luckiest hits of my life that I met him. He mingled but little with the public, but was widely known for his remarkable intelligence and incorruptible integrity, and for a heart brimful and running over with kindness and benevolence, which showed themselves not only in words, but in action around him, and his fame had extended far beyond the circle of his immediate acquaintance. Though I had never met him before, I had heard much of him, and but for this meeting it is very likely I should have had opposition, and had been beaten. One thing is very certain, no man could now stand up in that district under such a vote."

"At the appointed time I was at his house, having told our conversation to every crowd I had met, and to every man I stayed all night with, and I found that it gave the people an interest and a confidence in me stronger than I had ever seen manifested before."

"Though I was considerably fatigued when I reached his house, and, under ordinary circumstances, should have gone early to bed, I kept him up until midnight, talking about the principles and affairs of government, and got more real, true knowledge of them than I had got all my life before."

"I have known and seen much of him since, for I respect him—no, that is not the word—I reverence and love him more than any living man, and I go to see him two or three times every year; and I will tell you, sir, if every one who professes to be a Christian lived and acted and enjoyed it as he does, the religion of Christ would take the world by storm."

"But to return to my story. The next morning we went to the barbecue, and, to my surprise, found about a thousand men there. I met a good many whom I had not known before, and they and my friend introduced me around until I had got pretty well acquainted—at least, they all knew me."

"In due time notice was given that I would speak to them. They gathered up around a stand that had been erected. I opened my speech by saying:

"Fellow-citizens—I present myself before you today feeling like a new man. My eyes have lately been opened to truths which ignorance or prejudice, or both, had heretofore hidden from my view. I feel that I can today offer you the ability to render you more valuable service than I have ever been able to render before. I am here today more for the purpose of acknowledging my error than to seek your votes. That I should make this acknowledgment is due to myself as well as to you. Whether you will vote for me is a matter for your consideration only."

"I went on to tell them about the fire and my vote for the appropriation and then told them why I was satisfied it was wrong. I closed by saying:

"And now, fellow-citizens, it remains only for me to tell you that the most of the speech you have listened to with so much interest was simply a repetition of the arguments by which your neighbor, Mr. Bunce, convinced me of my error."

"It is the best speech I ever made in my life, but he is entitled to the credit for it. And now I hope he is satisfied with his convert and that he will get up here and tell you so."

"He came upon the stand and said:

"Fellow-citizens—It affords me great pleasure to comply with the request of Colonel Crockett. I have always considered him a thoroughly honest man, and I am satisfied that he will faithfully perform all that he has promised you today."

"He went down, and there went up from that crowd such a shout for Davy Crockett as his name never called forth before."

"I am not much given to tears, but I was taken with a choking then and felt some big drops rolling down my cheeks. And I tell you now that the remembrance of those few words spoken by such a man, and the honest, hearty shout they produced, is worth more to me than all the honors I have received and all the reputation I have ever made, or ever shall make, as a member of Congress."

"Now, sir," concluded Crockett, "you know why I made that speech yesterday."

"There is one thing now to which I will call your attention. You remember that I supposed to give a week's pay. There are in that House many very wealthy men—men who think nothing of spending a week's pay, or a dozen of them, for a dinner or a wine party when they have something to accomplish by it. Some of those same men made beautiful speeches upon the great debt of gratitude which the country owed the deceased—a debt which could not be paid by money—and the insignificance and worthlessness of money, particularly so insignificant a sum as \$10,000, when weighed against the honor of the nation. Yet not one of them responded to my proposition. Money with them is nothing but brass when it is to come out of the people. But it is the one great thing for which most of them are striving, and many of them sacrifice honor, integrity, and justice to obtain it."

SPECIAL HEBREW PRAYER SERVICE FOR "PUEBLO" CREWMEMBERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the special Hebrew prayer service of deliverance conducted in San Diego by Naval Chaplain Garson Goodman for the U.S.S. *Pueblo* crewmembers of the Jewish faith.

It is ironic that the two Jewish sailors, Seaman Steven Paul Ellis and Communications Technician Steven Jay Robin, were reportedly fearful during their captivity of their Communist captors taking notice of their religion because of the current intensification of anti-Semitism in the Communist nations. The men were not able to display the "mezzuzah," a small parchment scroll contained in a religious medallion worn around one's neck as some Christians wear the cross as a symbol of their faith. The first request made by these men on the arrival in San Diego was for the symbol of their faith.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that not only were various other basic human rights denied the crewmembers of the *Pueblo* but such a climate of fear existed that religious expression of the Jewish sailors was inhibited.

Chaplain Goodman is to be commended for conducting the appropriate services in welcoming these men at a time when he was stricken with influenza and had to leave his sickbed.

REGAINING CONTROL OF THE SCHOOLS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News of today, January 23, ran a short editorial concerning the crisis of schools in New York City which could well be a foretaste of things to come in other cities. The editorial reads:

TRUE LIFE HORROR TALE

Beatings in the hallways, assaults on teachers and students, terrorism in the classroom. These, according to a report released Tuesday by the High School Principals Association of New York City, are as common a part of school life nowadays as reading, writing and arithmetic.

The principals blame militants, radicals and general hell-raisers for this sad state of affairs, and they fault the Board of Education for not curbing the troublemakers.

The board, according to the principals, has been more interested in keeping reports of disorders and worse from reaching the public eye. If so, the board did no more than the principals themselves in sweeping the unpleasantness under the rug until it became unmanageable.

Nonetheless, all parties owe it to the city and the students to act vigorously now and reassert their control over the schools.

On the same day, January 23, the Christian Science Monitor carried an article by Peter C. Stuart, entitled, "Turmoil in Schools Drives Out Teachers," which began with this lead:

The black-power and student-power tugs-of-war testing many American urban public schools are driving out teachers and administrators in alarming numbers—and scaring off potential recruits.

Accompanying the article was a graph of teacher resignations and retirements from 1964 through 1968 with this caption:

More than 1,800 New York teachers resigned last year. Another 800 retired, many early. Strikes, harassment, and the issue of neighborhood control of schools are cited among the causes. The teacher drain has hit other city school systems around the nation as well. And replacements are becoming increasingly hard to find.

Perhaps the example of New York City is not a truly representative one as the issue of decentralization has been an abrasive problem for some time. However, as the article indicates, other areas are experiencing difficulties in recruiting and keeping trained teaching personnel.

Here again, it would seem that the destructive permissive philosophy which permeates other segments of our society is, in the field of education, working against our best interests. Here again, as in other fields, a firm hand in enforcing the law is basic to the alleviation of this problem. Both school and municipal authorities will have to crack down hard if our public school systems are to serve their educational functions.

I include the article "Turmoil in Schools Drives Out Teachers," from the Christian Science Monitor of January 23, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

RESIGNATIONS CLIMB IN NEW YORK—TURMOL IN SCHOOLS DRIVES OUT TEACHERS (By Peter C. Stuart)

NEW YORK.—The black-power and student-power tugs-of-war testing many American urban public schools are driving out teachers and administrators in alarming numbers—and scaring off potential recruits.

Unless peace is restored, some educators warn, critical shortages of qualified personnel may follow in the years ahead.

The problem is most pronounced in New York, hardest hit by school strife. But similar troubles in other major American cities suggest a problem of national dimensions. Some school officials tend to soft-pedal the existence of any such problem. But others in the field, particularly leaders of school-employee unions, discuss it freely—and in urgent terms.

EXODUS GREW IN 1968

In New York, resignations and retirements of teachers and administrators jumped sharply in 1968 compared with the previous five years, reports the Council of Supervisory Associations, the school administrators' union. Resignations climbed more than 50 percent during embattled 1968 alone. Retirements—many of them early retirements—rose more than 20 percent.

Nationally, the exodus of experienced school personnel from troubled urban schools has become "a very difficult problem," according to George W. Jones, director of the National Education Association's Task Force for Urban Education.

Hard evidence is scarce, he explained, because people often do not disclose why they resign or retire. But the "feeling" that emerges in city after city is that teachers and administrators increasingly want to escape the social tensions at many urban schools, he said.

Besides New York, he said, the problem has surfaced in such cities as Washington, Detroit, and St. Louis.

In Philadelphia, Frank Sullivan, president of the teachers' union, said "community hostility toward teachers" is one reason why 5,200 vacancies opened during a recent 20-month period in the school system's staff of 12,500 teachers.

Two cases in New York indicate the kinds of pressures to which urban educators sometimes are subjected:

Julius Nislow, white principal of an elementary school in a predominantly black section of Brooklyn, last fall was blocked from his school by racial extremists. He and his family were threatened by letter. He went on "sick leave," then was reassigned to board-of-education headquarters.

Isidore S. Rosenman, white principal of Boys' High School in Brooklyn, was harassed by black students who provoked turmoil at the school. He, too, accepted a transfer to board-of-education headquarters.

The supervisors' union figures a total of 48 administrators have been reassigned by the board of education in this manner. Others have taken extended leaves of absence.

Teachers and administrators who resign often take jobs in the quieter suburban schools of Long Island, Westchester County, or New Jersey. But most leave the field of education entirely, according to spokesmen for the supervisors' union.

STEP-UP FORECAST

"We're losing some of our bright, young people," reported Walter J. Degnan, president of the Council of Supervisory Associations. "They won't put up with the pressures and harassment. Militants tell them not to come back and say they'll take care of them if they do."

He warned that the manpower drain would accelerate if the State Legislature approves a citywide decentralization proposal which would transfer most hiring authority to

neighborhood and school districts and abolish citywide qualifying examinations.

Mr. Degnan was asked if he foresaw critical personnel shortages.

"Worse than that," he replied. "This situation will destroy the public school system if it is allowed to continue. Furthermore, cities like Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit will follow if we fail."

Dan Sanders, press spokesman for New York's United Federation of Teachers, said the sharp rise in resignations and retirements has been accompanied by rank-and-file demands for easing retirement eligibility. He attributed it all to "unsafe" schools "filled with conflict."

"Recruiting is a problem, too," he said. "We're able to solve it temporarily by hiring young men looking for the draft exemption. But after the war is over, it will become a real problem."

COMPLEX GOVERNMENT DEMANDS STREAMLINING

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with 155 Members of this Chamber in sponsoring H.R. 3856, the Executive Reorganization and Management Improvement Act, and with 165 Members of the House in sponsoring H.R. 3861, the Program Information Act.

These two bills represent an effort to streamline and modernize government at all levels—a goal worthy of our attention at this period in history.

We have become a nation of 200 million people, but the individual has become an overwhelmed and sometimes forgotten member of our national operation.

As our problems and the challenges which confront our Nation grow more complex, our system of local, State, and Federal Government has grown more complex—at times a maze of redtape and regulations which can only be confronted by experts.

State and local governments, as well as public and private organizations, have turned to these "experts" for guidance in approaching the Federal bureaucracy. Lately, we have heard State and local governments criticized for developing bureaucracies which challenge the Federal Government in complexity.

At the present time there are more than 1,000 Federal aid programs—how many more no one seems able to accurately define.

The duplication, the lack of efficiency, and the amount of administrative waste are bemoaned but remain unchallenged.

The two bills which I have cosponsored would first, require annual publication of a catalog of all Federal programs and require the President to submit to the Congress recommendations for streamlining and simplifying these programs; and second, establish a Hoover-type commission to evaluate Federal programs, their effectiveness and the feasibility of proposed alternative or additional programs.

Mr. Speaker, in a time of unlimited problems and limited financial sources, we must strive for efficiency in Government. We must also rely more on the resourcefulness of State and local governments to meet these challenges.

These bills are designed not only to modernize and simplify the Federal bureaucracy but to make it easier for local government to assume more of the burden of domestic programs. This can be done by closing the "information gap" on Federal assistance programs and by making these programs more efficient and more effective.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 22, marked the 51st anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On January 22, 1918, a national council at Kiev bravely declared the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic.

The spirit of nationalism demonstrated by the Ukrainians on that historic occasion has prevailed time and time again during the ensuing years, and to this day, despite the cloud of communism which hangs over the Ukraine, these courageous people remain true to the principle of self-determination.

In 1776, America declared her right to determine her destiny, and then proceeded to fight a long and wearisome war to preserve and protect that privilege.

Today we are involved in a difficult struggle in Vietnam. Our young fighting men in the Armed Forces, as well as those of us back home who support them, are engaged in this conflict because we firmly believe in the conviction that all peoples have the right to determine the government that leads them.

We were truly fortunate, for we won our struggle for independence and today we enjoy the fruits of liberty and self-determination. But we have never forgotten the sacrifices we made to achieve our national purpose, and now our hearts go out to the gallant Ukrainians who seek to achieve the self-same goal which we claimed as our inherent right almost two centuries ago.

In my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, as well as all over the United States, thousands upon thousands of Ukrainian Americans have joined together in commemorating the 51st anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We are fortunate to have these wonderful people among our citizens, and it is, therefore, with great pride that I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in observing Ukrainian Independence Day.

I congratulate the Ukrainians on their steadfast efforts to regain their freedom and express my profound hope for peaceful liberation of the Ukrainian people.

WHAT THE NAVAL AIR RESERVE LEARNED FROM THE 1968 CALLUP

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House a short and important article by Rear Adm. W. S. Guest, U.S. Navy, commander, Naval Air Reserve, concerning the experiences during the 1968 call to active duty of Naval air reservists.

The Members will recall that we heard a great deal of criticism at the time concerning preparedness of reserve units and the attitude of individual reservists. Unfortunately, as happens in such cases, equipment and personnel problems were blown out of all proportions. In regards to the Naval Air Reserve, Admiral Guest's article sets the record straight, and the Naval Reserve Association has performed a valuable public service in publishing the article. The article appeared in the NRA News for January 1969. I particularly call the attention of the Members to the fact that of the 600 reservists called, only 17 applied for delay or deferment, and of these only three were actually granted.

The article follows:

One year ago this month, six Selected Naval Air Reserve squadrons were called to active duty.

Nine months later they were released.

During that time there were complaints and misinformation spread about the Naval Air Reserve. There were also some very important lessons learned. I'd like to discuss them here so that NRA members will be fully informed of the facts concerning this partial mobilization and thus be able to answer intelligently any criticisms they may hear from those who are uninformed about the matter.

The most important lesson learned by this call-up is that first-line aircraft and weapons systems are the key to having a fully-effective Naval Air Reserve. In any foreseeable contingency, as proven in past call-ups, immediate response is an all-important factor. There may not be enough time after recall to produce new aircraft and equipment. Therefore, the Naval Air Reserve must, on a continuing basis, be outfitted with aircraft that are capable of starting fleet operations in a matter of hours or a few days.

This would correct the current situation wherein our attack and fighter jet squadrons do not right now have first-line aircraft which could be used in combat, such as in Vietnam.

At the time of the January recall, the Navy with its austere inventory of aircraft, wasn't in a very good position to outfit recalled Reserve squadrons with first-line aircraft equipped with advanced weapons systems. But any contention that the Navy was not prepared to absorb the six squadrons is erroneous. It would be illogical to say that our Navy, with its heavy commitments worldwide, was unable to use additional squadrons gainfully. But the fact remains that extra attack and fighter aircraft just didn't exist in the fleet. So our Reserve squadrons had to await re-programming of fleet inventories to provide them with the types of VA/VF aircraft considered suitable for use in the current combat environment.

A magazine article in September, which

was inserted in the Congressional Record, charged that "not only were Ready Reserves . . . not ready in terms of planes, equipment and training for immediate deployment, most of the units didn't have enough men to fill all its necessary jobs."

To this I must answer that at the time of the call-up, the Naval Air Reserve was manned at 100 percent of the total strength authorized by the Department of Defense. We were at the approved maximum "drill pay ceiling" set by DoD, which gave us 29,400 officers and enlisted men in 362 aviation units. However, the total wartime complement for these 362 units was 37,000. This meant that all units were level-manned at about 80 percent in order to give the most training to all Air Reservists authorized under this ceiling.

In the event of a partial mobilization, the plan—as executed in the Korean and Berlin call-ups—was to flesh out recalled squadrons to 100 percent strength by assigning additional people from other Selected Air Reserve units. However—and here's a point not many outsiders realize—in last year's call-up, involuntary recall of "individuals" was not authorized. Thus, we had to fill the specified squadrons with active-duty personnel and/or with volunteers from other Reserve units.

This shouldn't happen again, because we have now reorganized our Naval Air Reserve units. Squadrons, which if called to operate as integral units (fully manned with personnel and hardware) are now priority manned at or near 100 percent of fleet complement. Since we still have a drill-pay ceiling, this priority manning has had to be done at the expense of the so-called augmenting units (those which go to fleet units without equipment to bring them up to wartime personnel strength).

This doesn't, as you might deduce, detract from the importance of the augmentation units. The mobilization requirements for augmentation units still exist and are a "hard requirement" for the fleet. If, in a future recall, personnel only are needed, and in the meantime all augmenting units haven't been fully manned, we will have two alternatives:

(1) Based on "on-board" count, recall the number of augmenting units needed to meet the personnel requirements, or

(2) Recall hardware squadrons without their aircraft and equipment as the situation demands.

This same magazine article also charged that "the Navy, in activating the Reservists, took no notice of individual capabilities and talents that were not service acquired." It said that college graduates were doing blue collar jobs, business executives were doing janitorial duties, and a "stockbroker was night-guarding sleeping airplanes."

To this I say that certainly it's true in civilian life many Reservists hold positions of greater importance and prestige than in their Reserve assignments. This must not be looked upon as a discredit to the Reserve, but rather as reflecting the fact that the Naval Air Reserve attracts such highly qualified people—all of whom voluntarily drill in their particular assignments. Reservists, of their own choosing, participate at the level at which they are qualified militarily, regardless of how affluent or talented they are in civilian life. Many of them, in the last call-up and now still in the Naval Air Reserve, are aware that they are qualified to seek officer status, but have chosen to enlist instead. The many college graduates who have elected to serve in an enlisted status are promoted in accordance with their abilities and their desires for increased responsibilities.

The facts don't substantiate another allegation that a lot of men applied for hardship discharges. Of the 600 Reservists recalled, only 17 applied for delay or deferment, and of these only three were actually delayed or deferred. Only one of the three was re-

leased to inactive duty after recall and the other two were delayed for just enough time to allow their graduation from college. One of these two was being processed for an officer program and needed to finish college to qualify.

The 15 who were denied deferment had not informed the Navy, before the call-up, of any hardship. Screening of the Reserve is a continuous process and no one is kept on the rolls if it is known that circumstances could be a cause for release after being mobilized.

Closely related to manpower and equipment matters was the concern over morale. Alleged poor morale of recalled squadrons because they were kept at home stations for too long a period is only partially true and is misleading. Generally speaking, morale is rarely adversely affected because people are kept home, and the six squadrons were certainly no exception to this rule. However, it is understandable that some of the Reservists felt that since they were recalled to active duty in such haste, they should have been shipped out faster. Delays such as this can only be avoided in future call-ups if squadrons are fully manned, fully equipped, and fully trained so they can be inserted immediately into fleet rotation schedules with other active squadrons.

There was also the published charge that the call-up may have meant the finish of the Naval Reserve program.

This, of course, is ridiculous.

The crux of an effective Reserve gets back to the first part of this article regarding equipment. If we want a Reserve that is fully effective, then we must be willing to provide it with the kind of equipment needed in the event of a recall.

With first-line equipment, our Naval Air Reserve will be able to respond to a call-up as a true force in being—immediately usable. Without proper equipment, it can only provide partial training, which will have to be completed by the fleet after recall.

The Naval Air Reserve Force encompasses almost the entire spectrum of fleet air operations: it is composed of all types of aviation units—ASW, transport, attack and fighter tactical units, plus aircraft maintenance, air intelligence, operational control and analysis support units. The degree of modernity of aircraft now in use by the tactical forces varies. The ASW elements, which comprise about 40 percent of the total Naval Air Reserve Force, now have aircraft comparable to fleet aircraft and this is reflected in their much greater readiness for use in the fleet.

VP squadrons, which fly P2Hs and P2Es, are ready for practically immediate employment in the fleet. Carrier-based ASW squadrons and helicopter squadrons which fly SH-60s and SH-3As, respectively, would be ready for employment after a short period involving completion of carrier landing qualifications.

The P2 Neptunes are being phased out of fleet ASW squadrons and are being replaced by P3 Orions. In the Naval Air Reserve we have only a token training program in the Orions, but hopefully, we'll be getting these planes in the not too distant future. Our transport squadrons, although flying antiquated C54 and C118 aircraft, are ready immediately for logistic support of the fleet within the capabilities of these obsolescent transports.

In closing, I want to say that I believe that the current international situation justifies equipping our Naval Air Reserve components with first-line aircraft and fleet-type weapons systems. This would provide two essential defense assets: (1) a strategic Reserve aircraft "pool" to offset fleet combat losses during the time required to obtain authority and to manufacture replacement aircraft, and (2) truly ready combat squadrons almost instantly capable of augmenting fleet aviation when needed.

CONGRESSIONAL DELAY OF POSTAL POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago H.R. 2783 was introduced which, if enacted, will delay implementation of congressional policy governing implementation of special rate fourth-class mail postal regulations from January 15 to July 1.

I regret, of course, that Congress must involve itself in the timing of the application of the conditions of mailing. It is only one more example of the jungle of restrictions which surround postal management today. Hopefully, Congress will soon enact H.R. 1382, a bill to establish a Postal Service Corporation, which would retain for Congress its policy-making role, but allow the postal manager to bring unfettered management leadership to the task of delivering the mail.

But, as of today, we must deal with the postal system as it is, and that requires that the Congress involve itself in these matters.

My review of the action proposed by the Postmaster General convinces me that it reflects the clear intent of Congress as required by the expenditure reduction provisions of the Revenue and Control Act, and under the specific authority granted to the Postmaster General in section 108(a)(6) of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967—Public Law 90-206, approved December 16, 1967.

This section added the following new provisions to section 4554 of title 39 of the United States Code—the section governing special rate fourth-class mail:

(e) Articles may be mailed under this section in quantities of one thousand or more in a single mailing, as defined by the Postmaster General, only in the manner directed by him.

On June 29, 1968, the Post Office Department published a notice of proposed rulemaking to implement section 4554(e). The proposal would have required, first, effective October 1, 1968, that identical pieces mailed in quantities of 1,000 or more be sorted and sacked to the first three digits of the ZIP code; and, second, effective January 15, 1969, that all pieces—whether identical or not—be included in a mailing of 1,000 or more bear the full ZIP code and be sorted and sacked by three-digit ZIP code areas.

Thereafter, the book publishing and record industry raised objections to the second-stage requirement. Accordingly, to meet these objections as far as possible without losing the financial and operating savings envisioned by the proposal, the Department, in finally adopting the regulations on August 9, 1968, modified the second stage by making a number of concessions to the fourth-class mailers concerned.

As adopted, the regulations, rather than requiring nonidentical pieces to be sorted and sacked to three-digit ZIP

code areas, now ask only that they be sorted and sacked to States. In addition, mailers will not be required to merge the nonidentical pieces with identical pieces as initially proposed.

Articles in the special rate fourth-class category contribute greatly to the Department's expenditures and add considerably to those postal costs which must be met from general tax revenues. For example, the 1967 cost ascertainment report shows total volume of these mailings as 239,347,000 pieces producing \$63,138,000 revenue. The apportioned costs are shown as \$143,756,000. Thus, cost coverage is only 43.9 percent. The taxpayers lose \$80,618,000 annually, of which amount this regulation is designed to recapture but \$4,044,555. In other words, after this regulation is fully effective the taxpayers will still be subsidizing this category of mail in the sum of \$76.6 million annually. This is a heavy subsidy by the taxpayer, indeed.

I recognize, as does the Post Office Department, that determination of the postal rate structure still is the prerogative and the responsibility of the Congress. In carrying out that responsibility Congress passed Public Law 90-206 containing the enabling legislative clause giving the Postmaster General the authority to prescribe the detailed conditions for mailing. Recognizing that the cost-revenue relationship for what it is, the Postmaster General would be remiss in not implementing section 108 of Public Law 90-206.

The proposed regulations which H.R. 2783 is directed at delaying represent a modest approach to an improvement of the cost coverages on this class of mail. The plain fact is, as earlier stated, that the total program to reduce operating costs by an estimated \$4,044,555, when measured against the fourth-class revenue deficit of over \$80,000,000 is a modest attempt, indeed, at cost reduction.

The Postmaster General has previously informed both the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service that he did not feel he would be properly discharging his responsibilities if he delayed implementation of these new regulations.

It has been stated that the Postmaster General has been unresponsive to congressional and mailer representations regarding the impact of the January 15 regulations. Respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that responses have been made by the Department. By letter dated August 3, 1968, the Postmaster General informed the Subcommittee on Postal Rates that based upon its representations, as well as those of affected mailers, he had decided to dramatically lessen the impact of the final regulations he was publishing as contrasted to the regulations proposed in the initial notice.

The proposed regulation as now published is considerably less stringent, less costly, and more easily conformed to than that originally contemplated. The change was twofold. First, it eliminated the requirement that nonidentical pieces be merged with identical pieces. Second, it reduced the sorting requirements for nonidentical pieces from a three-digit ZIP code area sort to a much less sophisticated State sort.

It has also been represented that the Postmaster General has not fully considered industry proposals, the principal ones of which, in return for deletion of the January 15, 1969, second step, would have increased the daily mailing provision from 1,000 to 5,000 pieces with the industry willing to presort and sack mailings in excess of 5,000 pieces to the full five-digit ZIP code areas effective October 1, 1968.

I am informed that the industry proposal was carefully considered by the Postmaster General and his staff before publication of the final rules on August 9, 1968.

The Postmaster General could not accept the industry proposal for several reasons. First, it was not consistent with the basic law, Public Law 90-206, which provided that single mailings of 1,000 or more pieces should conform to the Postmaster General's rules defining the conditions of mailing.

The 5,000-piece minimum requirement would have eliminated the majority of the users of this category from any pre-mailing requirements, thus shifting the burden to a minority of users.

Second, the overall cost reduction to the Department would not have been as great.

It appears to me that the Postmaster General is fully warranted in implementing these new regulations in view of congressional concern about the Post Office Department annual deficit. In fact, it is his duty to do so. I also feel that the Postmaster General has been responsive to congressional and mailer representations on this issue; he has made a significant modification of the proposal which is now much less stringent on mailers while at the same time enabling the Department to realize a significant portion of the cost reduction anticipated by his earlier proposal. The Postmaster General would not be discharging his responsibilities to the taxpayers if he delayed the effective date.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2783 would delay postal regulations which went into effect on October 1, 1968, and with which a substantial part of the industry is already complying. The sponsor of H.R. 2783 has stated that only three companies have obtained preliminary injunctions from Federal district judges suspending implementation of those regulations while another six or seven companies have filed requests for such preliminary injunctions. All other mailers affected by the regulations are complying. Inasmuch as these firms have made arrangements to comply, I see no reason to request the Postmaster General to rescind the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, during the second session of the 90th Congress the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives reported out a bill whose provisions were very similar to those incorporated in H.R. 2783. I might add that, although this bill was reported by the committee, neither the House of Representatives nor the U.S. Senate saw fit to take any further action in conjunction with the Postmaster General's implementation of the regulations. In view of the serious

revenue-cost deficiency of fourth-class mail, I urge that the Postmaster General be fully supported in his efforts to comply with the clear intent of Congress by implementing section 4554(e) of title 39, United States Code.

NOTHING SACRED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of those TV viewers who saw the American soldier felled by a rock and the pelting of President Nixon's limousine with objects as it proceeded along Pennsylvania Avenue during the inauguration parade were infuriated by this sick form of dissent. Yet the same elements which participated in the riot at the Democratic Convention in Chicago in August were present in Washington for the inauguration, and, as was to be expected, a number of them were arrested for assaulting policemen and carrying dangerous weapons. The National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam—NMC—had prepared in advance for the ceremonies and had been successful in obtaining permission to use Federal grounds for their assemblage.

The Chicago Tribune of January 22 featured an extensive article by Ronald Koziol of the Tribune's Washington office which describes the program of disruption carried out by these radical groups.

It goes without saying that the American public has long been fed up with the coddling of these radical groups who abuse the right of free speech and assembly, among other things. These exponents of anarchy and revolution must be publicized for what they are so that their future programs of disruption can be thwarted by lawful citizens and their officials in every town and city in the Nation.

The detailed article, "Cop Goading Works Again at Inaugural," by Ronald Koziol is useful in placing on the record the latest excesses of these groups, and for this reason I place it in the Record at this point:

COP GOADING WORKS AGAIN AT INAUGURAL

(By Ronald Koziol)

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 21.—Radical leaders of anti-war groups achieved what they set out to do here during President Nixon's inauguration—disrupt, confuse, and battle the police, investigators conceded today. And, in the end, Washington police reacted much as Chicago police did during the Democratic convention in August.

The three days of counter-inaugural skirmishes resulted in 109 arrests, at least four police confrontations, and 30 reported injuries to police and demonstrators.

The charges against those arrested ranged from assaulting policemen to carrying dangerous weapons.

SAME LEADERS INVOLVED

Investigators, in their day-after evaluations, noted striking similarities between the disruptive tactics at the inauguration and the disorders which occurred during the Democratic convention.

Both disorders were organized and planned by leaders of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Viet Nam (N. M. C.). These included David Dellinger and Rennie Davis, who set up offices and spent two months in Washington laying the groundwork. In Chicago, N. M. C. leaders planned for six months.

On Sunday, the N. M. C. declared that it was no longer handling planning and was stepping out of the picture "because there were certain people making plans to disrupt."

OFFERS NO RESTRAINTS

This was the same tactic employed by the N. M. C. in Chicago, where the radical leaders disassociated themselves from the disorders after the violent confrontation in front of the Conrad Hilton hotel.

However, it was the N. M. C. which openly enlisted the support, both in Chicago and Washington, of the militant yippies and scores of other violence-prone anti-war demonstrators.

Davis was observed by police at the scene of one of the confrontations yesterday during the inaugural parade. At no time did he make any attempt to dissuade the mob, nor was he close enough to risk being hit by police clubs.

Investigators pointed out that the N.M.C. again supplied the planning and financial aid and the militants supplied the street troops needed to confront police and embarrass local and federal officials.

One of the most active groups here for the demonstrations was the Ohio chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society. Two weeks ago THE TRIBUNE disclosed S.D.S. plans to battle police and force the presence of troops at the inauguration.

ADVISE ON TACTICS

On Friday, an underground militant newspaper called for action to take place on the north side of Pennsylvania avenue because "on the south side there was no place to run if the going gets good."

Police noted that the yippies and many Ohio S.D.S. members were in the forefront of confrontations. As in Chicago only a few Negroes took part in the disorders.

National guard and federal troops in full battle gear had been placed in reserve and were used to contain the activities of the protesters.

An elite group of Washington policemen, all volunteers and known as the civil disorder unit, used their three-foot long riot sticks willingly to club demonstrators along the Pennsylvania avenue parade route and later at the scene of a 40-minute battle a block from the White House.

TROOPER HIT BY ROCK

The protesters still managed to hurl rocks, sticks, eggs, cherry bombs, and two paint-filled bottles at the Presidential cavalcade. All missed their mark, but a trooper from the 82d airborne division was injured when he was struck on the head by a rock.

As in Chicago, Washington police finally reacted with swinging clubs. The first encounter came when 100 policemen were given the order to move the demonstrators away from a rope lining the street. The police waded into the first four rows, driving their clubs into demonstrators abdomens, and clubbing others on the head. All of the protesters in the first few rows wore army or football helmets.

CARRIED TO SQUADROL

Some protesters who resisted or did not move fast enough were clubbed and carried to a waiting police squadrol, just as in Chicago. The scene was repeated in the second battle near the White House, with police swinging clubs as they charged the demonstrators in an effort to disperse them.

Prior to that confrontation, the unkempt demonstrators had fired a continuous stream

of verbal abuse at the police lines. Shouts of "police are pigs", and "remember Chicago" were repeated over and over. These were the mildest yells.

The same four-letter words used by demonstrators in Chicago were repeated here with the names of Nixon and Agnew substituted for Johnson, Humphrey, and Daley.

Because of tight security and the fact that the parade route was completely roped off along the edge of the sidewalk, the demonstrators' confrontations with police occurred several blocks away from television cameras. In Chicago, stationary cameras were set up outside of the Conrad Hilton.

Inclement weather and mid-year examinations in colleges played a major role in keeping down the size of the demonstrators to slightly more than 5,000. This peak was reached Sunday during a counter-inaugural parade. The rainy weather also forced cancellation of several planned demonstrations.

CALL FOR ACTION

A factional split was noted on Sunday when a group of howling yippies and other militants started their own parade while Dellinger was addressing 3,000 persons in a tent near the Washington monument. One yippie said, "We're tired of hearing speeches and we'll find our own action." This they did as a battle ensued at the end of the march when the mob disobeyed police orders.

Washington authorities are still trying to pinpoint the source of financial backing for the demonstrations. The huge tent cost the N. M. C. more than \$10,000, it was learned, plus the cost of insurance, loud-speakers, office space, and printing materials.

As in Chicago, local authorities will get stuck with the bill to restore the tent site area. The N. M. C. was not required to post a restoration bond. The city of Chicago had to restore an entire one-block section of Grant park across from the Hilton with new sod after the August disorders.

NEW BOOK DEPICTS LIFE IN THE MIDDLE SOUTH

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend a recently published book, "The Great Blue Heron" by Mary E. Wadlington, which depicts life with its stark tragedies, failures, and injustices. The background, in the Middle South, without the romanticism of the Old South or the vulgarity and profanities of the so-called New Left, is accurate. "The Great Blue Heron" written in simple pure English, quietly and effectively tells the story of one man's effort to achieve justice for his black and poor white brothers.

The characters are real, haunting, and unforgettable. This book presents no cure-all, no false optimism, but points the way to achieve justice.

Lawyers, judges, academic personnel, and public library readers have read and enjoyed this book, as have my wife and I. I commend it to all those who hope that law and order may be established in our country. It represents the real source of our troubles: brutality, the child of ignorance.

A LINCOLN-SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS FOR MONTANA

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill today to establish a Lincoln-Scapegoat Wilderness for Montana.

For more than half a century, citizens of Montana and the Nation have been aware of the need to protect an especially fragile and beautiful area of national forest wild land astraddle the Continental Divide in west central Montana. The Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain area have been a source of attraction ever since the Lewis and Clark Expedition, fur trappers, and hunters came upon the region many years ago. Since the middle 1800's, several generations of Montana citizens and others have used and enjoyed the Lincoln-Scapegoat country as wilderness. Yet, as part of the general national forest system, the area has received no special protective classification. Only its rugged inaccessibility and lack of significant timber and other commodity resources have saved its magnificent and primeval qualities from development.

In 1963, the Forest Service announced plans to develop the area for timber production and intensive recreational use. The Montana Wilderness Association, the Montana Wildlife Federation, the Montana Fish and Game Department, businessmen, ranchers, and many others urged that this irreplaceable area be given wilderness protection.

Last year, a public hearing was held in Montana on a bill cosponsored by Senators LEE METCALF and MIKE MANSFIELD to establish the area as wilderness and place it in the national wilderness preservation system. Mr. Speaker, this measure received overwhelming support by citizens from all parts of Montana and the Nation. It was strongly endorsed by conservationists, ranchers, businessmen, and professional natural resource educators.

Montana's Gov. Forrest Anderson, as well as former Gov. Tim Babcock, voiced enthusiastic support for this proposal. My colleague from the eastern district of Montana, Representative JAMES BARTIN, testified in favor of it and has introduced similar legislation in this Congress. So the legislation truly has widespread bipartisan support.

The Lincoln-Scapegoat area consists of approximately 240,000 acres of incomparable mountain wild country contiguous on the southeast to the Bob Marshall Wilderness. It is located some 60 miles northwest of Helena, near the recreational community of Lincoln.

Exquisite natural scenes of high mountain snowfields, rushing streams, tranquil lakes, and narrow valleys carpeted with wildflowers characterize the area. Scapegoat and Red Mountains, both of which rise above 9,000 feet, are scenically spectacular.

Signs of man's activity are extremely rare. With the exception of a few ranger cabins and limited foot and horseback trails, the Lincoln-Scapagoat area is completely undeveloped and wild. It is one of America's finest examples of undedicated pristine wilderness.

The area has a long history of wilderness use for horseback riding, hiking, backpacking, camping, sightseeing, hunting, and fishing. Recreational use ranges from family camping and hiking in the lower areas to horseback packtrips and backpacking outings into the rugged high country. Several State and national conservation organizations conduct annual trips into the area, which supports a significant guiding and outfitting industry.

A rich variety of wildlife makes the area especially attractive to recreationists. Bighorn sheep, mountain goats, grizzly bear, and moose inhabit these mountains, along with elk, deer, black bear, and cougar. This is one of the few remaining haunts of the endangered grizzly bear within the lower 48 States. The noble grizzly needs wilderness to survive. Other wildlife includes the wolverine, ptarmigan, bald eagle, and Montana grayling. Here, also, on the headwaters of both the Columbia and Missouri Rivers, is found one of the principal natural sources of the endangered native cutthroat. The area furnishes high-quality wilderness hunting in season and unexcelled opportunities to observe and study wildlife in undisturbed natural surroundings.

Most of the area is at alpine and sub-alpine elevations. Five small wilderness rivers—the East Fork, North Fork, and Landers Fork of the Blackfoot, as well as the headwaters of the Dearborn and the South Fork of the Sun River—flow through the area. Slopes are steep, and the glacial soils are shallow and fragile. Wilderness designation would protect critical watershed values.

Mineral explorations to date indicate that the mineral potential of the area is not significant. There is no grazing of domestic livestock, other than recreational stock, in the area encompassed by this legislation. No private lands are located within the proposed wilderness. No water development plans pertain to it. The merchantable timber in the area is poor in quantity and quality. Most of it consists of lodgepole pine—a low-quality lumber species which occurs throughout millions of acres in nearby roaded areas of the national forests. Roading, logging, and development of this area for intensive recreational purposes would not contribute to best possible land use and is not justified when the higher wilderness values of the area are considered. Many campgrounds and other sites for developed recreation are found nearby, outside the proposed wilderness.

I am personally acquainted with the Lincoln-Scapagoat area, and I believe that such wild beauty spots should be protected and preserved in accordance with the national forest multiple-use principle which provides for the management of appropriate areas for wilderness purposes.

A Lincoln-Scapagoat Wilderness is the

best way to assure protection and wise use of this magnificent area for all Montana citizens and their many visitors. To achieve these objectives, I urge prompt enactment of my bill.

A GREAT FIRST LADY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of the House, I am sure, who share the great admiration of Lady Bird Johnson with me and feel that she has been one, if not the finest of our First Ladies. I now also know that at least one columnist also shared that feeling, Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, whose editorial in a recent issue of the Washington Post will show:

A STIRRUP CUP FOR LADY BIRD

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

There are times of hello and good-bye in our town. Up on Capitol Hill, the new Congress has convened and the old-timers have vanished. Down the avenue, the Democratic exodus continues. It is impossible to voice all the farewells a reporter might wish to put in words, but there's one in particular that ought to be made—to Mrs. Claudia Alta Taylor Johnson. She's been a great First Lady.

Just a few days ago, Mrs. Johnson wound up her fortieth trip "to discover America." In 96 hours, she covered 6,000 miles. It was enough to exhaust the Campfire Girls of the press who hike the trails behind her, but Lady Bird came through, as she always does, with the old smile going strong.

In the past five years, she's traveled at least 200,000 miles. She's gone down the Rio Grande in a rubber raft, and gone up the Utah mountains by cable car. She has called on slum dwellers, hillbillies, and Indian tribes. If she has missed a single historic shrine or national park, the oversight has been accidental, not deliberate. In cowgirl hat, checkered shirt and muddy boots, she's won the West all over again.

These indefatigable travels have caused her to be compared with the late Eleanor Roosevelt. Mrs. R., as everyone recalls, was forever turning up in the coal mines of West Virginia and Ohio, or bounding around the dust bowls of Oklahoma and the work camps of California. But Eleanor Roosevelt was a tough old hen, stringy and chewy and full of grit; she numbered her enemies by the thousands. Lady Bird Johnson has numbered mostly friends.

Bess Truman and Mamie Eisenhower surely were assets to their husbands. So was Jackie Kennedy, after her glamorous fashion. Yet we are likely to remember Lady Bird longer and more pleasantly than all the others of recent time. In the political sense, she had perfect pitch; her greatest gift was to hit the right note.

Last January she was hostess at a White House luncheon set up to launch a "women's crusade against crime in the streets." To speak the truth, it was more of a charade than a crusade; it was a social affair—white gloves, cream cheese and rabbit food—and subject to the same rules of good manners that apply to such occasions everywhere.

Eartha Kitt, the Negro singer, was among the invited guests. Good manners were the last thing on her mind. With deliberate, insulting rudeness, she launched into an at-

tack on the war in Vietnam. Then she undertook to educate Mrs. Johnson in the use of narcotics.

"If you don't know what 'pot' is," she snarled at her hostess, "it's marijuana."

Mrs. Johnson kept her cool. She had tears in her eyes and a tremble in her fingers, but she never stood taller as First Lady of the land. In a dozen well-chosen sentences, she voiced her conviction that the war ought not to be permitted to keep us from trying to do those things here at home that would create "a happier and a better land." Then she went on with the luncheon.

To be sure, not all her efforts have been crowned with laurels. In their anxiety to please Mrs. Johnson, highway beautifiers have wasted a fortune in planting dinky little bushes in impossible clumps along the interstate system. Yet she has so identified herself with the beauty of America that a bench-sitter in Williamsburg recently was amused to overhear a mother scolding a negligent child: "If you throw any more candy-wrappers on the walk, I'll tell Mrs. Johnson!"

The first new issue of postage stamps in 1969 doubtless will be known to collectors as the "Lady Bird" issue. As specimens of the philatelic art, the stamps are not much; but in their exhortation to plant for more beautiful cities, highways, parks and streets, the stamps will provide a pleasant farewell to a good and gracious lady. She has a respectful stirrup cup coming as she rides on back to the ranch.

CENSORSHIP OF FREE SPEECH— UNESCO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations operation known as the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has now set itself up as a censorship bureau for world thought control. UNESCO would disarm words.

As the voice for a few tribal states and minority conscious groups they would prostitute education—undertake a book-burning episode by rewriting language and speech—reminiscent of the Bolshevik brainwashing techniques.

What an intellectual jungle these international directors must wander in. Could it be they distrust man so intensely they would develop a phobia that civilization is bad? Wonder what those who fear free speech and self-expression will do with Shakespeare—rewrite it or burn it?

And U.S. taxpayers contribute \$9,085,000 per year from their paychecks for this prejudicial undertaking?

And the source of this progressive program—Chief Fafunwa of Nigeria. They have no prejudice in Nigeria—they exterminate them.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit a censorship report on UNESCO from the Christian Science Monitor for January 18, 1969, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

UNESCO DENOUNCES "SLURS" IN LANGUAGE

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Watch your language, there. You might be committing racial prejudice without knowing it.

This, in effect, is the thrust of a recent report of the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO delegates meeting in Paris to discuss how to combat racial prejudice agreed that a special precision and prudence are called for from all persons making extensive use of language for communication.

It aimed its report particularly at teachers, authors, publishers of textbooks, and other teaching materials, and those concerned with the mass media.

UNESCO advised such prudence in the use of terminology employed to describe people of differing ethnic, religious, or other groups, especially formerly colonized peoples.

The UNESCO report telescopes in on more than a dozen words which violate the new norms of unprejudicial language.

Take, for instance, the terms "tribe," "native," "savage," "primitive," "jungle," "pagan," "kaffir," "bushman," "backward," "underdeveloped," "uncivilized," "vernacular," "Negro," "colored," and "race."

RECOMMENDATIONS OUTLINED

The report stressed that such terms were "so charged with emotive potential that their use, with or without conscious pejorative intent, to describe or characterize certain ethnic, social, or religious groups certainly provoked an adverse reaction on the part of these groups."

The report recommended, for instance, that:

The word "inhabitant" should be used in preference to the word "native."

The term "pagan" should not be applied to religions: Religions should be specified by name.

The word "savanna" or "wooded savanna" would be preferable to the word "jungle."

It was recommended that the use of all "contemptuous, unjust, or inadequate words be discontinued in reference to racial or societal matters."

The UNESCO report agreed that "much of the current terminology used with reference to 'race' questions was a heritage of a colonial past and often perpetuated feelings of superiority and prejudice."

COLONIALIST TINGE CITED

Many of the terms, the report said, "because of their colonialist origin, carry overtones of racial superiority vis-a-vis the one-time colonies. These terms could implant the seeds of racialism in the minds of former colonizing peoples; in any event, they offend the susceptibilities of peoples who were once colonized."

The report acknowledged that it would be difficult to dispense entirely with such terms as "race" or "tribe," which are part of current scientific terminology. "But they should be used correctly," it said.

Much of the report was excerpted from a speech given in Paris by A. Babs Fafunwa of Nigeria.

Mr. Fafunwa said that prior to the 15th century and before the beginning of intensive proselytization and colonization, there was little reference to racial discrimination in text materials.

MISSIONARY EFFECT DESCRIBED

Mr. Fafunwa said that "the early Christian missionaries in their naïveté believed that there was a 'civilizing' mission; that the 'noble savages' or the 'warring tribesmen' of Africa and Asia needed Christ if they were to be uplifted from their 'primitiveness.'"

"The colonial powers on the other hand had to justify their action by claiming that the 'natives' were too 'primitive' to rule themselves, and they had to be 'brought up' gradually and systematically before they could reach a stage of self-government and perhaps 'self-determination.'"

Mr. Fafunwa, citing the shorter Oxford English dictionary, said that the word "tribe"

is defined as "a group of persons forming a community and claiming descent from a common ancestor"; and as "a race of people; now applied especially to a primary aggregate of people in a primitive or barbarous condition under a headman or chief."

"TRIBE" USAGE LESSONS

Mr. Fafunwa said it is interesting to note that the word tribe is mainly used nowadays to describe African ethnic groups. He said it used to cover groups in "Asia and other non-European communities, but since most of the Asian countries became independent between 1947 and 1954, the word gradually disappeared from the textbooks and journals, thanks to the UNESCO effort in this direction."

He commented with some feeling: "How an ethnic group with 2 or 10 million people in East or West Africa, with a parliamentary government, can be described as a tribe and not the Irish, the Scot, the Welsh, the French, or the English, still baffles the non-European."

Both Mr. Fafunwa's and UNESCO's long-range recommendations are that UNESCO, to combat prejudice and racial discrimination in text materials:

Hold regional or international conferences of authors and publishers for the improvement of textbooks, journals, magazines, and other teaching and information materials.

Encourage learned societies in history, geography, civics, anthropology, and sociology to devote a portion of their conference programs to discussions on "bias in text materials."

Sponsor a conference of religious leaders—Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Bahais, etc.—to discuss the religious aspects of prejudice.

They recommended also that UNESCO should assume full leadership in ensuring that such words as they referred to are eliminated from text materials and learned journals.

Mr. Fafunwa commented that "we, the people of the world, cannot afford to ignore the epithets that tend to divide us into dangerous warring factions."

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION ENDORSES ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the committee on Federal legislation of the New York State Bar Association has enthusiastically endorsed House Concurrent Resolution 48 of the 90th Congress calling for a U.S. delegation to discuss with representatives of other free nations possibilities of future political union. This resolution was reported out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee last year but did not come before the floor because of the rush toward adjournment. Because of this milestone in support for the Atlantic Union Resolution, I include the recommendation of the New York State Bar Association at this point in my remarks:

REPORT ON RESOLUTION CALLING FOR U.S. DELEGATION TO CONFER WITH OTHER FREE NATIONS CONCERNING FUTURE STEPS TOWARD UNITY

During the 90th Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee approved by an overwhelming vote a resolution (H. Con. Res. 48,

90th Congress) calling for a United States delegation to discuss with representatives of other free nations possibilities of future union. H. Rep. No. 1656, 90th Cong. 2d Sess. (1968). Because the proposal has received strong Committee approval in the House, we believe it appropriate to address our comments concerning it to the 91st Congress. We believe that the proposal for such exploration, although bold, is sound and merits approval.

The concept has received endorsement of such diverse leaders as Richard M. Nixon, Hubert H. Humphrey, Eugene J. McCarthy, Robert F. Kennedy, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller.

The basis for the concept is the recognition expressed by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter that greater than national problems require greater than national solutions.

Our concern as lawyers is with the legal structure which will permit this nation to meet its large responsibilities in the most effective manner.

The resolution approved by the House Committee would not commit this country to anything. It would merely give express Congressional approval to exploration of the possibilities of a future Atlantic federation or wider union of free peoples. Although the resolution is drafted in Atlantic terms, we see nothing in it which would preclude inclusion of other free peoples in the discussions proposed or in any resulting union. Likewise, we see nothing in the resolution to preclude consultation with non-governmental as well as governmental representatives from other free nations.

The tragedy in Czechoslovakia in August, 1968, has lent new poignancy to careful exploration of these possibilities. Although the House Committee acted even before the invasion, the Committee on Federal Legislation of the New York County Lawyers' Association considered the matter immediately thereafter and unanimously approved the House Committee's action. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 21, page 28104. Their report termed the need for such consultations "beyond dispute" and noted that a precedent existed in Public Law 86-719, 74 Stat. 818, enacted September 7, 1960, which authorized participation of leading citizens in an international convention of citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

The need for such exploration is emphasized by currency crises and the need for cooperation for aiding developing nations, aside from such shocks as the Czech tragedy.

We accordingly recommend favorable consideration of the House Committee recommendations of the 90th Congress on the part of the 91st Congress.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION,

Richard A. Givens, *Chairman*; Anthony P. Marshall, *Secretary*; Leslie H. Arps, Harold Baer, Jr., Mark K. Benenson, Edward S. Blackstone, Vincent L. Broderick, Mason O. Damon, David M. Dorsen, John T. Elin, Robert B. Fiske, Jr., Lawrence W. Keopness, Norman Kellar, Herbert C. Miller, George W. Meyers, Jr., Bernard Nussbaum, Robert Patterson, Jr., Arthur C. Stever, Jr.

RESCINDING FEDERAL PAY HIKES

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with a number of colleagues in

the introduction of two House resolutions aimed at stopping former President Johnson's proposed pay increases for Members of Congress and other high-ranking Government officials.

The first resolution would disapprove the proposed increase and the second resolution is aimed at moving the bill from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee so that floor action can be taken.

These pay increases should be postponed until such time as we have brought the budget into balance and have stopped inflation. It simply is not in the best interest of the Nation that Congress should encourage pay hikes at this particular time. To sanction such proposals would further aggravate both the budget and our overall fiscal position.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN DAY CARE CENTERS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Mrs. MINK's bill to provide Federal assistance to improve child care in public and private nonprofit day-care centers. Recent research by medical authorities and psychologists has demonstrated the importance of salutary influences on children even in their earliest years. Often it appears that characteristics and traits which prove to be decisive in later life are first developed before the age of 4 years. Thus it is imperative that young children have available to them from the very start the kinds of beneficial experiences and influences which will help them develop into creative, contributing citizens.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that other countries sometimes provide child-care facilities which far surpass those here in the United States—the richest Nation on earth. In Israel, for example, early day-care facilities are maintained which match, and often even exceed, the educational opportunities which are available to a child in his own home. Such facilities demonstrate an awareness of the importance of early child care which offers both understanding and stimulation. In America we should be able to provide no less for our young citizens.

As Mrs. MINK points out, there is a serious gap in our present educational assistance programs—a gap which may well undercut the other Federal assistance efforts by handicapping certain children to the point that they can never fully benefit from later educational opportunities which become available to them. For this reason, this proposal for pre-Headstart assistance to working mothers is absolutely indispensable to the efficient functioning of other Federal educational assistance programs. The \$300 million which we authorize in this bill is in reality an investment in America's future which will pay handsome

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

dividends in the years ahead. The investment is one which we cannot afford to forgo.

I enthusiastically support Mrs. MINK's proposal, and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD LAUDS RETURN OF RADIO GENIUS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, comic genius is a rare and highly prized gift which few of us can claim but millions thrill to when it is employed by a talented professional entertainer.

This prize—the ability to make people laugh—is especially valuable today when people just seem too busy "doing their thing" to take a few moments out to chuckle.

The good people of my district in Pittsburgh, and those for many miles around the "Steel City," had numerous occasions to be cheerful when Regis Cordic, one of the best professional wits, was daily broadcasting his madcap early morning show from Pittsburgh's KDKA radio.

Rege Cordic for 22 years, 11 of them on KDKA, was the companion of thousands of Pittsburgh businessmen driving to work and housewives at home as he and a menagerie of radio characters daily ran through a dozen zany episodes—not a few of which were rather perceptively aimed at the Democratic administration who controlled the city.

In 1965, Mr. Cordic left Pittsburgh for Los Angeles where he further developed his talents in the movies, on television and radio, and with his own firm which made product commercials for those latter two mediums.

I am happy to note that next month, after 3 years too many, Mr. Cordic will return to Pittsburgh with a new Sunday radio program.

Mr. Harold V. Cohen, drama critic for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, in one of his recent columns, heralds the return of this creative showman to my city. I would like to bring this article to the attention of my fellow Congressmen:

CORDIC RETURNING TO RADIO HERE, ON WTAE, EVERY SUNDAY VIA TAPE

The merriest of Merry Christmases to one and all this morning, and good news, too. Santa Claus is dropping something extra special into Pa Pitt's stocking, a return to the air waves here of that Merry Madman of the Microphone, Rege Cordic.

That's right, Rege Cordic. The bearded gentleman, in whose craniological complex, roaming restlessly somewhere, lies lunacy, has just signed with WTAE-Radio to do a four-hour show, via tape from his present headquarters in Los Angeles, every Sunday, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m., beginning the middle of February.

The deal was finally closed off yesterday after weeks of negotiations between Franklin C. Snyder, the Hearst Broadcasting Company's Pittsburgh chief, and Arnold D. Wilner, Mr. Cordic's longtime local attorney.

To give the show a flying send-off, Mr. Cordic will be heading back home around the

end of January to do the first pair of programs live from the WTAE-Radio studios. They'll probably be aired on February 9 and 16.

By long-distance telephone from his home in Santa Monica, Calif., Mr. Cordic said "It will be strictly a Pittsburgh-oriented show, much the same as the show I was doing when I departed the Golden Triangle three years ago, with the old title, too, only a word added: 'Cordic and Co. West.'"

The founder, chairman of the board, president, secretary, treasurer and sergeant-at-arms of Cordic and Co. will revive a number of his most celebrated characters, Omicron, Louie the Garbage Man, Mr. Rouquetoff Q. LaFarge and Mr. Murchison, among others; plans to feature interviews with Pittsburghers who have made good in Hollywood ("I have already contacted people like Henry Mancini, Regis Toomey, Gene Kelly and Frank Gorshin") and used them in sketches as well; will feature all of his old electronic gimmicks and novelties; comment on the foibles of the Pittsburgh community and spin a few records as well.

"In other words," Mr. Cordic went on, "it'll be, with the barest of exceptions, exactly as we left it."

To keep him abreast of what is happening here, he has engaged Bob McCully, the local gagman and sketch writer, to supply him with city-slanted material, and he has also signed a practically charter member of Cordic and Co., Pittsburgh's Karl Hardman, to come aboard, too.

Mr. Cordic intends to do a lot of taping with Mr. Hardman during his stay in Pittsburgh and, occasionally, Mr. Hardman will fly to the Coast to augment the Cordic-Hardman stockpile of skits.

And out in Hollywood, Mr. Cordic has lined up for Cordic and Co. West several actors who worked with him on KNX, the Columbia Broadcasting Company's affiliate in Los Angeles, for two years. He named a few of them: Pat Harrington Jr., Artie Johnson (the "Verre Interesting" character on Rowan and Martin's "Laugh-In"), Paul Winchell and Hal (The Greatest Gliderleever) Peary.

Rege Cordic hasn't been heard regularly on local radio since December, 1965, when he left KDKA after 11 years to go with KNX in Los Angeles (he had contacted the Westinghouse station here in 1954 after 11 years with WWSW). He remained with the coast operation until the end of 1967 when KNX switched to an all-news format.

Mr. Cordic emphasized that he plans to remain permanently on the West Coast but would probably come to Pittsburgh from time to time to do Cordic and Co. West live "just to stay privy to what's going on around the town so we can keep the program local and topical."

Since leaving KNX, he has done considerable commercial work, played roles in many television shows, including "The Flying Nun," "The Monkees" and "The Outcasts," and just recently went into business with Steve Allen under the corporate name of The Great American Commercial Company, organized to produce television and radio commercials for national and local accounts.

Mr. Cordic and Mr. Allen have two other partners in this enterprise, Dave Pollock and Elias Davis, writers for the Steve Allen Show who have been loaned out to script the new Glen Campbell television hour while the Allen program is on a 13-week hiatus.

In addition, Rege is working with Eddie Albert on a different kind of radio program that Mr. Albert has in mind for syndication, and the head of Cordic and Co. also is being pitched in Hollywood to head a new teevee game show that will be produced by Chuck Barris, who already has "The Dating Game," "The Newly-wed Game" and "Operation Entertainment" going for him.

"A funny thing, how I got together with Barris," Rege chuckled over the horn from

his home in Santa Monica, "he heard I was out there and looked me up.

"And told me I had been responsible for changing the course of his life. Seems Chuck had graduated from college as an engineer and early in the 50s joined the training program of the U.S. Steel Company at its Homestead Works.

"He said he used to listen to me, when I was on WWSW, driving to work every morning and after a couple of months decided that what I was doing was what he wanted to do, too, so he chucked his job in Homestead, went to New York and got into broadcasting."

"WTAE-Radio is mapping a big promotion campaign for the return of Cordic and Co. to Pittsburgh and the return, of course, of The Cordic and Co. Research Laboratory which had been saving mankind for so long hereabouts with such items as Crudleigh, a car with an adjustable middle to suit the driver's mood; Old Frothingslosh, "the pale, stale ale so light the foam is on the bottom" and "Better Things for Better Living Through Chicanery."

"And so, before long now, over the kilocycles which have known him so intimately for so long, will be heard again the gentleman of whom it was said in this space just half a decade ago:

"Down through nearly a score of years, over the air waves, on rostrum and dais, in the world of commerce brew-mastering the pale, stale ale of Old Frothingslosh, Rege Cordic has clearly demonstrated that the convolutions of his mind are lubricated by madness—a wonderfully comic madness everybody within the sound of his mellifluous voice, the baritone of a bull-frog in the full moon of the mating season, has long been grateful for."

"And will be, every Sunday morning, grateful for again.

CRIMES

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I submitted a bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with non-capital offenses, and for other purposes.

The increase in crime rates has been such that it is demanding the attention of the entire Nation, and specifically of the Congress. Too many crimes are being committed by hard-core repeat offenders. Trial backlogs are growing longer, and with the requirement of the Ball Reform Act of 1966, that persons charged with crimes must be released prior to trial, and whereunder courts are not permitted to take the safety of the community into consideration in setting the terms of such release, crimes committed while on pretrial release have become a significant problem.

Prosecutors, police officials, trial judges, grand juries, and citizens are demanding our courts be provided with the authority to detain dangerous persons charged with crimes.

The measure introduced today would permit Federal courts to take into consideration the likelihood of the defend-

ant's danger to the community in setting conditions of pretrial release. When no such condition of pretrial release will assure safety to the community and when the defendant is charged with certain specified crimes involving violence, weapons, and narcotics, then the court is empowered to detain the defendant prior to trial.

In cases where defendants, charged with Federal crimes, are on pretrial release and commit an additional offense while on such release, then courts may order detention if the defendant's continued release would pose a danger to the community.

This measure contains safeguards for the individual in that all detention orders are subject to review in 24 hours and immediate appeal thereafter.

Also this measure would strengthen the penalty provision of the Bail Act in cases where defendants are released and fail to appear for subsequent court proceedings.

I believe these changes, along with others contained in the measure submitted today, could be a long step toward a return to law and order.

HUGH SPARROW: RETIRED

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, before the people of my district honored me by sending me to the Congress, I spent two terms in the Alabama Legislature. Every State capitol has its legends and its institutions. The Birmingham News had a reporter who became both a legend and an institution at the Alabama Capitol. Hugh Sparrow covered his first session of the legislature in 1921 and every one after that until he retired just recently. I know that when the legislature convenes later this year, Hugh Sparrow will be missed. I would like to place in the Record an article about Mr. Sparrow which appeared in the Sunday section of the Montgomery Advertiser this past week:

HUGH SPARROW: RETIRED

(By Walter Massey)

Forty-seven years ago, a young police reporter had just started out on his beat when his editor called him back to the newspaper office.

"I want you to go to Montgomery," the editor said.

And so the young reporter left his home in Birmingham and travelled to Montgomery to cover the Legislature for The Birmingham News.

His editors were pleased with the young man's stories, so they didn't call him back home. He became a political reporter and stayed in the Capitol.

Over the years, he developed a keen eye in looking out for the public interest. He learned the state's bookkeeping system and knew how to trace misplaced state funds.

He became convinced the public didn't have much voice in the state's business—but he wrote about the floggings in the state prisons and the practice was stopped. He wrote about the need for competitive bid

laws and a bill was passed. He exposed the sale of pardons and paroles; the traffic in quickie-divorces; give-away sales of state timber rights; and the leasing of a state park to a private company for next to nothing.

He was threatened, but he didn't yield to the bullying.

He was denied access to state records, but he got his information anyway.

He endured—to become undisputed dean of the Capitol reporters . . . an institution unto himself.

Then, last month, Hugh Sparrow, that reporter of reporters, retired.

Gov. Albert Brewer interrupted his press conference on Dec. 11 to pay tribute to Sparrow.

"Mr. Sparrow has dedicated his efforts to keeping the citizens of Alabama keenly aware of the inner workings of government, both on the state and local level," the Governor said.

Then, by official proclamation, the Governor set aside that day as "Hugh Wilson Sparrow Day" in Alabama, and he presented a metal plaque which can now be seen on the door of the Capitol's press room, named in honor of Sparrow by the Legislature in 1966.

During his career, Sparrow was recognized three times by the Legislature for outstanding reporting.

He received various other awards for excellence in journalism, including the Green Eyes Award of Sigma Delta Chi, the professional fraternity of journalism.

It was in 1921 that Hugh Sparrow covered his first session of the Legislature.

Musing on the years from then to the present, Sparrow spoke of his love for Alabama and the interest with which he has watched it grow.

"When I first came to the Capitol, there was no grass on the Capitol grounds," he recalled. "They were rutted and covered with weeds."

"It really was Goat Hill then," continued Sparrow. "Now, there are lawns and shrubs and it's really pretty."

"The tax total then was less than \$1 million," he said. "This year it's up to about half a billion. If the state keeps growing like it has in the past, it will really be a whopper."

Sparrow recalled his big stories. One was about a Jefferson County murder, which solved the crime and led to the execution of the killer. A part of the episode was the killer's attempt to keep the only witness from testifying by marrying her. Sparrow caught the deception in advance during a routine check of marriage licenses in the Court House. Although the wife couldn't legally be forced to testify against her husband by trial time she agreed to do it voluntarily.

While substantiating reports of unmerciful floggings at Kilby Prison in 1948, Sparrow encountered the wrath of a prison official who had barred him from the "official" flogging records.

The man met him in a hall and said, "I ought to cut your throat."

"I don't pay attention to threats," Sparrow said, remembering the incident. "It's the man who doesn't threaten that I worry about."

Another big story that Sparrow dug up, he decided not to report.

It concerned a constitutional amendment that was up for a vote and would have given more money to Birmingham schools.

"Some sob sisters," Sparrow said, "wrote stories about how the city would go broke without the bond issue. And it got defeated."

Not convinced that the city was lacking in funds, Sparrow started digging into the books.

"I found out the city had two bookkeeping systems," he stated. "I got to looking and found \$1 million not accounted for. The

comptroller of the schools said I was right. So I gave them a chance to make it right and I didn't write a story about it."

Sparrow comes from a newspaper family. His father, John Sparrow, with four associates founded the Birmingham Ledger. It lasted for 25 years, until just after World War I.

Then, the Birmingham News found itself short on newsprint and bought out the Ledger because it had a good newsprint contract.

Sparrow also has a sister who is the society editor of the New Orleans Daily State, and another who is the wife of the managing editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Even though he is retired now, after a long and eventful career in journalism, Sparrow well remembers the first story which carried his by-line. He was a high school correspondent and very proud of his handiwork.

"I showed it to my father," Sparrow said. "He took one look at it and said, 'Well, I see you split an infinitive.'"

Sparrow said the most effective lobbying tactic he has seen was when an association of Mobile ship pilots got navigation laws changed by sending a burley seaman to Montgomery during the depression with a trunk full of red liquor.

"You just couldn't get red liquor during the depression," Sparrow said.

CONGRESS LOOKS AT THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since my early days in Congress, more than 20 years ago, I have been interested in reform of the electoral college.

In this Congress I have introduced House Joint Resolution 194, and in response to the invitation of the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I plan to appear in support of that resolution for reform of the electoral college before the Judiciary Committee on February 6.

I include herein a brief article which I have prepared for publication in the Gavel, the monthly publication of the Milwaukee Bar Association:

CONGRESS LOOKS AT THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The third party Presidential candidacy of George Wallace, creating the spectres of fingering of the Electoral College and certain delay of months in the selection of the President before agreement by 26 state delegations in the House of Representatives, has rekindled the flame of reform in our Electoral College. The case of the faithless North Carolina elector¹ has added fuel to that flame.

There are Members of Congress who resist the thought of change. They aver that the present system has successfully withstood the test of almost two centuries. They assert the validity of the compromise compact with the smaller states, which induced them to support the conversion from loose confederation to Federal Republic. They "look at the record" of only three "minority" Presidents, and only two incidents, in the first half century of our Republic where the election of the President fell into the House of Representatives. They allege that the "winner take all" unit system in the Electoral College discourages splinter parties. In short,

the defenders of the present system refer to the existing Electoral College as an element of stability in our Federal Republic.

However, the recognition of the potential for shenanigans, both in the Electoral College and in the House of Representatives, the disadvantages, if not the dangers, of uncertainty and delay² in the formal election of the President, has broadened the base of support for change.

There are four general reform proposals under current discussion: (1) The direct national popular vote. This proposal is frequently coupled with provision for a nationwide primary for Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. (2) The district plan which would retain the electoral vote concept with electors chosen in each Congressional District, and in addition, two at large for each state. (3) The automatic electoral vote plan which would abolish the office of elector, but retain the electoral votes of each state, on a unit basis, as now provided. (4) The proportional plan, which would divide the electoral votes within each state in accordance with the number of popular votes received, to the nearest thousandth.

Objectively, one cannot be unaware of the points of strength and weakness in all of these general proposals. On balance, I have favored the proportional plan and have sponsored joint resolutions proposing this plan with minor modifications, since the 81st Congress.

From a practical point of view, the proportional plan probably has the best likelihood, among the proposed reforms of adoption. It would provide the basic advantage of substantially reflecting the will of the individual voters without threatening the power of the states to regulate suffrage requirements. In campaign concepts, it would result in more nation-wide campaigning, as opposed to the concentration on a few of the larger "swing" states.

While, like most essential compromises, the proportional plan has its detractors, both from those who would change everything and those who would change nothing, I look upon the proportional plan as practical politics, something that can be accomplished, and something that would avoid the major pitfalls of the present system and the prospective pitfalls of each of the three alternate reform proposals above mentioned.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey, a North Carolina elector, pledged to the Nixon-Agnew ticket, actually cast his vote, in the Electoral College, for the Wallace-LeMay ticket. In the counting of the electoral votes in the Joint Session of Congress on January 6, 1969 this North Carolina elector's vote was challenged. In separate proceedings in Senate and House, Mr. Bailey's defecting vote was sustained. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 145-173; 196-247.

² The 1968 Electoral College did not meet in the state capitols until December 6. The counting of the electoral votes did not occur until January 6, 1969. If no candidate had received a majority in the Electoral College; then, it should be recalled, the election of the President would not have been by majority vote of the Members of the House of Representatives, but rather by the majority vote of 26 separate state delegations in the House of Representatives. It is hardly conceivable that a President could have been elected in the House prior to the scheduled inauguration date. Meantime, the Senate would have proceeded to the election of the Vice President, who would have become Acting President until such time as the House, under these trying circumstances, could have reached a decision.

³ H.J. Res. 51 (1949); H.J. Res. 194 (1969). (Reference not indicated in text.)

RUTH KIRZON GROUP FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the wonderful work done in my district by the Ruth Kirzon Group for Handicapped Children, an organization of women volunteers who give their services selflessly to young people suffering from physical or emotional disabilities.

The Ruth Kirzon Group was organized in 1946. Today it has 400 members, who work with no compensation whatever and do not even have the assistance of a paid staff.

The Ruth Kirzon Group has a visiting children's service. Members go into the homes of severely handicapped children and spend time with them, giving them comfort, helping them to laugh. They take the children out in groups for a day in the country, for a picnic or boat ride, or for the joys of a circus or a rodeo. They take children to movies, planetariums, or the theater. They introduce these handicapped young people to opportunities they have perhaps never had in their lives. They bring these children out of the shells in which many of them live and expose them to the outside world.

Members of the Ruth Kirzon Group go into the hospitals of New York, where they read to and play with the children, conduct birthday parties, give them toys and present to them such entertainment as musicians, puppeteers and magicians. They have performed these services at the following hospitals: Blythedale Convalescent Home, Coney Island Hospital, Cumberland Hospital, Fordham Hospital, Jacobi Hospital, Joint Disease Hospital, Jewish Memorial Hospital, Morrisania Hospital, and Special Surgery Hospital.

In 1950, the Ruth Kirzon Group established a scholarship committee, to enable talented high school graduates to go on to higher education, despite their physical or emotional handicaps. The scholarships have assisted in maintenance, books, equipment, transportation, and tuition for young people. The group is proud that, among its scholarship recipients, there are now doctors, lawyers, accountants, speech therapists, engineers, journalists, and commercial artists. The group also encourages scholarly achievement by making special awards to handicapped young people who graduate with distinction in their class at high school.

May I also note that the Ruth Kirzon Group sends more than 100 children each summer to a specialized summer camp for handicapped young people, for periods of not less than 3 weeks. Under proper supervision, the children learn to play ball, swim, and participate in other activities, though hobbled by crutches or confined in wheelchairs. The group has also provided therapeutic swimming pools, special equipment, and made other major physical contributions to its summer program for handicapped children.

Mr. Speaker, it is largely out of the inspiration of the Ruth Kirzon Group for Handicapped Children that I have introduced legislation to give special tax benefits to handicapped persons. My aim, like that of these selfless women, is not simply charitable, but to give independence, strength and self-esteem to the handicapped, so they too can be a useful part of our society. I urge my colleagues to consider this legislation sympathetically, keeping close to their hearts the lesson of service and decency to the handicapped that the Ruth Kirzon group has offered us.

PROTECTING OUR CONSUMER'S INTERESTS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, never before has a nation been so indebted to its businessmen as America. Their initiative and drive has made our economy the greatest in the world.

The American businessman of 1969 is more sophisticated and more community conscious than ever before. The American buyer is more discerning. Yet, on the shadowy fringes of the business world lurk an unscrupulous few preying on the unwary buyer.

Fraud in the marketplace has become one of the most important issues in the 91st Congress.

It is to these dishonest few that I direct the consumer legislation package I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that the States will be provided with sufficient leadership and assistance to fully enforce their civil consumer codes.

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

My object is not to impose a federally controlled consumer protection program, but to leave the task of consumer protection where it belongs—in the States.

When this country was young, we were a nation of farms, small towns, and growing, closely knit cities. There was a personal relationship between the seller and buyer in everyday commerce.

Instead of going to the blacksmith, the corner grocer, or the miller, we now deal with complicated products and marketing organizations where the manufacturer may be thousands of miles away from his customer.

In this 20th century, commerce is impersonal, complex, and technical. When the consumer encounters fraud and indifference in the marketplace, he has little or no recourse to satisfactory adjudication, even when he has been cheated.

ESTABLISHES CONSUMER PROTECTION OFFICE

The legislation I offer today would move the States into an active role of consumer protection by channeling funds to them for the establishment of a consumer protection office and a plan to license and regulate fair business practices.

The object of this proposal is to weed out those in the business community who thrive on deception and intimidation and to provide consumer affairs regulations at the local level.

Under the provisions of my bill, individual grants up to 50 percent of the State's consumer protection plan would be allowed. However, no State could obtain more than an amount determined by the ratio of its own population to the population of all the States.

STATES QUALIFY FOR GRANTS

In order to qualify for these grants, the States would have to submit to the Secretary of Commerce for approval a plan to provide a consumer protection office within the State to deal with dishonest practices and a plan for programs to license or otherwise regulate business activities.

The bill's regulatory activities include, but are not limited to, household appliance repairmen, home movers, travel agents, and home improvement contractors. Industries with a history of consumer abuses would also be covered under these regulations.

The thrust of these regulations is aimed at false advertising and failure to perform work or services as represented for which the consumer was billed.

CONSUMER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

An important highlight of this consumer protection program is the authorization of State consumer education programs and the recommendation that courses be established within the curriculum of public schools. This would give consumers an awareness of today's problems and it would give tomorrow's consumer the understanding to deal intelligently in the marketplace.

Practices such as inflated pricing, "deceptive" giveaways, bait and switch, and other forms of false advertising which might cause people to sign contracts for unwanted and unneeded merchandise are also within the scope of this act.

Penalties are established for bogus contests, fictitious bargains, misrepresentation of guarantees, and other tactics to bilk the public.

LICENSING PROGRAMS

Finally, the bill authorizes licensing programs by which the States would establish uniform standards with which all home appliance repairmen, motor vehicle repairmen and similar service tradesmen would have to comply.

Mr. Speaker, consumer credit codes vary from State to State, and there are no effective laws to stop unscrupulous tradesmen even when they are discovered. The legal machinery may drag on for 2 or 3 years before a violator can be ordered to cease and desist.

The consumer protection office within the attorney general's office in New York City, through mediation and court action, returned \$766,486.42 to the public in money, goods, and/or services in 1967 alone when individuals submitted complaints about unfair consumer practices.

MORTGAGE FRAUDS

The home-improvement industry is a \$15 billion annual enterprise. In the shadowy fringes of this beneficial service swim a sea of home-improvement sharks

who prey on the poor, the elderly, and the ignorant.

Many an unwary customer has found himself victim of the home-improvement shark. Lured with false and deceptive offers of attractive home repairs, the victim finds he has paid too much, received inferior work and material, and worst of all has sometimes unknowingly mortgaged his home in the bargain.

Once in the hands of the home-improvement sharks, these home mortgages are usually sold to a holder in due course for a quick profit. The loan company that bought the note, disclaiming any prior knowledge of the home improvement contract, can then foreclose, forcing the unbelieving victim and his family to lose the home they had only wanted to improve.

COST OF DECEPTION

Shoddy and deceptive business practices such as this cost the American consumer between \$500 million and \$1 billion yearly according to the National Better Business Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I feel my bill provides the means for the State to curb abuses and fraud in commerce. By stimulating State efforts with grants, the Federal funds we provide can have a far greater impact than if we tried to implement such a program in any other way.

This legislation offers the public the safeguards to deal with confidence in the marketplace. Equitable laws, State enforcement and a national program of consumer education are the keys to protecting our consumers interests.

By enacting this legislation, we would not be pointing the finger at any particular kind of business. What we would be doing is removing the unjust scorn on legitimate businesses by weeding out those who try to bilk the public.

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE RELIEF TO BIAFRA

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor a House resolution to increase U.S. relief to Biafra, and at the outset of my remarks I would like to pay tribute to the two distinguished Members of this House who have taken the lead in enlisting bipartisan support for this measure. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE). These two men deserve the gratitude of the Nation for their efforts in behalf of the desperate members of the Ibo Tribe of Biafra who stand threatened with annihilation as a result of the Nigerian civil war.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we have introduced today calls upon President Nixon to do all he can to increase the amount of food and other supplies which we are sending to Biafra. Further, it calls upon the Government of the United

States to do all it can to enlist the support of all nations in aiding the starving people of Biafra.

As I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking not just for myself or for those Members who are moved by basic humanitarian motives. I speak not just for those who elected me. The people of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey who by the way, have sent hundreds of messages to me indicating their support of Biafran relief, I speak for all the people of this Nation, Republicans as well as Democrats, liberals and conservatives, northerners, and southerners.

The cause of Biafra has touched the heartstrings of this Nation. Americans have always been generous to those who have known misfortune. Once again this Nation has responded, its people have spoken. Now the Government must rise to the occasion.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1970—A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF ITS HIGHLIGHTS
THE BUDGET PICTURE IN BRIEF—SELECTED YEARS 1960-70

Fiscal years	(Billions)					
	1960	1965	1967	1968	1969	1970
Receipts.....	\$92.4	\$116.8	\$149.6	\$153.7	\$186.1	\$198.7
Outlays.....	92.2	118.4	158.4	178.9	183.7	195.3
Surplus (+) or deficit (-)	+0.2	-1.6	-8.8	-25.2	+2.4	+13.4
New spending authority.....	(0)	(0)	182.2	190.6	194.6	210.1
Obligations incurred.....	(0)	(0)	168.2	181.8	189.2	202.0
Federal debt—end of year.....	290.8	323.1	341.3	369.7	385.2	371.5
Portion held by public.....	237.1	261.6	267.5	290.6	276.6	272.6

¹ Figures not available prior to 1967 under unified budget concept.
² Not applicable.

The table shows in condensed form the fiscal record of the Federal Government for the decade beginning with the last full fiscal year (1960) for which the Eisenhower Administration was responsible through the Johnson Administration's last year (1969) of primary responsibility. It also includes the totals of the budget plan that Mr. Johnson has recommended to Congress for the coming fiscal year, 1970.

This last Johnson budget will, of course, be subject to revision by the new Nixon Administration when it has had an opportunity to develop its own fiscal program for 1970. But the dimensions of the 1970 budget are in large measure the result of actions taken by the Johnson Administration and Congress over the last few years, so the area of discretion for the new Administration will be relatively small in its first budget year. Consequently, this Johnson budget will remain the basic budget plan for 1970 even though being subject to revisions by President Nixon through administrative action and in recommendations to Congress.

Analysis of the Johnson fiscal program for 1970 as the terminal budget of the current decade points up the following facts:

1. The planned \$195.3 billion outlays in 1970 represents an increase of 112% over the 1960 total of \$92.2 billion. It is an increase of 65% in the five years since 1965 when outlays were \$118.4 billion while the 1965 total was an increase of only 28% over 1960 spending.
2. Rising national defense costs, including Vietnam, accounts for 35% of the \$103.1 billion spending increase since 1960. Interest accounts for 7%, and other nondefense spending accounts for 58% of the increase. Of the spending increase of \$76.9 billion since 1965, 42% is due to increased defense spending, 7% to higher interest costs, and 51% to growth in nondefense programs.
3. The rate of spending growth, averaging \$20 billion a year from 1965 to 1968, has been

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt approval of this resolution which bears the names of almost 100 Members of this House.

ANNUAL BUDGET ANALYSIS

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the annual budget analysis by Eugene F. Rinta is being made public tomorrow, and I wish to extend it in the RECORD for the enlightenment and consideration of Members.

Mr. Rinta is an acknowledged expert on budget problems, and his summary and comments will be of great value.

The analysis follows:

sharply reduced to a \$5 billion increase in 1969 over 1968. This reduced rate of growth resulted primarily from a leveling off of Vietnam costs and spending restraints imposed by Congress in the last session. A renewal of more rapid growth, however, is proposed by Mr. Johnson for 1970 with a budgeted increase of \$11.6 billion over 1969. Of that increase, only \$0.5 billion is in defense costs

and \$0.8 billion is for interest. The remaining \$10.3 billion is for expansion of nondefense spending.

4. Receipts rose almost as rapidly as outlays from 1960 to 1965 with the result being a modest deficit of \$1.6 billion in 1965 as compared to a slight surplus of \$0.2 billion in 1960. During the next three years, however, outlays rose far more rapidly than receipts with the result being three successively larger deficits aggregating \$37.8 billion for the three years. The combination of sharply higher revenues and a smaller increase in spending resulting from the increased taxes and spending restraints imposed by Congress last year makes possible an estimated surplus of \$2.4 billion in 1969.

5. Despite the proposed increase of \$11.6 billion in outlays, another surplus of \$3.4 billion is budgeted for 1970. This would be made possible by a \$12.6 billion increase in receipts over 1969 which is largely based on extension of the 10% surtax and certain excise tax rates which are scheduled for reduction and on enactment of legislation which would produce \$2.4 billion additional receipts from payroll taxes and user charges.

6. Proposed new spending authority and, of even more significance, estimated obligations to be incurred in 1970 substantially exceed planned 1970 outlays, as they have in all recent years. With obligations incurred exceeding outlays in the three years 1967-69 alone by over \$18 billion and by almost \$7 billion in the 1970 budget plans, large future increases are being built into the spending stream.

COMPARISON OF SPENDING BY FUNCTION FOR 1970 AND PRIOR YEARS

The purposes for which President Johnson recommends outlays of \$195.3 billion in the 1970 fiscal year beginning next July are shown in the table that follows. For comparative purposes the table shows the expenditures for the same functions in the current year and in 1965 and 1960. The table also shows by functions the new spending authority proposed for 1970. In addition to amounts by major functional categories, the table includes amounts in parentheses for large sub-categories in which significant changes occur. The major category amounts are net figures after deduction for offsetting receipts.

	[in millions]				Proposed new spending authority, 1970
	Actual, 1960	Actual, 1965	Estimated, 1969	Planned, 1970	
National defense.....	\$45,908	\$49,578	\$80,999	\$81,542	\$82,986
Department of Defense.....	(41,478)	(45,973)	(77,790)	(78,471)	(80,238)
International affairs and finance.....	3,054	4,340	3,338	3,755	4,342
Economic assistance and food.....	(2,849)	(3,893)	(3,564)	(3,390)	(3,997)
Space research and technology.....	401	5,091	4,247	3,947	3,758
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	3,322	4,807	5,448	5,181	5,720
Farm income stabilization.....	(2,222)	(3,234)	(4,509)	(3,921)	(4,361)
Natural resources.....	1,019	2,063	1,898	1,891	1,708
Commerce and transportation.....	4,774	7,364	8,969	8,969	10,364
Air transportation.....	(568)	(875)	(1,144)	(1,332)	(1,308)
Ground transportation.....	(2,984)	(4,092)	(4,327)	(5,081)	(6,087)
Community development and housing.....	971	288	2,313	2,772	3,694
Concentrated community development.....	(51)	(51)	(732)	(1,216)	(1,507)
Community environment.....	(105)	(331)	(801)	(984)	(1,128)
Low and moderate income housing.....	(145)	(81)	(935)	(1,131)	(704)
Education and manpower.....	1,282	2,509	7,165	8,887	7,961
Elementary and secondary education.....	(327)	(478)	(1,182)	(2,373)	(2,861)
Higher education.....	(261)	(413)	(1,368)	(1,366)	(1,047)
Manpower training.....	(4)	(336)	(1,511)	(1,685)	(1,920)
Health and welfare.....	18,734	27,209	48,839	54,966	64,814
Health programs.....	(761)	(1,747)	(11,379)	(12,938)	(15,507)
Income security payments.....	(17,659)	(25,111)	(36,275)	(40,497)	(49,883)
Social and individual services.....	(317)	(547)	(1,188)	(1,514)	(1,586)
Veterans' benefits and services.....	5,428	5,722	7,692	7,724	7,939
Interest.....	8,289	10,357	12,171	12,958	15,958
General Government.....	1,334	2,276	2,948	3,275	3,312
Allowance for pay increases.....				2,800	2,800
Allowance for contingencies.....				100	500
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions.....	-2,296	-3,174	-5,105	-5,745	-5,745
Total.....	\$92,230	\$118,431	\$183,701	\$195,272	\$210,116

ANALYSIS OF MAJOR CHANGES IN SPENDING

A comparison of budgeted outlays in 1970 with current estimates for 1969 shows a net

overall increase of \$11.6 billion. In comparison with 1960, which was the last full budget year of the Eisenhower Administration, the

\$195.3 billion 1970 spending total is up \$103 billion, or 112%. In relation to the Johnson Administration's first full budget year, 1965, outlays proposed for 1970 are up \$76.8 billion, or 65%.

National defense spending rose moderately from \$45.9 billion in 1960 to \$49.6 billion in 1965. Then defense costs rose rapidly during the next three years to \$80.5 billion in 1968 where they leveled off with further increases of \$0.5 billion expected in both 1969 and 1970. The request of \$83.0 billion new spending authority for 1970 indicates somewhat higher outlays ahead unless Vietnam costs can be reduced materially. Vietnam outlays are estimated at \$25.4 billion in 1970 as compared to \$28.8 billion in 1969 and \$26.5 billion in 1968. The new spending authority request for Vietnam operations in 1970 is \$23.0 billion.

Interest costs have been rising substantially in recent years because of both a rapidly rising debt and unusually high interest rates. Net interest costs, after deducting interest received by the Treasury, are estimated at \$16.0 billion in 1970 as compared to \$15.2 billion in 1969, \$10.4 billion in 1965, and \$8.3 billion in 1960. Interest on the public debt will cost an estimated \$16.8 billion in 1970. This compares with \$16.0 billion in 1969, \$11.3 billion in 1965, and \$9.2 billion in 1960. Over the five-year period from 1965 through 1970 the increase in cost of interest on the public debt will be \$5.5 billion, or 48%.

International affairs, including foreign economic aid programs, will cost an estimated \$3.8 billion in 1970. This is \$0.2 billion less than in 1969 and \$0.9 billion less than in 1965. In fact it is the smallest total in this category since 1961. An upturn after 1970 is contemplated, however, because the new spending authority request is \$4.3 billion as compared to \$3.4 billion approved by Congress for 1969.

Domestic nondefense programs (excluding interest) account for the remainder of the budget except for the major part of a \$2.8 billion allowance for civilian and military pay increases scheduled to become effective July 1, 1969. Assuming that about \$1.0 billion of the scheduled pay increases are applicable to domestic nondefense programs, the 1970 total of outlays for these programs will be \$98.0 billion. This is an increase of \$9.3 billion over 1969. In comparison with 1965, planned 1970 outlays for domestic nondefense programs are up \$40.6 billion, or 71%, in five years. The increase since 1960 is \$60.7 billion and 163%.

(NOTE.—The above comparisons of outlays do not include any estimated functional allocation of the amounts of undistributed intragovernmental transactions. These amounts include government contributions for employee retirement and interest received by trust funds which are deducted from program expenditures in determining net budget outlays under the unified budget concept.)

The growth of domestic nondefense spending in the major functional categories is shown in the following table. For comparative purposes the table also shows the growth in defense, interest, and international programs.

Outlays by function	Increase (billions)		Percentage increase	
	1960 to 1965	1965 to 1970	1960 to 1965	1965 to 1970
Space research and technology.....	\$4.7	-\$1.1	1,170	-22
Agriculture programs.....	1.5	.4	45	8
Natural resources.....	1.0	-.2	102	-8
Commerce and transportation.....	2.6	1.6	54	22
Community development and housing.....	-7	2.5	-70	863
Education and manpower.....	1.2	5.4	96	214

Outlays by function	Increase (billions)		Percentage increase	
	1960 to 1965	1965 to 1970	1960 to 1965	1965 to 1970
Health and welfare.....	\$8.5	\$27.8	45	102
Veterans programs.....	.3	2.0	5	35
General government.....	.9	1.0	71	44
Total domestic non-defense.....	20.1	140.6	54	171
National defense.....	3.7	32.0	8	64
Interest, net.....	2.1	5.6	25	54
International programs.....	1.3	-.6	42	-13

1 Includes for 1970 \$1,000,000,000 allowance for pay increases and \$350,000,000 allowance for contingencies.

Following are some of the more significant increases in individual nondefense programs from current estimates for 1969 to budgeted amounts for 1970:

Federal funds	Increases in 1970—millions	
	Outlays	Appropriations
Airports and air traffic control.....	\$194	\$340
Model cities programs.....	465	438
Elementary and secondary education.....	191	-85
Manpower training.....	174	439
Health services and mental health.....	145	111
National Institutes of Health.....	202	90
Public assistance grants.....	407	294
Medical grants.....	631	661
Rehabilitation program grants.....	140	195
Social services and administration.....	138	136
Law enforcement assistance.....	192	237
Veterans readjustment benefits.....	109	118
Total of above items.....	2,968	2,974
TRUST FUNDS		
Old-age and survivors insurance.....	2,497	4,543
Disability insurance.....	297	599
Health insurance.....	629	53
Highway programs.....	857	506
Total of above trust fund items.....	4,280	5,701

In addition to the above program increases for 1970, a very costly item will be pay increases for Federal civilian and military personnel scheduled under existing law to become effective July 1, 1969. The total cost of these pay raises is estimated in the budget at \$2.8 billion. This amount represents a 7% increase for both civilian and military personnel. About \$1.75 billion will be given civilian employees and \$1.05 billion to the military.

RENEWED SPENDING GROWTH AFTER 1969 RESTRAINT

In enacting the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-364), Congress provided that budget outlays in 1969 would have to be held to a level at least \$6 billion below the budget estimate of \$186.1 billion and that new spending authority would have to be held at least \$10 billion below the \$201.7 billion proposed in the budget. Exceptions to these budget control provisions were made for Vietnam war costs and for several major "uncontrollable" programs. Thus, while outlays and spending authority for the expected activities could exceed the budget estimates, the remaining budget items would have to be reduced \$6 billion in outlays and \$10 billion in new spending authority below the original budget estimates.

The Congress itself met the required \$10 billion reduction in new spending authority by cutting 1969 appropriation requests in excess of that amount in the individual appropriation bills. According to the President's 1970 Budget Message, the \$6 billion reduction in 1969 outlays will also be met through the combined efforts of Congress and the Executive Branch. Programs exempted from P.L. 90-364 show net increases above the original 1969 budget estimates of \$6.0 billion in outlays and \$6.1 billion in spending au-

thority. If spending restraints had not been imposed by Congress and applied by the Administration, the current estimates of 1969 outlays would be \$189.7 billion instead of \$183.7 billion and spending authority would be in excess of \$204.6 billion instead of \$194.6 billion.

With the spending restraints imposed for 1969, outlays in 1969 are expected to exceed the 1968 total by only \$4.8 billion and new spending authority will be only \$4.0 billion above 1968. But the 1970 budget calls for increases over 1969 in the amounts of \$11.6 billion in outlays and \$15.5 billion in new spending authority. Renewed expenditure growth is also indicated by the substantial excess of obligations incurred, as well as new spending authority, over actual outlays in 1970 as in each of the last several years. Following are the figures for the four years beginning with 1967:

Fiscal year	[in billions]		
	New spending authority	Obligations incurred	Outlays
1967 actual.....	\$182.6	\$168.2	\$158.4
1968 actual.....	190.6	181.5	178.9
1969 estimates.....	194.6	189.2	183.7
1970 estimates.....	210.1	202.0	195.3
Total.....	777.9	741.2	716.3

While deobligation of spending commitments already made does occasionally occur through change of plans and cancellation of contracts, in general the obligation of appropriations inevitably leads to outlays of cash. Availability of new spending authority does not so definitely imply its commitment to expenditure. But the fact that obligations incurred in the four years through 1970 exceeded the outlays in those years by \$25 billion is a clear indication that there is being built into the spending stream substantial growth ahead which will be difficult to stop. Settlement of the Vietnam conflict offers the best hope, but even then large reductions in outlays will not be immediate.

THE TAX PROPOSALS IN THE BUDGET

The principal revenue proposal in the budget calls for extension to June 30, 1970 of the 10% income tax surcharge on individuals and corporations which is scheduled to expire June 30, 1969. This would provide \$9.0 billion of additional revenues in 1970. Other revenue proposals, and the amounts they would produce in 1970, call for:

Delaying until January 1, 1971, instead of January 1, 1970, the reduction to 5% in the current 7% excise tax rate on automobiles and the 10% rate on telephone services to produce \$0.5 billion revenues.

Raising the OASDI and health insurance taxable income base from \$7,800 to \$9,000 and increasing the combined tax rate on employers and employees from 9.6% to 10.4%, effective January 1, 1970, for a revenue increase of \$1.7 billion.

Enacting additional user charges, primarily highway and aviation, to produce \$0.4 billion new revenues.

Quarterly rather than annual collection of the Federal unemployment insurance tax to provide one-time additional revenues of \$0.3 billion.

SURPLUS IN 1970 BUT STILL AN INCREASE IN DEBT

After eight consecutive deficits since 1960, a surplus of \$2.4 billion is anticipated for 1969 and another surplus of \$3.4 billion is budgeted for 1970. The eight deficits in the years 1961 through 1968 totaled \$60.6 billion under the unified budget concept which includes trust fund operations as well as regular Federal fund accounts. During these same eight years the Federal debt rose by \$78.9 billion from \$290.8 billion at the end of 1960 to \$369.7 billion at the end of 1968.

The fact that debt grew \$78.9 billion while deficits totaled \$18.3 billion less can be explained in part by increases in agency debt, such as TVA revenue bond issues, which are not used to finance budget deficits. The main reason for the difference, however, is the fact that Treasury debt changes are primarily caused by deficits and surpluses in Federal fund transactions rather than by total transactions in the unified budget. This is illustrated by changes in the Federal debt in 1969 and 1970.

Gross Federal debt is expected to drop by \$4.5 billion in 1969 from \$369.7 billion to \$365.2 billion. But this reduction will be more than accounted for by elimination from Federal debt of \$10.9 billion debt obligations of three mixed ownership financing agencies converted to complete private ownership in 1969. Treasury debt, however, will rise by \$4.9 billion in 1969 from \$345.3 billion to \$350.2 billion despite a budget surplus of \$2.4 billion. This increase in Treasury debt is due to the fact that a deficit of almost \$7 billion is expected in the Federal fund accounts.

Even though a surplus of \$3.4 billion is budgeted for 1970, gross Federal Debt is expected to rise by \$6.3 billion in 1970, with Treasury debt rising \$7.2 billion and agency debt dropping \$0.9 billion. The primary explanation for the debt increase is the fact that Federal fund operations in 1970 are expected to result in a deficit of \$6.8 billion.

The budget surpluses in 1969 and 1970, despite deficits of \$7.0 billion and \$6.8 billion in Federal fund operations, are made possible because of excesses of estimated receipts over outlays in the dedicated trust funds in the amounts of \$9.4 billion in 1969 and \$10.2 billion in 1970. But the Congress as well as the new Nixon Administration should bear in mind that these trust fund surpluses are not available for general expenditure purposes other than as loans from the respective trust funds. And they should remember in their consideration of the 1970 budget that, while the unified budget shows surpluses for both 1969 and 1970, the general revenue and expenditure accounts still show large deficits for these years. These are facts which are not in the 1970 Budget Message or readily apparent in the budget document although they are in the official supplementary Special Analyses to the budget.

EUGENE F. RINTA,
Research Director.

THE NIXON CABINET

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Russell K. Berg, an outstanding labor leader and international president of the Bolshemakers-Blacksmiths Union has presented one of the most objective and penetrating analyses of the Nixon Cabinet that has come to my attention in recent weeks. I present here, for the interest of my colleagues, Mr. Berg's comments:

COMMENTS BY RUSSELL K. BERG

President-elect Nixon's choice of cabinet members fit the qualifications Mr. Nixon has established for the top officials in his administration—proficient men conspicuously lacking in the kind of glamour that marked the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

His choice of William Pierce Rogers as secretary of state, the supreme cabinet job, is a positive sign that Mr. Nixon is going to run the government not through glittering experts with high reputations in their

fields but through trusted old friends, some of them long-time cronies, whose loyalties to him are beyond question.

Rogers goes to the State Department with two advantages: An intimacy with the President that no secretary of state has had in at least half a century; and a lawyer's approach to foreign policy. Rogers is well-known from his days as President Eisenhower's attorney general and highly-regarded.

Another theme Mr. Nixon's major cabinet choices reflect is that they are not tied to policies of the past.

There is, finally, one other Nixon characteristic that his choice of top cabinet aides illuminates: His refusal to take chances with outsiders he doesn't know well or who might have the slightest taint of divided loyalty. With Rogers and Nixon's secretary of defense Rep. Melvin Laird, at the top and an old friend, Robert Finch, nailing down the key domestic affairs cabinet post, Nixon will be surrounded by loyal intimates.

Thus, Nixon, promises to bring the most personalized administration to Washington that the town has seen since Franklin Roosevelt's second administration.

It has been said that Nixon has always been uneasy with strangers, that he has never been comfortable outside his small circle of intimates. Thus, he is simply bringing the whole circle to Washington with him to make out of it what has all the earmarks of a good cabinet.

It would seem that what Mr. Nixon has done is to pick a cabinet in which certain members will be policymakers and others will be administrators who will carry out the policies laid down by the President and some of the special advisers he will have at his elbow.

For instance, it seems to be a known fact that Rogers is not a foreign-policy expert. But he is a good administrator and, as a former head of the Department of Justice, he knows a great deal about the organization problems inside a big government department.

George P. Shultz, Nixon's choice for Secretary of Labor, has had practical experience as co-chairman of the Armour Automation Commission which should prove particularly helpful in meeting the serious problem of manpower retraining, technological unemployment and job opportunities.

Constitutionally, cabinet members are "principal officers . . . of the executive department and public ministers" appointed by the President. But historically and as a matter of practical government, the cabinet is whatever the President wants to make it.

Richard M. Nixon seems to have chosen a body of individualistic, capable men as his advisers in the numerous and important fields of executive responsibility. Most are relatively unknown to the public. Within a matter of months the American people will know some of their names very well.

They will be directly involved with the prospects of war and peace in Vietnam and elsewhere; the general foreign policy of the United States and the multitude of domestic issues and decisions that confront the nation. They will, we hope, offer fresh approaches to old problems. Inevitably they will make mistakes, and Congress and various interests and groups about the country will become rapidly disenchanted with some of them.

But every President shapes his own administration. And it is our impression that Richard Nixon will be a strong President and firm authority within the limits of that powerful office. White House advisers, along with formal members of the cabinet, may play important roles. Mr. Nixon says he wants an interchange of ideas and opinions. But final decisions, and properly so, will be made by the man who holds the ultimate responsibility.

Time will tell the influence these men who make up the President's cabinet will exert on the quality of life in the nation and on events that affect the future of the world.

DR. LUTHER HOLCOMB

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it would be superfluous for me to say that there are many fine Texans holding positions of import in Washington, as all of my colleagues are well aware of this. One of these, however, is my good friend, Dr. Luther Holcomb, Vice Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Recently, Mr. Louis C. Harris, writing for the Augusta Chronicle, did a very commendable job in bringing Dr. Holcomb to the attention of his readers. Under leave to attend my remarks, I wish to include this article:

NOT ALL BUREAUCRATS ARE BAD

(By Louis C. Harris)

We have a regrettable tendency, those of us who do not always subscribe to the nostrums concocted in Washington as cures for what supposedly ails us, to regard all bureaucrats as impractical meddlers striving to extract sunbeams from cucumbers.

But such is not the case. In fact, I can now say that one of my very good friends is a bureaucrat!

The gentleman to whom I refer is Dr. Luther Holcomb, the vice chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission whom I came to know for the first time in Athens last year when he spoke on a program of the Georgia Press Institute.

An ordained minister who originally hailed from Texas, Luther Holcomb is one man for sure who has not permitted his role in national affairs to wrap one with his ideals, principles, his sense of humor, nor his concept of fair play.

But because the mark of Washington was upon him, I recall how surprised some of us were when, hearing Dr. Holcomb for the first time, we received an altogether rational and unemotional approach toward achieving equal employment opportunities for men everywhere.

It was with a large measure of delight—and with no surprise at all—that I read another of Luther Holcomb's speeches the other day after receiving a copy from Stan Smith, the general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association and, coincidentally, a former Chronicle staffer.

Stan sent along the speech to various newspaper editors around the country because it had to do, primarily, with the EEOC's ruling in connection with the use of sex labels in classified ads. To eliminate any semblance of "discrimination" in advertising, EEOC said newspapers must no longer list ads under "male" and "female" classifications. Luther Holcomb dissented.

He contended that in such advertising the newspaper is not doing the hiring, but is simply providing a service to the advertiser. Thus, he said, EEOC has no jurisdiction. In the first place. By the same token, he argued, the classification of ads under the heading of male and female is a time-saver for those seeking jobs, as well as for those seeking employees. Havoc will result, he pointed out, if personnel departments are besieged with

male applicants unwittingly applying for jobs modeling feminine apparel, or with female applicants for the position of locker room attendant at a men's gymnasium.

As thoroughly in accord as one might expect me to be with Dr. Holcomb's premises, I found far more impressive what he had to say, later on in his talk, as he offered his audience "some observations on issues pertinent to the times."

"Despite America's seemingly infinite capacity for growth and flexibility," he said, "the truth is that our society as now organized has been stretched taut . . . America is 'supercharged.' 'Hyperemotionalism' is on the rise. As a nation, as a people we are capable of creating the greatest good for the greatest number, but we are also capable through self-deception of bringing chaos upon our society." Then he said:

"The time of divisiveness is over. It is now our solemn obligation to stand united and occupy ourselves with the fundamentals and imperatives of the transition to a new administration . . .

"Our new President-elect is aware of the gravity of our social cleavages, but he alone cannot restore unity. Although he has been chosen to lead our nation, the people must cooperate by following. We must learn to respect each other despite our diversities and to trust each other despite our differences . . . I believe every American should commit himself to unite in spirit with the President."

As for the job he holds, Dr. Holcomb explained that the original concept of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which created EEOC, "was to acknowledge the existence of job discrimination, to make the public aware of it, and by elimination of job discrimination to give minority groups the 'opportunity to achieve' that is uniquely American. It was never intended," he added, "that Title VII become a permanent part of the functions of the federal system . . .

Said Dr. Holcomb: "The private enterprise system is the backbone of America. American business is known for its creative and progressive techniques, and those innovative methods must be put to use in eradicating discrimination in employment opportunity.

"Likewise," said he, "government must seek a common-sense, down-to-earth approach to problem-solving at every level. Past bureaucratic methods must be alleviated. Government and business, working together, must develop an equitable way to include minorities in every aspect of American opportunity. A revolution of responsibility on the part of all Americans—including minorities—must occur.

Just as I said, Luther Holcomb is an unusual bureaucrat. We need more like him.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Central Rada proclaimed the independence of the Ukraine from Russia. This monumental act could occur only because of the unremitting efforts of the Ukrainian people to retain their sovereignty. This was no easy task. These courageous people, plagued by war and internal strife, were subjected to hardships of great severity at the hands of the Russians. Still they worked and fought together, and with the Russians greatly weakened by the revolution of 1917, the

Ukrainians seized this opportunity to declare their freedom.

At this time, the Moscow government recognized the independence of the Ukraine, but the Russians later chose to ignore their commitment. The Ukrainians were subjected to acts of military aggression and subversion which brought to an end their short-lived freedom. They were the victims of harsh treatment. Millions died of starvation in an attempt to resist Soviet collectivization of their farms. Ukrainian youth were shipped off to remote areas of the Soviet Union, and religious persecution was devastating.

Even in the face of such severe adversity, these gallant people have not lost their sense of nationalism. They have continually resisted Soviet domination.

I, along with the millions of people of the world dedicated to freedom and the democratic way of life, want to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence. May we here in a country dedicated to these ideals never cease to be thankful for the privilege of inheriting these rights and pledge to do our utmost to extend these rights to countries not as fortunate as ours.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 50th anniversary of the union of the Ukraine, and the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of the free and independent Ukrainian Republic.

The Act of Union stated the aspirations of the Ukrainian people in stirring prose, a part of which is quoted below:

From today on there shall be only one independent Ukrainian National Republic. From today on the Ukrainian people, freed by the mighty upsurge of their own strength, have the opportunity to unite all the endeavors of their sons for the creation of an indivisible, independent Ukrainian State for the good and the welfare of the working people.

Tragically these dreams went unfulfilled for, as even former Premier Khrushchev admitted in 1956, Stalin planned the total annihilation of the Ukrainian people because of their opposition and resistance to Russian communism. This persecution continues to the present day with a program for the systematic dismemberment of the Ukrainian nation, and the suppression of its people and culture.

History has clearly demonstrated that no people can indefinitely be denied their right to self-determination, without this leading to the eventual destruction of the oppressor. Let us hope that the Soviet Union is wise enough to heed this lesson and permit the natural union of the Ukrainian nation, containing as it does a common language, culture, and people. By doing so the Russians will not only be recognizing the legitimate right of the

Ukrainian people to their own sovereignty, but will also assist in the maintenance of its own stability. In addition, it would also herald a welcome departure, in the eyes of the world, away from Russia's present role as the chief practitioner of impericalism.

In the meantime, let us never forget the suffering of the brave Ukrainian people and the heroic sacrifices made in their quest for liberty and freedom. By keeping alive the flame of hope for eventual independence we will be offering the most significant commemoration of these important anniversaries.

IRISH IMMIGRATION: A FAIR AND REALISTIC SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on January 6 I reintroduced legislation—H.R. 2118—which I submitted in the 90th Congress to resolve the problem of immigration from Ireland and other Western European nations that has developed following full implementation of the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965 on July 1, 1968.

I firmly believe that present U.S. immigration policy, established by the 1965 act, is just and realistic. It is a policy founded on three basic principles: Reuniting families, giving preference to those who will contribute to our expanding society, and offering asylum to refugees.

With approval of the 1965 act Congress eliminated the last vestige of the odious national origins quota system as a basis for the selection of immigrants to the United States. That discriminatory system recognized neither passage of time nor the dignity of the individual. It was conceived during an era of unrealistic fear of immigration accentuated by a period of economic uneasiness. The immigration quotas which it established based on place of birth were designed to serve a twofold purpose: To restrict numerically the volume of immigration into the United States and to select immigrants in such a way as to preserve the balance between the various ethnic elements in the American population.

The system, however, was highly unsatisfactory from every viewpoint. In the first place, it failed to maintain the ethnic balance of the American population as it was designed and intended, since the nations favored with high quotas left them largely unused. In fact, statistics establish that only one of every three immigrants since World War II actually was admitted to the United States as a quota immigrant.

Most repugnant, too, was the system's built-in discrimination and lack of imagination which is antithetical to the very concepts of freedom and equality for which the United States stands. As the late President Kennedy said, in submitting a special immigration message to Congress to accomplish needed reforms:

The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all our important problems in the field of immigration. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribed.

But despite the fundamental equity of our immigration policy, it is a fact that the 1965 act created unintended problems and inequities. One of the most serious is the drop in immigration from Ireland and other Western European nations which were traditional sources of immigration to the United States.

The difficulty developed as a result of the 3-year phaseout period before the 1965 act became fully effective. During this period unused quota numbers were put in an immigration pool. However, no part of annual quotas was deducted, so countries such as Ireland found it easier to make use of their great abundance of nonpreference numbers and as a consequence there was no build-up of priorities under the preferences. Thus, for those countries there was, in effect, business as usual under the national origins system during the phaseout period. But by guaranteeing that countries such as Ireland, Germany, and Great Britain would not be disadvantaged by quota deductions during the phaseout period, the law only served to place them, at a disadvantage after July 1, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill I have introduced represents a fair and flexible response to this problem that will, at the same time, avoid any retrogressive move in the direction of national origins favoritism and thereby negate the objectives of the 1965 act.

Under H.R. 2118, which has been sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ERLBERG), 50 percent of the unused visa numbers from fiscal year 1968 would be reserved in a pool for use by the President to alleviate undue hardships such as in the Irish immigration situation. Furthermore, the bill provides that the remainder of the numbers not reserved may be reallocated on a first-come, first-served basis to those preference categories which are presently oversubscribed. The bill, therefore, will accomplish two objectives:

First, Permit Irish immigrants to continue to come to the United States during its proposed 2-year operation; and

Second, Eliminate some of the backlog in the preference categories, thus allowing Ireland and other countries of Western Europe to compete favorably for visa numbers.

Statistics clearly indicate that my bill should resolve the problem. For example, during the phaseout period—December 1, 1965 to July 1, 1968—Ireland had an annual quota of 17,756 visa numbers. Yet the total of visas issued, conditional entries and adjustments of status for immigrants born in Ireland was only 3,188 in fiscal year 1966, 2,816 in fiscal year 1967 and 3,916 in fiscal year 1968. It is evident that heretofore Irish immigration has not been limited by a lack of visa numbers. However, the very fact that the Irish did not have to wait for visas

in the past resulted in the situation now with no Irish on the preference waiting lists.

My bill will remedy this defect, and will I am sure provide an ample number of visa numbers since Irish immigration has in fact decreased, as evidenced by the statistics on immigration during the phaseout period. It is a feasible, fair, and realistic solution to the problem and will not breach the policy of the 1965 act which established an annual ceiling of 170,000 on immigration from the Eastern Hemisphere and a per country limitation of 20,000.

Mr. Speaker, there is a tradition of Irish immigration to the United States, and we all recognize the magnificent role of citizens of Irish heritage in building this great Nation. The hardship felt by the Irish who are turned away without visas is immense, and it is a matter of special concern to me to remove the obstacle created by the 1965 act. I intend to seek early consideration of this legislation, for I feel it is timely, necessary and will provide relief from the inequity that has developed.

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM C. FOSTER

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, resigned a few days ago after more than 7 years of distinguished service in the cause of peace. No one has understood better than Bill Foster that the most urgent and important concern facing all people is putting an end to the arms race. With modern arsenals, man has the frightening power to destroy himself and his physical environment quickly and effortlessly. Yet Bill Foster takes his leave with many milestones on the road to peace rightfully credited to his leadership.

In 1958, Mr. Foster was appointed an adviser to the Secretary of State on arms control policies. Later that year he was selected to head the U.S. delegation to the Geneva Technical Conference on the Problem of Surprise Attack. His experience in Geneva led him to recommend the establishment of a full-time organized effort in the arms control field, a recommendation that came to fruition in 1961 with the establishment of ACDA. Bill Foster was the natural choice to head the new agency.

Seidom has a new undertaking of such importance had the fortune to be headed at its most crucial period by so able a leader. A former Under Secretary of Commerce, Administrator of the Marshall plan, Deputy Secretary of Defense and Presidential adviser, Bill Foster had earned the respect of Government leaders. As an industrial executive, he had been president of a steel products company, president of a national chemists' association, and chairman of a nuclear energy corporation.

With his business and Government

expertise, Bill Foster was the right man to bring arms control and disarmament considerations into focus on national security matters. His efforts have brought us to realize that we cannot rest our policies on the deceptive foundation of military might alone. Under his leadership the Agency has put its stamp on arms control agreements that enhance our safety and security.

Mr. Foster has distinguished himself in the arduous task of international negotiations. As chief U.S. representative to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva and as delegate to the United Nations, Bill Foster is to be commended for his accomplishments. The Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Washington-Moscow "hot line," the Outer Space Treaty and the Nonproliferation Treaty owe much to his efforts. The Nonproliferation Treaty alone took 4 years to negotiate. It is unlikely that the treaty would have been concluded without Mr. Foster's convictions and patience.

As a congressional adviser to the Geneva Disarmament Conference and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have known and admired Bill Foster. One could go on at greater length reciting his accomplishments and his credentials. But his personal qualities also merit attention and go far to explain the attainment of such a distinguished career. He is a man of warmth and charm, of dignity and humility, of integrity and commitment. Because of Bill Foster's dedication to peace, his able leadership of his Agency, and his remarkable qualities as a negotiator, our loss on his retirement is severe. We extend to him our best wishes for the future.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 51st anniversary of the Ukrainian independence. On this date in 1918 the newly created Ukrainian Government was among the first to declare its independence from the Russian empire. We note with sadness that this independence was short lived as the greatly outnumbered Ukrainians were quickly conquered anew by the new Communist regime in Russia.

A Communist tyranny even more oppressive than the czarist regimes settled over this unfortunate land. Many of the people made their escape to more hospitable lands but their love for their homeland has never been abandoned. Their sincere desire to see their nation again free has never diminished.

Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation in both Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union empire. For more than five decades the Ukrainian people, both in captive Soviet Russia and in the free world have kept alive their dream of independence.

Today, I am happy to join with my colleagues in a fervent wish that the Ukrainian homeland may again see the light of freedom from tyranny and oppression.

HAWAII CITIZENS RESPOND MAGNIFICENTLY TO PLEAS FOR BLOOD IN WAKE OF "ENTERPRISE" FIRE

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, there were many heroes aboard the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise* on Tuesday, January 14, when the mammoth nuclear-powered ship, while on her way to a fourth tour in Vietnam waters, was rocked by explosions as fire swept across her flight deck.

This naval disaster was the worst to occur in central Pacific waters in recent years. When the call for blood donors to help the injured of the *Enterprise* reached Hawaii, the response of the citizens of the Island State was overwhelming. Within 2 hours after the appeal, the shortage at the blood bank of Hawaii was wiped out as citizens from every walk of life lined up to give blood.

As the Honolulu Star-Bulletin so aptly commented:

It represents more than just a transfusion of blood. It's a transfusion of spirit.

I know that my colleagues and the readers of the Record would wish to join with me in paying tribute to the spirit of the people of Hawaii for their heroic response to the call for help for the injured of the *Enterprise*.

I submit for the Record a report of the incident by Janos Gereben, from the January 15, 1969, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

TRAGEDY ON "ENTERPRISE" BRINGS FLOOD OF DONORS

(By Janos Gereben)

The Blood Bank of Hawaii announced two months ago that it is "low on all types of blood, particularly the A's and O's."

Yesterday, in a matter of two hours, that shortage was wiped out and today Honolulu is one of the very few cities in the world with a sufficient supply of whole blood.

When Tripler Hospital put out the call at 9:30 a.m. for blood donors to help the injured of the *Enterprise*, the people of Honolulu responded with unhesitating action seldom seen in peacetime.

"Everybody came," said Sgt. Ralph Yoder of the Tripler information office.

"Businessmen, military dependents, guys driving down the street and hearing the appeal, airmen who just finished a 24-hour work shift, our own patients, newsmen covering the story."

By 11:30 a.m., would-be donors, estimated at 1,000, created a traffic jam on the freeways near the access road to Tripler and the hospital's blood bank called off its appeal, suggesting that the Queen's Medical Center Blood Bank be used.

Queen's was jammed, too, by this time. Normally operating from noon on Tuesdays, the Blood Bank there called in its whole staff of 30 and started working at 10:30 a.m.

Edwin E. Harris, administrator of the Blood Bank, said about 200 donors were processed

("all we could handle"), and hundreds added to come back or make appointments.

About 350 donors were processed at Tripler and the information office there said, "We are squared away; all our immediate needs are filled."

But Harris at Queen's stressed that the need will continue for days and perhaps weeks.

Whole blood, unlike plasma, cannot be stored beyond 21 days and the wounded of the *Enterprise* will continue to need blood.

Harris announced that the Blood Bank at Queen's will be open 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. on weekdays, except on Tuesdays when it operates noon to 8:30.

He asked prospective donors to call for an appointment at 536-7771.

RELIEF FOR NIGERIA-BIAFRA

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, unless we act quickly and with a sense of utmost urgency, the Nigeria-Biafra Civil War will soon leave as many as 25,000 people a day dead of starvation. This cruel conflict, from which neither side can emerge as a meaningful victor, now threatens to end millions of lives by slow and lingering suffering and death.

It is for this reason that I am joining today with 89 of my colleagues in sponsorship of a concurrent resolution calling upon the President to do more to stop the senseless suffering that is stemming from this dispute. This is an issue which unites and summons us all who care for their fellowmen, and it is in this spirit that we call others to join us.

Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution urges the President to make available increased amounts of surplus food, relief moneys, noncombat aircraft, and such other vehicles of transport as may be needed for relief purposes. It further expresses the sense of Congress that this relief assistance be made available to the Organization of African Unity, UNICEF, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and such other suitable religious and charitable relief agencies as may be operating in the area with the consent of the responsible authorities. Finally, the resolution urges our Government to seek the cooperation of other nations in this humanitarian effort.

The United States has already given about \$23.7 million in relief, much of it in the form of Public Law 480 food. Our Government also recently announced that it was selling, for a minimal fee, eight surplus C-97G Stratofreighters to the church groups and the International Committee of the Red Cross. Four of the planes are to go to the American religious consortium, Joint Church Aid, U.S.A., and four to the Red Cross. The sale of these aircraft is an important forward step. However, much more must be done. With this additional cargo capacity, relief flights will not be able to carry in more than 250 tons a day, while the daily amount needed has been estimated from 1,000 to 2,500 tons. It is obvious that more planes are needed.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution also calls for the provision of "other vehicles of transportation." It is possible that, while the relief crisis is still urgent, agreement may be reached by the disputants to open a water channel or a land corridor for the transshipment of relief supplies. We are making it clear to our Government that we in the Congress also favor arrangements by which barges or trucks could be made available to take full advantage of such a breakthrough.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution concludes by urging our Government to solicit the cooperation of other nations in this humanitarian effort. It was designed to avoid direct U.S. involvement in the dispute. This does not imply that we should be indifferent to the factors which brought about this war and which now prolong it. On the contrary, we should make the utmost use of our diplomatic channels in African capitals and in London, Paris, the U.N., and elsewhere, to persuade the two sides to negotiate and compromise rather than continue to rely on the use of force. But the purpose of this resolution is to fulfill our moral obligation to save innocent lives. The relief operations could be undertaken by the relief agencies with the minimum necessary cooperation of the Africans themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union are already directly involved in the supply of arms to one side or the other and this convergence of big powers fosters a continuation of the fighting. There is no easy solution to the internal and external issues which are working to divide this suffering land. This resolution does not indicate ways by which political or military pressures might bring about a cease-fire or an arms embargo or a lasting political solution. Yet I see no reason why the morally imperative action to save lives cannot progress swiftly while the lengthy and complex work for a negotiated settlement is pursued through other channels. With every day's delay, more men, women, and children—especially children—are dying needlessly. We must meet our humanitarian obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge action without delay.

AMEND THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join as a cosponsor on Mr. RYAN's bill amending the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. It would make interest subsidy and rent supplement benefits available to existing State and municipally financed low- and middle-income housing. Under the present law, housing programs completed before the 1968 act are ineligible for these benefits. These programs, seriously affected by rising interest and rents, would find relief under the proposed amendment.

Rent increases are a major issue with

my constituents in the 17th Congressional District and the residents throughout New York City. I am concerned not only over the plight of those caught in the rent squeeze, but also in the relentless exodus of the city's middle-class residents to the suburbs—a condition for which rising rents are largely responsible. These are people the city can ill afford to lose, yet 1 million of them have left the city for the suburbs in the last decade.

The adoption of this amendment is one measure that seeks to deal with the critical problem of rising rents in New York City. The relief provided for the existing housing programs will aid many tenants when enacted.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, 51 years ago on January 22, 1918, millions of Ukrainians savored the joys of independence and freedom that our forefathers felt after our own Revolution. The dreams that were realized on that glorious day in 1918 were soon dashed with the Soviet expansion of 1920 which followed the Russian Bolshevik revolution. Since that time 45 million people have been isolated from the free world. They are deprived of the basic freedoms which we hold so dear. We who know freedom observe this 51st anniversary of their Independence Day with the hope that they again will know freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to share with my colleagues a letter from two of the officers of the Troy, N.Y., branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which has many members in my district. This letter demonstrates that we in America and free men everywhere will never forget and never cease to work for the renewed independence of the gallant people of the Ukraine.

The letter follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Troy, N.Y., January 17, 1969.

HON. DANIEL BUTTON,
U.S. Congressman,

January 22, 1969 will mark the 51st Anniversary of the proclamation of Independence of Ukraine, and the 50th Anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian ethnic lands were united into one independent and sovereign state of the Ukrainian nation. The Independence of Ukraine was proclaimed in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, on January 22, 1918, and the Act of Union took place a year later, on January 22, 1919, also in Kiev.

The young Ukrainian democratic republic was immediately recognized by a number of foreign governments, including that of Soviet Russia. The latter, however, almost simultaneously with recognition, began a large-scale invasion of Ukraine. By 1920, Ukraine, alone and unaided, succumbed to the superior forces of Communist Russia, and in 1923 had become a part of the Soviet Union.

The Freedom loving people of Ukraine have not accepted Soviet Russian domination and have been fighting for the re-establishment of their independence by all means at their disposal.

During World War II the Ukrainians organized a powerful underground resistance movement, known as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which fought not only against the Nazi regime, but against the Soviet Russian occupation as well.

Bloody and relentless persecution of Ukrainians continued after the death of Stalin, and it continues now under the Brezhnev-Kosygin duumvirate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BAYLEK,
Chairman-President.
RUSSELL KOLODY,
Secretary.

CLEAR THE DECKS FOR COMPETITION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an eloquent and needed appeal to the Government in behalf of the American farmer to "clear the decks for competition" was issued by the distinguished president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Speaking at the recent annual meeting of the federation, Mr. Charles B. Shuman lashed out at import protection including the present system of payments to farmers and predicted that U.S. farm exports can be doubled. Mr. Shuman has long been a courageous and effective champion of the disciplines of the marketplace and a critic of Government-imposed disciplines. Here are his words: THE UNITED STATES CAN DOUBLE EXPORTS

It is entirely feasible to double agricultural export sales in the next four to five years. The objective of the proposed new agricultural trade expansion legislation should be to make it possible for farm export sales to increase to the ten billion dollar level. This can be done if the State Department and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade negotiations are instructed to begin immediate negotiations with any or all free nations on either a multilateral or unilateral basis.

Our negotiators must be prepared to demand reciprocal action. If the United States is to continue to permit the importation of automobiles, chemicals, wine and steel from the European Common Market, we must be assured of access to European markets for our farm products. In order to pursue this hard-nosed bargaining policy successfully, it will be necessary for Congress to discontinue direct subsidy payments to farmers.

These payments are recognized by foreign nations as a form of export subsidy. For example, the direct payments to wheat farmers are a substitute for fair market prices and have the effect of stimulating excess production which is subsequently dumped on world markets by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If we want to trade we must be willing to end export dumping programs. U.S. farmers must compete in the world market on an equitable basis. Only then can we demand similar action by other nations. We must also be willing to resist demands for import barriers to protect a growing list of agricultural and industrial products which have been meeting increased competition from foreign producers.

Trade is a two way street. Our foreign customers must not be denied the opportunity to earn dollars to pay for our products or be provoked into retaliatory restrictions. Agri-

culture has far more to gain from trade expansion than from protectionism.

However, there are occasions when imports will threaten an industry or an important segment of agriculture. The present trade expansion legislation provides for escape clause action by the President after investigation and a finding of damage by the Tariff Commission. The procedures provided for this protective action should be improved so that it will not be as difficult to obtain relief when producers of any important commodity are threatened with unfair import competition.

Subsidies and restrictions on competitors do not strengthen, they weaken. Competition is the way to grow strong—the way to greater profits. The temporary advantage of a subsidy or of import protection is rapidly lost as the protected industry sinks deeper into the ruts of complacency, inefficiency and obsolescence. Tariff or quota protections cannot guarantee continued sales because consumers will look for substitute products.

There are hundreds of examples of industries that have floundered and lost much of their business while basking in the temporary comfort of subsidies or import protection. U.S. farmers, if given the opportunity, can compete successfully in the world market for practically any commodity adapted to our conditions. It is time to clear the decks for competition—not to add further restrictions.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the good citizens of Ukrainian descent in my congressional district will celebrate this weekend the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic in Kiev and the 50th anniversary of the Proclamation of Unification of all Ukrainian lands under the new government.

As all of us know, these historic events, offering such great promise of freedom, independence, and cultural advancement, were soon overshadowed by the Soviet conquest of the Ukraine. Many years of captivity under the repressive rule of Moscow have followed and millions of Ukrainian people have fled the Communist world.

In a recent letter to me, Wasył Juskiw, secretary of the Canton branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, expressed the situation clearly and simply in these few words:

Ukrainians have a saying that "you can break the body but the spirit lives on." The main purpose of commemorating Ukrainian Independence Day is to keep alive this spirit of freedom and to focus the attention of all Americans on the fact that the Soviet Union from its inception was, and to this date is, a prison of many nations held in totalitarian captivity, the most recent example being Czechoslovakia.

All the captive nations, to the present day, are aspiring to freedom and independence. Ukraine is one of these captive nations.

The Canton ceremonies observing this anniversary will be conducted in St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Church Sunday evening. The Honorable Stanley Cmich, mayor of Canton, has proclaimed January 26 as Ukrainian Day.

I join with my friends of Ukrainian descent and all Cantonians in the prayer that the Communist oppression of the Ukraine may soon be lifted and that the hopes and aspirations of 50 years ago may be revived in a new birth of freedom and independence for the people of this sad land.

RECENT EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in the Middle East have concerned us as the tension has grown and the United Nations has sought a solution. Many people in my district have written me to express their concern and to urge the expression of true American feelings. One of them has called to my attention the attached column, written by Barney Laschever, formerly of the Hartford Times, which he believes sets in perspective matters which my constituent has found reported and editorialized in a distressing fashion. I offer Mr. Laschever's column for the Record, as follows:

SEPARATE RULES FOR ISRAEL?

(By Barnett D. Laschever)

How pervasive, and how true, is the belief held by most Jews that there are two sets of rules in the world—one for them, and one for everyone else?

When others fight wars, the winner is in fact the winner and imposes the peace. Three times the world, through the United Nations, has imposed cease-fires that have denied Israel the opportunity to obtain a true peace.

Terrorist attacks from three fronts, and even in foreign airports, are greeted by a unanimous silence from the world community.

But retaliatory raids are over-reaction, and the Jews are acting like Nazis.

The Jews are compared with the Nazis because they try to fight a war as it should be fought—quickly and decisively—to save lives on both sides. Unlike America, Israel cannot afford the luxury of a prolonged war.

Is it not the epitome of hypocrisy for nations and people whose histories are successions of hard reactions to guerrillas to condemn Israel now? One rule for us, one for the Israelis?

One highly-placed American diplomat put it this way: The Israelis should be condemned, he said, for using official uniformed troops to respond to an "isolated" act of terrorism by only two guerrillas.

To the Israeli engineer killed on the El Al plane at Athens, it doesn't matter. He is no less dead than if the fatal bullets had been fired from the gun of a uniformed Arab soldier.

Was it over-reaction when the United States sent uniformed soldiers into Vietnam to quell Viet Cong guerrilla terrorists, and kept pouring in troops until the North Vietnamese regulars entered the fight?

Item: At the end of World War II, the Greek government sent uniformed soldiers against guerrilla terrorists in the northern part of that country.

Item: In Malaya, the British fought guerrillas with uniformed Gurkhas and other members of its armed forces.

Item: In the fading days of the British

Empire, Britain used uniformed soldiers against Indian terrorists.

Go back a few years. A couple of drunken American soldiers were imprisoned by the Mexicans. American Marines were landed in Vera Cruz.

Pancho Villa and his guerrillas roamed across the Texas border. General Pershing was dispatched with the American Army. Whether over-reaction, and it certainly was that, will lead to peace in the Middle East is a question no one can answer.

But the Israeli is remembering bitterly that walking into gas chambers also has no future. "But why attack Beirut?" the world has cried, "peace-loving Lebanon whose government long has been controlled by Christians!" Much has been made of the Christian influence in Lebanon—by people who forget that Jews have historically fared worse at the hands of Christians than from the Arabs. More important, the guerrillas from their headquarters in Lebanon have themselves announced that the enemy was to be attacked wherever he could be found—not just in Israel.

So be it, say the Israelis. King Hussein has said: "We are all comrades."

Israel has no land communications with anyone. No cars, trucks, trains, buses flow across its borders. To stab at its only remaining lifelines to the world—its shipping and airlines—is to aim at Israel's jugular vein. How do you react to a slash at your jugular?

The raid was ill-advised. But in their frustration and anger, and in their fear, the Israelis struck.

How naive they were, however, to think that the world would applaud because they only smashed up machinery without taking Arab lives.

They forget that Machiavelli many hundreds of years ago noted that you can kill a man's father and he will be angry with you but he will forgive you. Take or destroy his property, however, and you have made an enemy for life.

Let those who are so quick with their condemnation come up with constructive ways to settle this chronic crisis. Let them also remember that the Arabs, with their vast lands and populations, can afford to lose many wars.

The Israelis can lose only once.

MICHAEL ASSOCIATES,

Hartford, Conn., January 14, 1969.

EMILIO Q. DADDARIO,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "MIM": Having just returned with Mrs. Goldman from a tour of Israel, have been taking particular note of all the discussions, news reports and editorials regarding Israel and their Neighbouring Countries.

Not only have I found these news reports and editorials distressing and one sided. I have also found our own action in condemning Israel in the U.N. very unworthy of the Standards of our great Country, as to fair play, and trustworthiness.

I would advise all those who condemn Israel, to visit the Memorial for Six Million. There they will finally realize why Israel can not afford to lose Two and a Half Million more Jews to be destroyed, together perhaps with more millions throughout the world.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a Column by Bernard D. Laschever which appeared on the editorial page of The Hartford Times, Sunday, January 12, 1969.

I Believe that Mr. Laschever, aptly spells out the case for all the Peoples of Israel, and why the Jewry of the World are so concerned in this, thus request that you read and place same into The Congressional Record, so as to bring to the attention of our legislators.

I would also at this time, send my thanks, for the magnificent calendar, which I received from your office, I am with personal regards,

Respectfully yours,

M. MICHAEL GOLDMAN.

JANUARY 14, 1969.

Mr. BERNARD D. LASCHEVER,
Sunday Editor, Hartford Times,
Hartford, Conn.

DEAR Mr. LASCHEVER: Thank you for your column of Sunday, January 12, 1969. I was most impressed with same.

Enclosed you will find a letter to our own "Mim" Daddario with whom I am personally acquainted and hold in very high esteem.

I do hope that I have not overstepped my bounds by being presumptive in requesting Congressman Daddario to place same in The Congressional Record.

Very truly yours,

M. MICHAEL GOLDMAN.

DEMANDS OF THE COMMON DREAM AND COMMON ASPIRATIONS OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time student of Latin America, a member of the Foreign Affairs Inter-American Subcommittee and a Representative from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, it is an especial privilege and a double source of pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues the address of Minister Jorge de Sá Almeida, Chargé d'Affaires of Brazil, at the decoration ceremony to honor Ambassador John Moors Cabot, of Massachusetts, former U.S. Ambassador to Brazil.

Ambassador Cabot was presented the Grand Cross of the National Order of the "Cruzeiro do Sul," the highest decoration conferred upon foreigners by the Brazilian Government.

As Minister Almeida so eloquently and aptly stated, the "common aspirations" and "common dream" that North and South America share "demand honest interpreters, men of good will, and wisdom to make them understood," and both he and Ambassador Cabot are two of the finest of this type.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY MINISTER JORGE DE SA ALMEIDA, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES OF BRAZIL A.I. ON THE DECORATION CEREMONY OF AMBASSADOR JOHN MOORS CABOT, HELD AT THE BRAZILIAN EMBASSY JANUARY 13, 1969.

(NOTE—Ambassador Cabot has served twice in Brazil and received the "Grã-Cruz" of the Southern Cross Order, the highest decoration conferred upon foreigners by the Brazilian Government.)

My dear Ambassador Cabot: It is for me both an honor and a great pleasure to present to you the Grand Cross of the National Order of the "Cruzeiro do Sul," the image of that same constellation which you have so often seen in the southern skies in your many years of distinguished service in several countries of this Hemisphere.

You have written that America is our common destiny, and you have followed, step after successful step, that destiny since the early beginnings of your career as Vice Consul in Callao, and Third Secretary in the

Dominican Republic, through assignments in Mexico, Guatemala, Argentina and Colombia, all the way to becoming a well known and esteemed Ambassador to Brazil, a well rounded diplomat knowledgeable in Inter-American affairs. Coming from the North of this country, which your ancestors helped to discover and settle your diplomatic destiny has associated you with the south of this Continent.

We Brazilians were most fortunate in the choice you made of the main field of your activities, since you have twice held posts among us, as Second Secretary, in 1932, and as Ambassador, in 1961, a "double blessing", which as the bard wrote is a "double joy." We in South America have many things in common with you, in North America, including a destiny. You are well aware that those common aspirations and that common American dream demand honest interpreters, men of good will and wisdom to make them understood.

Allow me to say that it is mainly owing to the dedication and unceasing efforts of men such as you—and of such as many honoring us with their presence here, today—that the Inter-American System entered the present phase of sound mutuality and practical financial and economic cooperation, and left, hopefully for good, the past when South and North America lived in blissful reciprocal ignorance, and could afford the luxury in the old Victorian style, of passing occasional self-gratifying moral judgments on each other. Together, we now face realities, such as trends in international trade, questions of market integration; self-supporting development, rates of "per capita" growth—and last but not least the need to strive in common for our common dignity of Americans, of men of this New World which we all want to call our own. North and South America have by now learnt to live together and to respect each other, and indeed to respect their differences of approach, of language, of domestic political evolution.

You understand us so well, Mr. Ambassador. I am, for that reason, glad you were teaching in the famous Fletcher School of International Affairs, thus giving the benefit of your experience to a younger generation. Diplomats should become either teachers or writers, for they acquire so much knowledge in the day-to-day business of their trade, while they have so often to keep silent, even if they may, in good Ambassadorial ways, find comfort in the precious line of Virgil "Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas." Fortunately you have been both a writer and a teacher, and we wish you well in these exciting activities for which you will now have more time.

For you, Mr. Ambassador, this Cross of the Interpreter, of the diplomat, of the man who has bridged the gulf between two cultures, is a Cross you have in a way borne with gallantry all the time since your early days as Vice Consul in Callao. It will, I trust, rest lightly on your shoulders. May it bring you luck in all your endeavors as that Northern Star which led your ancestors to the discovery of a New World, as new and full of hope as that of the Cosmic Space which is now being revealed to us by your heroic fellow-countrymen.

TOP-LEVEL FEDERAL SALARY INCREASES SHOULD BE DISAPPROVED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with other colleagues in sponsor-

ing two House resolutions designed to bring about House defeat of the increased pay recommendations proposed by former President Johnson.

The only way these unjustified salary increases can be defeated at this point is through a House vote. My bills are designed to assure that this vote occurs.

While some claim that salary adjustments are justified, I maintain that this action would surely trigger another inflationary round that the country cannot stand. Congress should set a responsible example, and avoid the inflationary merry-go-round that already has everybody dizzy.

Since formal House disapproval is the only action now possible to stop the raises which otherwise become effective February 15, it is hoped quick action on these resolutions will be forthcoming.

AMBASSADOR YOST, THE U.N. AND WORLD PEACE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's selection of Ambassador Charles W. Yost as the permanent United States representative in the United Nations has been widely applauded by Americans of all ranks and persuasions who share the belief that the world organization is an important instrument of world peace.

An interesting article about Ambassador Yost's outlook on the United Nations, and his outstanding qualifications for his new job, appeared recently in the Milwaukee Journal.

Written by Attorney Bruno V. Bitker of Milwaukee, the article contains some valuable insights into Ambassador Yost's prognosis about the future course of world affairs. For this reason, I am inserting it into the Record.

Attorney Bitker is a recognized and respected specialist on matters involving the U.N. He has served for 9 years as chairman of the Wisconsin Governor's Committee for the United Nations and has met Ambassador Yost on a number of occasions in that period. Most recently, he was a member of the U.S. Commission on the International Human Rights Year 1968.

The article follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 12, 1969]
AMBASSADOR YOST'S ADVANCED IDEAS ON THE U.N.

(By Bruno V. Bitker)

One of the real surprises among the cabinet and key advisers selected by President-Elect Nixon was Charles W. Yost as chief ambassador to the United Nations.

Yost's predecessors have been for the most part men of considerable national prominence. Many of them, such as Henry Cabot Lodge, Adlai Stevenson, and Arthur Goldberg, had political followings. Yost, although highly respected in the world of diplomacy, cannot be said to have either public prominence or a political base.

Although usually identified as a Democrat—he did act as an adviser on international affairs to Hubert Humphrey—it would

be more accurate to describe him as non-political. Until his resignation in 1966 as second in command at the United States mission to the UN, he was a widely experienced career officer in the foreign service.

One reason for surprise at his selection emanates from the advanced and innovative ideas set forth in what he has written since becoming senior research fellow with the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City. Some of his ideas in the area of international relations are not those usually associated with President-Elect Nixon.

In his book, "The Insecurity of Nations," published last winter, Yost states forcefully his concepts of what the United Nations could and should be. In order to be an effective force in peace keeping. Both in his book and in recent magazine articles, Yost emphasizes his main thesis: That only if all nations submerge their national interests in the interests of all mankind can there be security for any nation. Thus he says:

"The primary cause of the insecurity of nations persists—the very attribute on which nations pride themselves most—their sovereign independence, their 'sacred egotism,' their insubordination to any interest broader or higher than their own. The tragic character of their condition lies, moreover, in their habitual failure to understand what their own interests really are, to recognize that the interests of all are in the modern world so bound together that those of one nation cannot be served over the long run without all being served, that those of one nation cannot be imperiled without all being imperiled."

"There will never be security for nations and peoples until there exists some impartial and effective international authority," he writes, "expressing man's best instincts and common interests, designed and empowered to keep the peace, restrain aggressive governments, control national armaments, negotiate and enforce peaceful settlements, facilitate peaceful change, and assist new states to develop and modernize."

"The nature of the modern world is such that it will not tolerate a pax Romana, pax Britannica, pax Sovietica or pax Americana. Peace-keeping, if it is not in practice to become war-making, is a task that henceforth has to be performed collectively."

In reference to the theory of the value of regional organizations in assuring world peace, he notes that:

"Nor are regional organizations any more generously endowed with power by their members. The Organization of American States has a relatively long tradition, but neither the United States nor the other 20 republics are willing to confide to the organization the right to intervene or to forbid intervention, the right to determine levels of economic assistance or standards of social and political performance."

To those who insist that the hopes for peace through subordination of nationalistic fears or ambitions are pure fantasies, he says:

"The revival and re-enforcement of the United Nations no doubt seems, and at the moment may be, Utopian. The point to be made again and again, to be hammered unmercifully into our proud hard, silly heads, is that the attempt to achieve the security of nations by national means under modern circumstances is still more Utopian."

This is a positive assertion of where American security lies. But it remains to be seen whether this expresses the philosophy of the Nixon administration. It also remains to be seen whether Yost will be free to act in the United Nations than have some of his predecessors.

It remains to be seen, too, whether the inclusion of the UN ambassador in cabinet meetings will in fact elevate the post to one of near equality with the secretary of state in inner White House councils. The practice of including the ambassador in such meet-

ings was initiated by President Eisenhower with respect to the then ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge.

RELATION TO PRESIDENT

It is now an established custom on paper. But its practical effect is uncertain. A particular ambassador may enjoy a relationship with the president so close that he feels free to telephone directly to the White House from the UN's New York headquarters without going through the office of the secretary of state or the department's bureau of international organizations. Undoubtedly Lodge enjoyed that relationship with President Eisenhower. Ambassador Goldberg reportedly had a similar direct line to President Johnson.

There does not appear at the outset to be such a close personal bond between Yost and Nixon. But Yost is a man of quiet manner who seems to play down the personal approach. It is possible that his reticence could produce better results than have the more dramatic efforts of some of his predecessors. It should be noted, too, that as a career diplomat Yost is known and highly regarded by the "establishment" within the state department.

The anomaly whereby the UN ambassadorial post ranks a seat at the cabinet table has raised problems. On the one hand it has indicated to the world that the president of the United States recognizes the special importance of the United Nations. But if one examines the bureaucratic chart of the department, the UN ambassador is not only under the secretary of state, but his direct contact with the department, in theory, is at least two steps down the line. He deals with the assistant secretary of state for international affairs, who in turn is responsible to the undersecretary of state.

All of this has resulted in confusion, and on occasions, created resentments between officials who previously have been on amicable terms. It has stimulated much discussion on the proper role of a chief ambassador to the UN.

Yost's long experience in operating through recognized lines of authority may help smooth over some rough spots which have disturbed other ambassadors. The result could be most constructive in influencing the foreign policies of the United States. The effectiveness of the UN ambassador should not be measured by whether he is an intimate of the president or on close terms with cabinet members, but by what he accomplishes through the United Nations.

For years the United States has taken a negative position on the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. It is an issue bound to arise again in 1969. This is what Yost has said on this question:

"She should be invited without delay, and without regard for her current disorders, into the United Nations, and into all other appropriate international organizations. Initially, she will no doubt refuse; she will prove, when she does come in, a most prickly and disruptive partner. . . . The stakes in this case, however, are too high to permit or excuse goggling by the rest of the world. . . . Both China's sobriety and its friendship are essential to world order."

NIXON-YOST ACCORD?

But when Nixon introduced his new UN ambassador at a press conference he indicated no enthusiastic belief that the UN could mediate between the United States and the USSR, nor did he express any hope that the superpowers would even submit significant decisions to the UN affecting their respective vital interests. One wonders whether his future policies will be in harmony with the ideas of Ambassador Yost, who says:

"If mankind is to continue to prosper, perhaps even to survive to the end of this century, there is going to have to be a rather

rapid assimilation of nation-states into a more coherent and functional international system."

It may be true that the world is still reluctant to support a stable international order that would exclude war as a way of settling international disputes. But the grinding necessity of the times may force the world to do what needs to be done. Yost has pointed the way.

COMMENTARY ON THE CURRENT REBELLION OF SOME OF OUR YOUTH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with great interest that I noted the commentary on the current rebellion of some of our youth as analyzed by Rev. John B. Sheerin, C.S.P., in the January 10 New Word, the official Catholic newspaper of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The article was especially intriguing since Father Sheerin generally inclines to the liberal point of view. This is obviously a thought provoking article.

Under unanimous consent I submit the article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SUM AND SUBSTANCE—YOUNG REBELS COULD BECOME OLD TYRANTS
(By John B. Sheerin, C.S.P.)

The youth revolt was probably the biggest news event of 1968 except for Apollo 8's moon voyage. Much as we sympathize with many of the young rebels' protests against the Establishment, there is one angle of the phenomenon that makes us all a bit uneasy.

There is a little tyrant in every rebel and today's campus rebels may turn out to be tomorrow's tinhorn dictators. Rebellion seems to spawn authoritarianism, and the rebel of one generation too often becomes the tyrant of the next.

This was brought home to me vividly by an article in the Times Literary Supplement, (London, Dec. 26.) The subject of the article was Rousseau, architect of the French Revolution, and the title was "The Dictatorial Libertarian."

It was Rousseau who lamented that "man is born free but is everywhere in chains" and he urged a return to the pristine state of the noble savage, unfettered by governmental laws and the customary restrictions of civilization. Rousseau was a living paradox, the rebel in him constantly being dominated by the dictator.

He wailed that the King was the enemy of freedom but somehow managed to look upon the high-handed Republican magistrate as the friend of freedom.

The writer of the Times article shows that Rousseau believed that no man should have a master in any shape or form, and yet he found no difficulty in his writings in advocating the subjection of religion to the State.

Moreover, he felt that this religion, a form of civil religion, must be vigorously enforced: anyone who does not accept it must be banished, and anyone who apostatizes from this civil religion is to be put to death "for he has committed the greatest crime."

The Times writer quotes a Rousseau expert as saying that the French philosopher was a rebel and yet had within him the attributes of the tyrant.

He aspired to harden himself against any-

thing that smacked of submission or effeminacy. "It is conceivable that this fear of femininity is the primary factor that shaped . . . the authoritarian element in his personality."

So too with conscience. He extolled conscience in one of his earlier works, saying that the voice of conscience within the individual is infallible "since conscience never deceives us." But in a later volume, he insisted that the General Will of the community was supreme above individual conscience.

It reminds us of the SDS rioters at Columbia who claimed a right in conscience to use violence but denied to the police the same right of conscience. In one work he extolled Natural Law as "that holy and in-prescriptible law which speaks to the heart and reason of man." Then he turned around and pronounced in all solemnity that the only competent interpreter of Natural Law is the State.

In his early days, Rousseau loved the theater but time marched on and the great libertarian wanted to banish the theater. In one of his writings, he condemned theaters as temples of luxury and vice.

His dislike for femininity probably dated back to his childhood when one of his female guardians used to spank him but this fear drove him to extreme lengths. The young rebel who crusaded for freedom eventually advocated that the nation preserve its masculinity by stern military discipline, militant civil religion and Spartan living.

Today the Establishment needs reform, and some of the protests of the young rebels among us are most laudable, especially their protests against the American involvement in the Vietnam war. But I confess I feel a bit uncomfortable when the young rebels attempt to pull down everything overnight.

It is one thing to disturb the equanimity of a few old fogies in Congress who are still living in the age of McKinley. It is something else again to burn American flags, destroy property, shout obscenity and parade in the nude.

Rebels who declare war on civilized society today, too soon become the strong-armed law-and-order Fuehrers of tomorrow.

CONQUEST, WAR, FAMINE, AND DEATH DEFY RELIEF IN BIAFRA

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse are ravaging a land called Biafra. Mesmerized by the political and military factors interwoven in this tragedy, the U.S. Government has wisely avoided politico-military involvement in Biafra by channeling relief support to this land through international relief agencies which are presently supplying an inadequate lifeline of food and medical supplies to Biafrans by air.

The toll of millions of innocent victims in the Nigerian-Biafran war from famine and malnutrition is well known. The 200 tons of food reaching Biafra every day is simply not enough to meet the minimum relief needs of a people who need 10 times that amount to survive.

Today I am cosponsoring a concurrent resolution with like-minded colleagues in the House who believe that the United States must bring more relief to those

in need, and bring it without directly involving this country in the war itself.

Our resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the President should act to increase significantly food stocks, relief money, medical supplies, and aircraft and other vehicles needed for relief purposes by the Organization of African Unity, the International Committee of the Red Cross, or other religious and charitable relief agencies operating in the area.

It is my hope that we can fulfill our humanitarian obligations and at the same time avoid diplomatic and military pitfalls of direct involvement in cold war polemics.

Astute observers the world over point out that those nations which are most vulnerable to takeover by Communist and totalitarian or military regimes are those whose people suffer from hunger, from a lack of education and from general hopelessness concerning their condition.

Hunger, unlike other responsibilities of government, cannot await long and drawn out deliberations before action is taken.

We, here in America, are faced with a moral obligation to do all we can to prevent this appalling starvation in Biafra and Nigeria from becoming the major disaster of our times.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to pay special tribute to all those across the Nation who responded to the plight of the starving people of Biafra. In particular, I would like to call attention to a group of concerned citizens in Rochester, N.Y., who were among the first to raise their voices in concern by forming a group called "Emergency Relief for Biafrans."

These concerned Americans, and all those like them, serve as the conscience of a nation. Let us respond with positive action on this resolution and help drive the Four Horsemen from Biafra.

THIS GIFTED AGE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and thereby bring to the attention of my colleagues, the inaugural address, "This Gifted Age," of Dr. Brage Golding, the first president of Wright State University, of Dayton, Ohio.

I had the honor of sponsoring the act of the Ohio General Assembly which established the university in 1965. I believe it is indicative of the university's promising future that a man of Dr. Golding's capabilities and stature was chosen to lead it through the extremely important early years.

President Golding came to Wright State from a career that has combined academic, administrative, and industrial

experience. He has been director of research for the Lilly Varnish Co., and professor and head of the school of chemical engineering at Purdue University, the latter position he held from 1959 until 1966, when he accepted the presidency of Wright State.

Because of his interest in improving engineering education and to better understand its changing character throughout the world, he participated in the first Inter-American Congress of Chemical Engineering Education in Puerto Rico, and subsequently spent 3 months visiting many of the major universities of the United Kingdom and the continent to meet with European innovators in engineering education.

Dr. Golding's inaugural address bespeaks his longstanding commitment to higher education and his realization of the unique role of the urban university today. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to insert President Golding's address at this point in the RECORD:

THIS GIFTED AGE

*Upon this gifted age in its dark hour,
Rains from the sky a meteoric shower Of
facts . . . they lie unquestioned, uncombined.*

Distinguished guests, Teachers and students of the University, Ladies and Gentlemen: Those three lines from Sonnet 137 by Edna St. Vincent Millay contain the central theme of the events of this week at this University. At this time and in this place there could be no more eloquent theme.

We observe today a singular occasion: the inauguration of the first president of a new university. The significance of this occasion lies not in the inauguration itself but in the dedication of a new university; a university that is automatically a contemporary one—so far as its students are concerned. Our future lies in the fact that we have a unique opportunity to brighten this dark hour, to examine the shower of facts, and to permit this gifted age to become a reality for our students.

My purpose today is to examine the task ahead and to determine the role of Wright State as a new university facing the future in especially dramatic circumstances. Such a new institution, born here and now, must be sensitive to the problems and opportunities of the future or it will have failed before it has begun!

To determine our place in the educational spectrum, a brief history of higher education in the United States is in order. Of course, it all started with Harvard. Harvard's first graduating class in 1655 contained eleven students, nine of whom were prepared for the ministry. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, higher education was confined to the affluent and privileged few. Education was limited to the liberal arts and the ministry. The prime movers of higher education were the religious institutions, and little contribution was made by government until the nineteenth century. There were a few exceptions: the state of New Jersey supported Rutgers in 1766, and before the end of that century other state supported universities had been formed in Georgia, North Carolina, Vermont and Tennessee.

In the early nineteenth century, education was still concentrated in the liberal arts and the ministry. Not until 1822 was a professional school of medicine established at the University of Vermont. Law schools then appeared at Georgia and North Carolina; dentistry at Maryland; and engineering and law at Alabama, all prior to 1860. The professional schools were beginning to make significant inroads in the liberal arts schools. Well

into the nineteenth century, higher education continued to be almost entirely the prerogative of the small upper social and economic stratum of the country.

The Civil War marked a point of change in higher education. The Morrill Act was adopted by Congress in 1862, requiring that the proceeds from the sale of certain state lands and land grant be invested, the yield from these investments to be used by each state—and I quote in part from Section 4 of the Morrill Act, ". . . To the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be . . . to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes . . ."

The progressive legislation had an immediate effect. Iowa, which just four years before had chartered its own college, was the first to accept the land grant conditions and become a participant.

Vermont also joined the program that first year. By 1865, Massachusetts had split its land grant between two institutions: the already established but private Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a new Massachusetts Agricultural College. By 1900, land grants had been assigned to 26 state universities.

Thus, the state universities were here at the beginning of this century. Who were the students? The practicability of higher education had been clear to the far-sighted legislators who sponsored the Morrill Act, but it had not reached the masses of the working population. Higher education now was becoming available to the upper middle class, but even these were a more or less privileged minority.

Only during and after World War I did the colleges and universities begin to develop the curricula and student bodies which interacted to provide America with the basis for the finest system of practical education beyond the high school in the world. Indeed, their success has exceeded all expectations. Since the time of the second World War and the advent of the G.I. Bill of Rights, virtually any person who had the ambition and ability, theoretically at least, could go to college and attain a degree. This is not to say that there was equality of opportunity throughout the land, but the means were there for many of those who chose to take advantage of them. The unparalleled success of the land grant colleges was provided primarily by the streaming of the middle class to school, particularly when science and technology had developed sufficiently to demonstrate the advantages of a college education as a passport to a better life.

With the advantage of hindsight, we can see that the history of American higher education moved through two major evolutions prior to World War II, in terms of types of institutions, kind of education offered, and clientele served by the program. In the early period the emphasis was classical, the institutions were small and private for the most part, and the student bodies were distinctly upper-class. In the second period, with public resources involved on a fairly large scale, the undertaking became larger; the subject matter came to include the professions, agriculture, and the so-called mechanic arts; and the middle classes of the towns and farms of the nation began to go to college.

Now we are entering the third evolutionary stage in American higher education. The populace has been moving rapidly into the cities, and the universities' eternal task of accumulating, creating, and dispensing human knowledge must necessarily be done now in an urban context. More important, the commitment to universal access to higher education now is taken seriously; the urban

masses of people from all social and economic levels are being invited to participate—and are expecting to participate—and the new economy, in fact, is requiring them to participate. In a new university, at this point in time, we must think carefully about our role and our methods in the years ahead.

First, we should consider for a moment the basic obligations of any American college or university, so that we might then reconsider those obligations in the light of these modern, revolutionary conditions. All institutions of higher education share the goals of achieving excellence in teaching, research, and public service. Note the words on the great seal of this University: *Ad Docendum, Investigandum, Servendum*.

Concerning excellence in teaching and the complementary learning process, I shall limit myself to one observation: that man can successfully realize his full potential and cope with the great problems of mankind only after he has attained some insights into the nature of his physical, social, and moral environment; and some knowledge of values, institutions, principles, facts; and of rational inquiry and analysis. The faculty of a university provides the key to the attainment of such insight, knowledge, inquiry, and analysis. Only through the expertise of the faculty will the student be able to approach the limits of his abilities.

It is therefore essential that all students be exposed to a wide range of disciplines, to opportunities for living and working with others, to avenues for self-development, and to means for communicating well with others.

Concerning research: to advance the frontiers of knowledge in our respective disciplines and professions is a scholarly obligation; to strengthen the capacity of man to accommodate successfully to the new challenges of a world of revolutionary change is mandatory. A university has an objectivity and an impartiality toward knowledge development which is unique in our society. We must, to operate successfully, operate in a free environment—subject only to the rigorous demands of truth. No tests of practicability can be imposed on research—nor on course work, I might add.

As to public service, I endorse this characteristically American university objective—that we assist private and public institutions, locally and nationally—to the extent feasible and compatible with scholarship and impartiality—in discovering the factual bases for economic, scientific, and social policy. I believe this objective to be particularly appropriate to a primarily urban university. Moreover, I believe the university itself—as an entity comprised of more than the sum of its individuals—should actively engage in public service when such engagement can contribute to man's realization of his intellectual potential.

Let us now examine the role of the contemporary public urban university. Such a university can and must do for today's urban society what land grant colleges have done for the agricultural society of a century ago—by facing the demands of the multitudes to whom a higher education has, heretofore, not been available and extending to them for the first time the educational and economic advantages so long desired.

In the face of the urgencies of this revolutionary time, there is a tendency to confuse the role of the university itself with the roles of the individuals within it. The university itself is a legal entity, a body corporate, a community. It is a place for widely differing individual pursuits. The university itself, as a legal entity, has one role; the individuals within it quite properly have various other roles to play. I have some convictions about what the university itself in our time should

and should not be, in order that its wealth of individuals may more effectively and more freely do the things that individuals should do.

The urban university must be responsive to, but not subject to, society's needs. Too much frenetic effort spent in trying to solve, by direct action, every urgent short-range problem of the larger community dissipates the energies and subverts the true function of the university.

There are many things that a university should not be: the university is not, as many would have it, merely a place where its various members can withdraw from the world to pursue their own interests. As Dr. Morris Abram, president of Brandeis University, so well stated at his inauguration earlier this month, a university is not a church or political party. It does not itself vote. It is, however, filled with people who think, vote, and participate in every level of life. While all members of the community should feel free to speak out on subjects of interest or concern, the university itself must not be partisan. It must not become a monolithic, ideological vested interest. (A partisan institution is hospitable only to those who support its tenets—it cannot be pluralistic—it cannot be a community—and it will not long be a residence for scholars.)

Further, I believe it is not the function of the university to duplicate the experiences which can better be acquired in the outside world—in the hospitals, the ghettos, the home, the religious institutions, the office or factory—although many activists today would have it so. Such activists have asked whether four years spent in school acquiring what they term non-relevant knowledge is a waste of time—whether the time might be more usefully spent in attacking the ills of the world immediately and directly.

The answer lies, I believe, in the understanding of what a university can and cannot do best. A university is not a social-action agency; it is not a tool or servant of some governmental or political interest in the pursuit of selected social or economic ends—no matter how deserving they might be.

The best capability of a university, and of its people, is in the achievement of understanding of various scientific, social, or political ends—not in the achieving of those ends as such. It follows, then, that the members of the university should understand that the primary purpose of this place is the achievement of knowledge and understanding; and that each in his turn, as an individual citizen or as one of a group of citizens, has every right and freedom to apply his understanding by participation in the various other institutions organized for direct action. Some of the recent university crises have arisen because the individual has confused his own freedom and commitment with those of the university and has tried to draw his university, with all of its other equally valid commitments, along some narrow ideological channel in which he happens to believe. Through a better common understanding of what a university is not, it seems to me that we can have a freer environment within the university for the individual.

I have spoken at some length of what a contemporary urban university should not be. What, then, should it be? The University, or any educational facility for that matter, exists as it does because it has been found to be the most convenient and efficient organization for transmitting knowledge and skills, and, more important, for teaching the student the rational approach to thinking, within some minimum period of time. Since the university obviously cannot teach all that needs to be known to man in just a few years, its programs should be

flexible, yet must be sufficiently structured to insure that the student obtain a successively more sophisticated comprehension of his course of study.

A further and vital function of a university must be to open the minds of our students, young and old, and by means of dispassionate inquiry reduce the social, religious, and ethnic prejudices and bigotry acquired over a period of years.

The benefits issuing from a university are not unilaterally directed to the student. The faculty member, the administrator, and the community are also the beneficiaries of the university's sphere of influence.

In the urban university, the social scientist can study real, as well as theoretical, problems of public concern. The professional educator is able to see school growth and management problems at first hand—such as having 1,500 unexpected students enroll as happened to us this fall. The engineer and scientist can relate to the dramatic developments of industrial technology and work with the city's industrial and research facilities.

Because investigation, experimentation, confirmation of fact, testing, and evaluation are particularly suited to the university scholar, the community is afforded an expanding source of competence and talent from which to draw in the solution of its problems.

The university can be and should be a center of continuing education. Belatedly the nation is discovering that people can and should go on learning throughout life. Already this university and many others are carrying on this kind of education enthusiastically and on such a scale that a truly great proportion of our efforts is not for the earning of the magical degree but for the purpose of enabling a sensible adult to learn something that he believes he should learn.

The university can also create within its sphere of influence a climate in which the arts can flourish . . . not only by broadening the base of interest and participation, but, as important, by maintaining and insisting upon high quality in the creative arts.

I have given you some of the history of education; we have explored the role of universities in general, and of a public urban university in particular. Now what about Wright State and its future?

This University is contemporary, automatically. The physical plant is completely new. The "now" student attends Wright State. Therefore, the future of this University depends essentially upon our faculty. Will they be contemporary? Unshackled? Freed from academic rigor mortis? They must—and I know they will. Our uniqueness must spring from the realization that here and now we have an opportunity to brighten this dark hour and make this gifted age a reality for our students.

But, if we are so concerned with our contemporary status why then this traditional ceremony in medieval garb? This is to remind us that the future is a reflection of the past, and that academic progress in modern times still requires the traditional search for the truth; facts before action; thought before speech; and due consideration for the rights of others—all of these being the hallmarks of a scholar of today as well as yesterday.

From these scholars, these professors, each student must acquire a personal philosophy which makes him aware of his own individuality and importance as well as that of his fellow man.

From these scholars, these professors—and I intend to contribute with them—our students must become inspired to realize their full potentials, thus giving to the future the gift of this gifted age.

MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 President Johnson presented the Medal of Honor to four of the Nation's newest heroes of the Vietnam conflict at a formal White House ceremony. One of these men who received the country's greatest measure of intrinsic recognition is S. Sgt. Drew D. Dix, U.S. Army, of Pueblo, Colo. Sergeant Dix's wife, Betty, and their two sons, Dennis and Kevin, reside with the Sergeant's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harold L. Dix, at 2910 Country Club Drive, Pueblo, Colo. Sergeant Dix is now stationed with the 6th Special Forces Group, Fort Bragg, N.C. His father, a retired Army Reserve captain, works at the CF&I Steel Corp. in Pueblo.

I was proud to accompany this outstanding soldier and his family at the White House ceremony where a grateful Nation bestowed its highest honor upon him. The incredible exploits of Sergeant Dix epitomize the highest measure of devotion to the precepts of honor, duty, country to which the Army is dedicated. His heroic actions certainly represent conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty—the official citation reads as follows:

Staff Sergeant Drew D. Dix distinguished himself by exceptional heroism on 31 January and 1 February 1968 while serving as a unit advisor in Chau Phu, Chau Doc Province, Republic of Vietnam. Two heavily armed Viet Cong battalions attacked the Province capital city of Chau Phu on 31 January 1968, resulting in the complete breakdown and fragmentation of the defenses of the city. Sergeant Dix, with a patrol of Vietnamese soldiers, was recalled to assist in the defense of Chau Phu. Learning that a nurse was trapped in a house near the center of the city, Sergeant Dix organized a relief force, successfully rescued the nurse, and returned her to the safety of the Tactical Operations Center. Being informed of other trapped civilians within the city, Sergeant Dix voluntarily led another force to rescue eight civilian employees located in a building which was under heavy mortar and small arm fire. Sergeant Dix then returned to the center of the city. Upon approaching a building, he was subjected to intense automatic rifle and machine gun fire from an unknown number of Viet Cong. He personally assaulted the building, killing six Viet Cong, and rescuing two Filipinos. The following day Sergeant Dix, still on his own volition, assembled a 20 man force and though under intense enemy fire cleared the Viet Cong out of the hotel, theater, and other adjacent buildings within the city. During this portion of the attack, Army Republic of Vietnam soldiers, inspired by the heroism and success of Sergeant Dix, rallied and commenced firing upon the Viet Cong. Sergeant Dix captured 20 prisoners including a high ranking Viet Cong official. He then attacked enemy troops who had entered the residence of the Deputy Province Chief and was successful in rescuing the official's wife and children. Sergeant Dix's personal heroic actions resulted in 14 confirmed Viet Cong killed in action and pos-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sibly 25 more, the capture of 20 prisoners, 15 weapons, and the rescue of the 14 United States and Free World civilians. The heroism of Sergeant Dix was in the highest tradition and reflects great credit upon the United States Army.

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have known Daniel Patrick Moynihan over the years will be watching with interest to see how he fares in the new administration, what he will say, and what he will be able to accomplish. From his past record, it seems doubtful that he will be able to maintain the "passion for anonymity" that used to be associated with White House aides. Indeed, it would be a crying shame if this colorful and irreverent personality were to become an indistinguishable part of a gray and solemn assemblage of talent.

I take considerable pride in the fact that Pat Moynihan has achieved the distinction of being the only man selected for a post close to the seat of power by Presidents Kennedy and Nixon, for I was largely responsible for Pat Moynihan's first undertaking a government job—as assistant to the secretary to the Governor in Albany, N.Y., in 1955. A friendly and fair portrayal of this remarkable man was contained in the "T. R. B." column in a recent New Republic. The article follows:

T. R. B. FROM WASHINGTON

PAT AMONG THE MINNOWS

If you dropped a goldfish into a tankful of minnows it would be as conspicuous as Daniel Patrick Moynihan is likely to be in months ahead. In the school of drab lawyers, bankers and real estate promoters that Richard Nixon is assembling for his official family, Pat Moynihan is a startling oddity.

Just the thought of the admirable Irishman in this congregation of cool fish boggles the mind. Washington will be a livelier place while it lasts, and he has taken a two-year leave of absence as director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies. Some think the stay will be considerably shorter. Mr. Moynihan observes himself that his first task is to "shut up." That feat itself is one to come running to watch and as contrary to Nature as its opposite would be, to hear a graaffe, for instance (without vocal cords), speak.

Pat Moynihan is a passionate reformer, and a crusader for the poor. He also carries controversy as a boy carries a kite. Some men are born with the gentle art of self-publicity. Teddy Roosevelt was; Mayor LaGuardia was. Mr. Moynihan could recite "Mary had a little lamb" in Central Park and would probably be charged by somebody with inciting a riot. As Assistant Secretary of Labor he got out a report showing the decay of Negro families due to the poverty that grinds many ghetto units into the mold of matriarchy. It looked all right; it sounded compassionate; Lyndon Johnson drew on it in a celebrated speech at Howard University, June, 1965. And then all hell broke loose.

Negroes charged that it was patronizing. Southern newspapers denounced its reform

proposals. The Social Worker Establishment saw its dogma challenged. Eager-beaver liberals with short fuses called him a racist.

Tall, blue-eyed, chubby-cheeked urbanologist Pat Moynihan reacted with the hurt feelings of a small child whose fingers have been slapped for trying to help. The Johnson Administration gave him the same mean look that the little boy got who said the Emperor had no clothes.

He appeared before Americans for Democratic Action in 1967 (of whose board he was a member) to say "liberals must somehow overcome the curious condescension which takes the form of sticking up for and explaining away anything, however outrageous, which Negroes, individually and collectively, might do." Another storm! Bemused conservatives canonized him; militant leftists called him a Judas. And gregarious, mercurial, slum-born Moynihan, the man who said tragically after the Kennedy assassination, "you're not Irish if you don't know your heart's meant to be broken," went on to higher and higher things.

THE POOR NEED MONEY

For example, he wrote a chapter for the paperback book, *Republican Papers* (1968), edited by Defense Secretary-designate Melvin Laird. And he said things that would crisp the hair of many Republicans. Primarily he argued that what the poor need most is money. Not social theories. Not make-up classes or political organization. The poor must have jobs and government should be the employer of last resort; he said there must be some sort of federal income maintenance and that "the best known way is through a family (or children's) allowance."

This is the man Mr. Nixon has picked to head a Cabinet-level Council on Urban Affairs, which is supposed to be the counterpart on the domestic side of the one Henry A. Kissinger will head on foreign affairs.

In a way there is a kind of logic about it. Mr. Moynihan doubtless feels he eschews controversy. After all, how did he know, when his publishers picked next month to bring out his new book that he would then be in the sub-cabinet? The book's title is mild, too, isn't it?—*Maximum Feasible Understanding*. It paraphrases the current welfare law requiring the poor to have "maximum feasible participation" in community councils. With a forthcoming book like that who needs to speak?

Like Mr. Nixon, Pat Moynihan believes there is over-centralization in the poverty program; that there is a place for profit-making in harnessing industry to slum relief; that some theorists have been less interested in the poor than in their own nostrums. But after that it is hard to see how Mr. Nixon will go along with the deeper Moynihan credo.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

The family allowance (Canada's "baby bonus") would cost an estimated \$9 billion a year. Nobody knows how much government job guarantees would cost. What will the self-confident, self-made businessmen in the Nixon cabinet feel about the declaration that "what is needed now is a strategy of income equalization" (his italics) or that social restlessness will continue "until the incomes of the poor are brought up to average levels"?

Mr. Moynihan will tell the Republicans that the US is the only industrial democracy without a family allowance, that it devotes the lowest percentage of Gross National Product to social welfare of any Western democracy, and that the biggest Republican liability is that the "party became associated with unemployment in the mind of the electorate."

One's jaw drops over Moynihan's seeming

capacity to goad all groups while remaining one of the nicest men around—the John Birch founder has just warned Nixon against him and he has infuriated many liberals; his report on Negro families irked Lyndon Johnson, militant Negroes, Southern whites and welfare dogmatists—a high score for one try! Even as Mr. Nixon introduced him in New York over TV there was a funny scene as the irrepressible Pat intervened several times.

Let's see, he ought to appeal to clan feeling of fellow Irish; but no, in a magazine article last year he backed birth control and tactfully declared "a conspicuous streak of this kind of feeling (race prejudice) is to be found among a certain type of Catholic preoccupied with problems of contraception and dirty magazines to a point injurious to spiritual life."

This is a goldfish to watch in the Washington minnow tank.

REPRESENTATIVE GILBERT GUDE
PRESENTS LEGISLATIVE AGENDA
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call your attention to an example of the deep interest and work which one of my colleagues devotes to the District of Columbia in his membership on the House District Committee.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) has written to President Richard M. Nixon suggesting a legislative agenda for the District which the chief executive could present to Congress "without delay." Especially concerned about the crime situation here in Washington the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) has taken the recommendations of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, as well as those of other groups such as the District of Columbia Bar Association, and done considerable research of the various efforts at implementation here in the District.

We on the House District Committee are pleased that the Congress has responded in several cases; but, as Mr. GUDE points out, there is extensive "unfinished business" which challenges us and the government and citizens of the District, if we are to wage a coordinated, effective war on crime.

The complete text of Mr. GUDE's letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., January 14, 1969.

President-elect RICHARD M. NIXON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT ELECT: With the commencement of the 91st Congress, I have been giving considerable thought to the continuing role of Congress in the District of Columbia, and feel that I would like to outline my ideas and my interest in working with you in building a greater and better Federal City. More than ever before, we on the House District Committee must face our responsibility in District affairs. We in Congress represent the Nation, and must represent and act on the Nation's concern over her Capital.

During my first term in the Congress as a member of the House District Committee, I have striven to delve deeply into the machinations, both organizational and human, of our 7th largest city. Representing a Washington Metropolitan area constituency, I feel it imperative that the suburbanite, who is undeniably affected by them, be cognizant of and involved in urban problems if we are to make headway in our cities. The District is no exception.

In the up-coming two years of the 91st Congress, I feel we have the machinery for progress. I strongly and actively stressed the importance of Reorganization Plan #3 last session as a member of the House Government Operations Committee and have been pleased with the changes it was designed to, and did, make toward a more representative government. I myself have joined with concerned District citizens and officials to testify before the City Council regarding District affairs. I have on numerous occasions conferred with District officials on such crucial matters as improvement of police protection, riot reinsurance for District businesses, juvenile problems, consumer affairs, and improvement of the court system. I am convinced that Members of Congress and citizens of the District will be pleased as certain areas of rule making are transferred from Congress to the City Council, such as in the case of the air pollution law enacted last year. A closer working relationship between Congress and the District of Columbia is imperative for a better attack against the District's problems.

As recommended by the Kerner Commission, there must be more citizen participation in the District's policy making, rather than in reaction to it. I actively supported the direct election of the school board, I have co-sponsored in the House a measure to provide for voting representation here in Congress for District residents and plan to reintroduce such a measure. Feeling that this is the next essential step, I pressed in Miami to have this important proposal included in the Republican platform.

As you are well aware, the focus of attention on problems of the Metropolitan area and all across the country is on the crime situation. Citizens of the area are indeed grateful that your Administration will make this high on your list of priorities following January 20.

Many citizens through many public and private institutions have been grappling with the problem with growing concern over the recent years. A landmark point in their efforts was made by the publication of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia's Report in December 1966. This Report, as well as other proposals such as recommendations of the D.C. Bar Association, have given a good point of departure to combat crime and a yardstick to measure progress.

Although every recommendation has not had broad acceptance, there are certain items which, because of their nature and general acceptance, I hope will become priority items on a legislative agenda for the District which you could present to the 91st Congress without delay.

The legal community and the public in general are seriously concerned about crimes committed by those on bail awaiting trial. As a result, several Congressmen have introduced legislation to amend the Bail Reform Act; we are also awaiting the completion and recommendations of the Hart Committee of the Judicial Conference as well as the outcome of the Senate hearings commencing January 21. Therefore, a law to detain for quick trial those arrestees who would with some certainty commit crimes if released, is a priority item for your legislative recommendations. However, this is really only a

beginning for a comprehensive anti-crime legislative agenda.

Measures are needed within the Court system which would serve to reduce materially the time between apprehension and disposition of an offender, which now takes an average of 9½ months. More Assistant U.S. Attorneys and judges are gravely needed to eliminate the present backlog of felony cases in the U.S. District Court. I feel that the Administration should back additional funds for attorneys and support measures to employ visiting judges from other jurisdictions to take care of the backlog. Legislation should be enacted to provide for more judges on the D.C. Court of General Sessions and the Juvenile Court for this same purpose.

There should be legislation to transfer non-support and paternity cases from the Juvenile Court, in order that Juvenile judges may concentrate on juvenile offenders. The lack of integration and the ineffectiveness of the entire juvenile system was severely criticized by the Commission. This crucial area in the crime war, that of juvenile crime, should receive much emphasis.

In order to provide for an increasingly professional police force, there should be legislation for educational pay incentives for force members who receive professional training at the college level in the expanding fields of law enforcement and police administration.

In addition to these specific items, there should be new priorities in funding. For instance, an already appointed committee to study possible revisions in the D.C. Criminal Code provided for in the D.C. Crime Bill has not been funded.

Your Administration's support of funding salary increases and additional personnel in the rehabilitation area is critical if the above items of legislation are to be effective. Unless the quality and number of personnel at facilities, such as the Receiving Home, Junior Village, the Juvenile Facilities at Laurel, and the Detention Centers, are improved and increased, all of the additional efforts that we invest into the police and the courts will be lost. Counselors, cottage matrons and masters, probation officers, and other rehabilitative personnel are as vital a link in the legal machinery as the policeman and the judge.

I would also hope that the necessary, long-overdue funds to create a new Receiving Home would be stressed. In addition, only by funding separate facilities to care for neglected juveniles and juveniles involved in non-support cases will we separate all the unfortunate young people from those accused of delinquency. This is just one aspect of the dimly neglected area of crime prevention, explored and deplored by the Crime Commission.

In the area of rehabilitation, we must face the fact that the narcotics problem is highly correlated to criminal activity. Expanded support is needed for those facilities which provide comprehensive treatment to the narcotics addict and restore him from his antisocial role to a productive role in society. The District's need in the narcotics addiction field I find is identical to that of other areas in the country and emphasizes the similarity of the Nation's metropolitan problems.

The present D.C. drug addiction treatment facility is devoting some effort to preventive action, but this aspect, the staff realizes, is woefully inadequate. The science of curing drug addiction is at such a point that money invested in preventive education will yield results a thousand fold greater in terms of preventing human misery and crime.

Although this agenda of urgent items of unfinished business in the crime war is extensive, we can point to accomplishments of the 90th Congress and other activities

which show that many are at work in our crime war here in the District. During the last two years, Congress passed legislation to increase the salaries of law enforcement officers, judges, and teachers. The police force is legislated to be at its strongest, and such an objective must be reached. We were successful in obtaining two more judges to sit on the D.C. Court of General Sessions, but this increase did not achieve the quality of strength that several of my colleagues and I advocated the bench should attain.

Some of the activity in response to the Crime Commission's Report is in the realm of research and study and unfortunately the results of such activity may not be felt for some years. A comprehensive management study of the District Court system was begun in July 1968 by the Judicial Conference which will take two to three years. A data system is being coordinated by the Mayor's Office of Crime Analysis to integrate information to follow an individual from arrest through rehabilitation programs. Progress reports of the implementation of the Commission's recommendations are being researched by the various agencies affected and submitted to the Crime Analysis Office. The Department of Corrections has been doing this every two months.

The economic life of the city has been put in jeopardy by the continuing delays, often pure obstructionism, in developing a balanced regional transportation system of freeways and rapid rail transit. A considerable amount of statesmanship and enlightened leadership will be required to overcome past obstacles to development of this badly needed transportation system for the National Capital region.

The Washington Metropolitan area is viewed as the Nation in microcosm. The above efforts are in essence what is needed in all of our urban centers. The crisis and the challenge faces all of us.

Mr. President-elect, I have great hopes for "District Day" during the 91st Congress. But confronted with daily reports of increasing instances of crime, we cannot rest on our accomplishments of the past. The continuing research efforts must be supported, given the complexity of the problems we face. But we must take every realistic, substantive action now.

The job of Congress, the District Government, and area citizens is without a doubt a prodigious one. But as I embark upon my second term as a Representative and a District Committee member, I will continue to enlarge my knowledge of the District and accordingly increase my effective activity. I am anxious to work with you in every way possible to make our Federal City—and our Metropolitan Region—a model for the Nation in every respect.

Sincerely,

GILBERT GUDE.

CUBAN CRISIS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks were made by Theodore Sorensen at Ferdinand, Ind., on January 13, 1969:

Dean Acheson is right when he claims we were lucky in the Cuban crisis. His proposals to bomb the missile sites were discussed thoroughly. Our biggest luck was not taking his advice.

AVIATION SAFETY: A STEP BACKWARD

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year I have urged the Federal Aviation Administration to require that all aircraft be equipped with crash locator beacons. The Armed Forces have been using these small, inexpensive, life-saving devices for several years, and more than a thousand flightcrews downed in Vietnam have been saved because their aircraft were equipped with locators.

Last year, the FAA took what I hailed then as a modest, but important step forward when it issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking which would have required pilots to carry crash locator beacons on flights over hazardous terrain.

Just recently, the FAA, with no notice to interested Members of Congress, quietly withdrew the proposed regulation. I have been told that it will not even reconsider the rule for at least a year.

In my view, this is simply unconscionable. The FAA knows how effective crash locator beacons are. The agency even conducted a successful test of this equipment over terrain where the Oien family of Oregon died of exposure and starvation, despite intensive search efforts, weeks after their light plane crashed.

The proof is overwhelming that crash locator beacons can save lives. With faster aircraft carrying vastly increased passenger loads about to come into service, we can overlook no feasible step to improve safety standards. And let us not overlook the fact that air search and rescue missions are costing this Nation upward of \$60 million each year—largely because of the time spent in pinpointing the location of downed aircraft by methods made obsolete a decade ago.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for insertion in the Record a letter from me to David Thomas, Acting Administrator of the FAA, urging reconsideration of the agency's policy regarding crash locators, and an article from a recent issue of the AOPA Pilot, describing successful tests of this equipment—tests in which the FAA participated:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1969.

HON. DAVID THOMAS,
Acting Administrator,
Federal Aviation Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: I was shocked and disappointed to learn that the Federal Aviation Administration has withdrawn its advance notice of proposed rule-making with respect to the carrying of crash locator beacons on flights over hazardous terrain.

As you know, for more than a year I have urged the FAA to make this equipment mandatory for all flights, by all aircraft. You are aware that the armed forces have been using crash locator beacons with marked success in Vietnam and a recent test in which

the FAA participated demonstrated their effectiveness in civilian use.

We are currently spending about \$60 million a year on search and rescue missions for downed pilots and passengers. Officials in charge of those operations have repeatedly told me that it is their opinion that lives have been endangered and lost because of long delays in pinpointing the locations of downed aircraft.

In my view, there simply is no excuse for further delay on the FAA's part in requiring crash locator beacons for aircraft certification. The cost to aircraft owners is no longer too great; anyone capable of purchasing and maintaining a piece of equipment selling for upwards of \$10,000 should be able to bear an additional \$100 or \$200 burden designed to save his life and the lives of those who may accompany him.

I believe that FAA can and should handle this administratively. However, I am fully prepared to introduce legislation directing the FAA to require crash locator beacons in order for aircraft to receive certification. Continued timidity in this area will make the FAA responsible for the unnecessary loss of lives.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

GET LOST!

(By Don Downie)

(NOTE.—Pilot instructed to fly away and find good hiding place for Cessna 150 in crash-locator beacon exercise. The most inaccessible landing place he could find is located without too much difficulty by plane using regular VHF equipment.)

The FAA told us to "get lost!" Garrett Corporation asked that we get lost—but well!

So we got lost, not once but twice in three days. Both times were located in a remarkably short period of time; once by a single aircraft from the Nevada Civil Air Patrol, the second time by an FAA DC-3. On the second exercise, it took "the Friedlies" ubiquitous DC-3 just 17 minutes to zero in and fly the 84 statute miles from Las Vegas, Nev., to our unannounced landing on the dirt strip at Pierce Ferry, at the mouth of the Grand Canyon in Arizona.

These two exercises in search and rescue—with emphasis on the rescue—took place out of the Las Vegas (LAS) International Airport. Our aircraft, a Cessna 150, N50215, was probably the most sought-after small plane that had done down (intentionally) for a long time. This Cessna trainer was strictly stock except for a four-pound Garrett-AIRsearch "Downed Aircraft Locator Beacon" installed in the fin. This unit has an impact switch that would turn it on no matter what happened.

Fortunately, we were working on a practice exercise in airborne hide-and-seek that didn't require flying into the side of a mountain to make the problem work. But we did have a problem: "get lost." A group of perhaps 10 of us outlined "the ground rules" (and flight rules, too) in the Thunderbird Motel on the evening preceding the first flight.

As the discussion developed, Rollin Cooper (AOPA 9782), a consultant for Garrett in the beacon business, took no more than 10 minutes to explain the basic electronic search procedure to CAP Pilot L. K. Dixon, who flew the next day in a Beech Travel Air with observer Dick Case (AOPA 129529). FAA Western Region crews were on hand to monitor the exercise while my daughter, Dana, and I were target for the next day in the 150.

Essentially, the location system called for climbing as high as possible along the suspected area of the missing airplane until

the first tone of the locator beacon was heard. "Then drop in altitude until the signal vanishes," explained Rollin Cooper. "When you lose the signal, circle back in a climb to where you lost contact. Then turn 90° either to the right or left and drop down again in altitude. When the signal disappears, climb back up and do it again. This random type of search pattern requires no special VHF-DF equipment, just the standard VHF receiver."

That's all the briefing our single search crew had. The next day it took Dixon and Case an hour to pick up the first signal from our beacon and less than an hour and a half more to come streaking in over the top of us. During this search, they had covered most of the northern half of Arizona.

During our briefing, we outlined our "lost airplane" project as being up to 45° off-course. Sometimes people get way out beyond that. So, we proposed a flight from LAS to PHX (Phoenix). After the meeting broke up, Dana and I unfolded the sectional charts and played a preflight game of cat-and-mouse. First we marked out the on-course route from LAS to PHX. Then we angled a line 45° to either side of course. Dirty pool? Not really. If this electronic rescue system would work, let's really find out.

After considerable doodling, we looked at the tiny dirt strip at Tuweep, seven miles north of the Grand Canyon and 118 statute miles 67 degrees northeast of LAS. Here we played a little dirty pool in an effort to find out for sure whether or not this system would really work. Tuweep is 39° north of the regular V105 airway to Phoenix via Prescott, but it's actually 53° north of a direct line course.

Neither of us had ever landed at Tuweep before, but it turned out to be an ideal location for a missing-aircraft search. The little dirt strip showed on the sectional chart as 3,400 feet of dirt at an elevation of 4,875 feet, deep in a box canyon with 7,700-foot Mt. Emma, 7,840-foot Mt. Logan and 8,034-foot Mt. Trumbull ringing it to the west. A slightly lower range of unnamed hills obstructed beacon signals to the east.

Having something less than complete faith in all "black boxes," standard search and rescue capabilities and the ever-present possibility of landing way out in the "boondocks" with a blown tire, dead battery or whatever, we penned a hasty description of our proposed destination and put it in a double-sealed envelope. Just in case the dirt strip proved too soft or eroded, we added an alternate landing on one of the isolated dirt roads south of the Grand Canyon near a ranch called Frazier Well.

This double-sealed "flight plan" went to the FAA's veteran Public Affairs man Gene Kropf, who had a bad cold and was planning to monitor our "exercise" from a ground station near Boulder City. I picked up the letter, still unopened, much, much later the next afternoon.

The next morning we arrived at Las Vegas International (McCarran), pre-flighted N50215 and inspected the four-pound Garrett installation mounted in the fin. Cooper explained that the impact switch, set for 5 G's, would trigger the system automatically, but that merely inserting a dim in the dot of the beacon and turning the head would activate the two-channel 243 MHz and 121.5 MHz emergency frequencies. For purposes of this test, the Garrett beacon was crystal-controlled to 121.0 MHz and 242 MHz. To obtain additional "mileage" from the life program, we carried a small, portable "Life Pak" (see PILOT, Nov. 1968) beacon set on 121.6. Both systems worked perfectly.

We took off, headed out "on course" and then drifted far to the north over the fascinating, forebodingly rugged terrain east of the entrance to the Grand Canyon. Unless you could touch down safely on a sand bar

in the bottom of the canyon, walking out would be quite a problem.

The CAP Beech Travel Air took off from the North Las Vegas Airport an hour and a half after we were airborne. This timing gave us sufficient time to explore the area around Tuweep, look at the single narrow road leading down toward the flight strip and decide not to try a landing at the airport. There wasn't that much reason to inject realism into the problem.

We circled Tuweep and the Department of Land Management building nearby. The open-topped hangar showed a Super Cub tied down inside and the windsock was right down the soft strip. Shortly after we taxied back and parked beside the hangar, we turned on the fin-mounted Garrett beacon and erected the "Life Pak" atop one corner of the weather-beaten hangar. Soon veteran Grand Canyon resident John Riffe (AOPA 121210) drove up. He's lived in the backwoods of the Grand Canyon most of his life and learned to fly because he couldn't see enough of the country from horseback or jeep. He looked over our new 150 with both interest and suspicion.

We explained what we were doing and Riffe commented, "You picked a good spot. We don't have many visitors here and the hills all around are going to make you hard to find. However, we did have a couple of fellows spend the night two weeks ago when they ran out of daylight."

Reluctantly, Riffe excused himself, explaining that he had to drive to St. George, Utah.

After the dust of the Riffes' car had settled, we sat in the sunshine and admired the miles and miles of solitude. Occasionally, we'd turn on the receiver in N50215 and monitor both frequencies to make sure that both frequencies were on the air. They were. We counted the contrails of at least 30 jet airliners in the next two hours, and finally quit counting. Had any one of these jets been carrying a single crystal-controlled receiver tuned to the emergency frequency, we would have been "found" under actual conditions in minutes.

After participating in these search and rescue exercises, it is one reporter's opinion that the popularity and effectiveness of the entire crash locator beacon system will never approach its full potential until the airliners, just like commercial ocean-going vessels, are required by the FCC to guard the international distress frequency. [See Feb. 1968 PILOT.] Just four high-flying passenger transports could monitor the entire continental United States in less than five hours.

Electronic development engineers estimate that an "idiot light" 121.5 MHz emergency receiver would weigh perhaps one pound, draw just a few watts of power and cost considerably less than \$1,000 when manufactured to exacting airline specifications in the volume of 2,500 required to equip the entire domestic airline fleet in this country. Once this "idiot light" came on, all the airline crew need do would be to tune any receiver to 121.5, verify the signal and relay this information to the nearest FAA/PSS, giving their exact position. A second call should be made when the signal was lost. These two calls would alert rescue forces that an emergency existed long before a flight plan—if filed—was overdue. The airline report would also begin to locate the position of the downed beacon. Additional reports from high-flying jets would further narrow the search area, all this within a short period of time.

Without exception, every airline captain and corporate jet pilot that I've asked about this system has commented, "We have too much radio now. If this receiver can be installed with a light so that we don't have to listen to it all the time, there should be no objections."

However, managers of the "big brothers in the sky" don't seem to be interested in helping other birdmen. The powerful Airline

Transport Association has gone on record as opposing the addition of this simple lifesaver in the jet cockpit.

The ATA policy, as stated to FAA officials by William B. Becker, assistant vice president for operations, is:

"The airlines are of the unanimous opinion that they can find no justification to alter their position as expressed in the ATA comments on FAA advanced Notice 68-4. The airlines are still of the opinion that because of the technical difficulties involved and the extensive equipment changes required, implementation of new equipment to automatically monitor crash locator beacons triggered by general aviation aircraft would not be justifiable. As always, the airlines stand ready, when requested in a given situation, to offer Good Samaritan service by monitoring emergency frequencies of 121.5 MHz and to relay any resulting information to appropriate agencies."

The basic emergency frequency listening watch is firmly established at sea. Yet it's not even off the ground in aviation.

Garrett's approach to the problem has been a two-frequency transmitter that broadcasts simultaneously on both the civilian (121.5) and the military (243) frequency. Every military aircraft radio delivered since World War II has a built-in guard on 243 MHz, according to Rollin Cooper. When an emergency signal is on the air, the distinctive oscillating distress signal comes into the pilot's headset regardless of what frequency he is monitoring at the time.

Back at Tuweep, we looked at our watches and relaxed in the sun. The silence was so loud it was noticeable.

As the moments ticked by, Dana and I discussed "what if . . ." We decided that we'd inspect John Riffe's house and spend the night there, if necessary. After all, there was no reason to louse up a good search exercise. And, if we weren't found that day, our "insurance letter" would bring someone over the following day. However, this was our first exposure to the potential of a locator beacon and we were understandably skeptical. But as it turned out, all this really wasn't necessary.

After we'd been on the ground for two hours and 45 minutes, we heard the reassuring roar of the CAP Travel Air and the ship streaked in at low altitude from over the Grand Canyon. There was no question about it, we'd been tracked down by electronics, not "eye-balled."

"N-215, we have you in sight," was L. K. Dixon's call as he circled overhead. Actually, the CAP pilot sounded tired. He should have been! In his 2½-hour high-altitude search, he had covered virtually all of Northern Arizona and the fringes of three other adjoining states.

During debriefing, search pilot Dixon commented, "Even though we had been somewhat misled by the pilots of the 'lost' airplane, we picked up an initial signal after an hour of flying at 10,000 feet. This signal lasted only a few seconds and we backtracked to pick it up again. It took us an hour and a half to finally find the Cessna, using nothing but standard VHF receivers. We would have found the ship somewhat sooner if we had made our initial track to the south of the proposed course where a number of good landing spots were available down the Sacramento Valley of Arizona, the Big Sandy River or Chino Creek."

A certain VHF "bounce" from the beacon's signal off the walls of the hills surrounding Tuweep nearly doubled the time it would have taken normally to pinpoint the ship. Dixon flew a box pattern twice around our immediate area before coming in from the open end of the narrow dead-end canyon. However, the fact that one search airplane, using only regulation communications equipment, was able to find us at all, and particularly in 2½ hours, was most impres-

sive. The locator beacon system works—*but good!* Actually, both the Garrett and the smaller "Life Pak" gave clear, easily identifiable line-of-sight signals. We could have been located in any kind of flyable weather.

Monitoring this exercise was one of the FAA's 80 DC-3's that fly regularly on the airways to monitor the accuracy of all nav/aids. Each of these aircraft had a VHF signal meter and all will be equipped with VHF-DP equipment by mid-summer, eliminating the time-consuming trial-and-error system now used as standard equipment.

The FAA's sensitive electronic equipment picked up our signals from 16,500 feet, miles away near Kingman, Ariz. However, the FAA's function on this particular exercise was to monitor the signal, not to "bird dog" the search airplane to our location. On a different test two days later, the FAA's N-14 demonstrated the efficiency of airborne VHF-DP equipment and found us again in just 17 minutes.

The second get-lost flight was an even more unpredictable problem. This time the copilot was my wife, Ruth, and the problem was to take off from LAS and fly "anywhere." There was no announced destination, just "get lost," and let the FAA's airborne DP equipment find us.

Just to be sneaky, and because we'd had a good look at the route two days earlier, we took the Cessna back along the same course toward Tuweep. Our flight was to the 2,600-foot-long dirt strip at Pierce Ferry that sits atop a 2,941-foot mesa at the mouth of the Grand Canyon 64 statute miles east of LAS. From the time we landed, taxiied into the shade of the one Joshua tree near the airport and turned the two beacons on, it was just 17 minutes until FAA Pilot L.C. Whalton wheeled in over the canyon. The DC-3 had been circling over LAS at 10,000 feet when the beacons came on the air.

In our continuing effort, to be sneaky, we'd taken along a surplus camouflage cloth to cover part of the airplane. Actually, this cloth covering was purely "window dressing" since the electronic signal from either beacon was all that the "Gooney Bird" needed to track directly to us.

We had planned something entirely new on this flight: an air-to-air intercept. As far as our crew could find out, this was the first time such an exercise had been attempted with a civilian beacon. N-14 was scheduled to go out or a random course while we took off from Pierce Ferry. The "Life Pak" was placed inside the cockpit of the 150 with its antenna as nearly vertical as possible between the front seats.

Once we were airborne, N-14 headed south and we headed north. Still being sneaky, we flew behind a couple of hills before climbing to 8,000 feet, just to give the search plane an intermittent signal. With the beacons on in flight, we found out one thing very promptly. It's almost impossible to read radio calls in the cockpit because of the "bleed off" from the beacons back to the aircraft's receiver. It's logical, because the aircraft receiver was almost sitting atop two transmitting beacons.

On any actual VHF/DF air-to-air intercept using a beacon signal, pilots of the search airplane will have to assume that the "lost pilot" isn't going to be able to hear instructions very well because of the distinctive, irritating signal. At the end of an hour in the air, there were two 150 pilots with headaches and jumpy nerves.

However, the air-to-air intercept was completely successful. N-14 tracked us down quickly and slowly pulled up alongside. Did you ever try to fly formation between a DC-3 and a Cessna 150? Most interesting! FAA pilot Whalton eased in off our right wing with his gear down and half flaps. We had a solid 90 m.p.h. indicated at 8,000 feet and still had a little power reserve.

An understandable confusion probably ex-

ists in most pilots' minds, including this reporter's, regarding the great difference in cost of various locator beacons. You can purchase 121.5 and 243 beacons the size of a pack of cigarettes for \$69.95 upward. The "Life Pak" that we carried retails for \$219. Garrett's basic two-channel system is \$485 including dual antennas. Installation and battery options can run this total from \$540 to as much as \$800.

The great variation in cost, according to electronic engineers, depends upon the type and capacity of batteries used.

Operating in the relatively warm temperatures near the Grand Canyon, FAA Electronic Engineer Harman reported a clear signal from the tiny "Life Pak" with its 225 of a watt power output at a distance of 86 miles.

So, you pay your money and take your choice.

Following our LAS exercise, the beacon and fin were removed from N60215. As the first winter snows collected on the Klamath Mountains along the California-Oregon border, this same beacon was "planted" on the ground within three miles of the tragic Olen crash. Two FAA DC-3's were able to pinpoint the beacon above a solid overcast in 7 and 15 minutes with a group of press representatives aboard.

The following day the beacon was relocated slightly and a regular CAP search mission was flown by five planes of the San Jose squadron. The briefing assumed an aircraft departing from Medford, Ore., southbound and last reported over the Fort Jones VOR. The three fastest aircraft were sent to Fort Jones and made a parallel sweep 20 miles apart south along the airway. The two slower aircraft were sent south to search the flat country of the Sacramento Valley.

Again the weather was broken to overcast and the beacon was "planted" in a box canyon 23 statute miles on the 277° radial from the Redding VOR. This was again in the immediate vicinity of the Olen crash. All three aircraft searching from the north identified the beacon and located the area within four miles; one from an on-top "fix" and the other two visually within a mile while flying beneath the weather and circling around the snow-capped ridges. Both aircraft flying north heard the signal and one of them was able to establish a definite "fix" in the area. None of the CAP aircraft was equipped with VHF-DP equipment. Orientation was similar to the exercise flown in LAS once the highest signal strength of the beacon was identified. During this exercise, the beacon was turned on for 2½ hours.

The FAA's VHF-DP-equipped N-10 was in the air when the beacons were first turned on, and orbited the site atop the overcast within ten minutes.

As both an airborne and groundbound "guinea pig" for locator beacons, take it from this reporter that the system works—and well! In these days of electronic technology, it is something more than archaic to have to blunder around with a team of from five to 50 airplanes that frequently find the downed aircraft—if at all—after it's too late to do any good. In a recent 12-month period, reports show that search was initiated for 254 downed aircraft carrying 801 people. Fifty-eight of these people were never located and six people lost their lives in search effort.

Add the one, simple, inexpensive ingredient of 121.5 distress watch receivers in all high-flying turbine aircraft and it suddenly becomes practical for those of us who fly "little airplanes" to purchase some sort of an emergency beacon.

Carry the system a logical step farther. Is there any reason why this listening watch system couldn't be carried on to international jet carriers? Then we'd have worldwide rescue—not just search and rescue.

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS., MARCHING BAND LAUDED FOR PERFORMANCE IN INAUGURAL PARADE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the South Hadley, Mass., High School band represented the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the inaugural parade through downtown Washington this week. Known as the Marching Tigers, the 121-member band performed with remarkable flair and precision. National television correspondents reviewing the inaugural parade cited the South Hadley band's striking performance. Established several years ago with a mere handful of young musicians, the Marching Tigers has since become one of the Nation's outstanding amateur musical groups. I know my colleagues from Massachusetts join me in congratulating the band for its performance Monday.

The Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram this week published two articles on the band's trip to Washington and its participation in the parade:

SOUTH HADLEY SCHOOL BAND'S PERFORMANCE IS PRAISED

The South Hadley High School "Marching Tigers" band arrived home yesterday noon, after a nation-wide television debut in Monday's Presidential Inauguration Parade.

The band's 121 members and six chaperones started out from Washington, D.C. at 5 a.m. this morning, traveling in a three-bus caravan. According to William Cox, Peter Pan Bus Lines dispatcher, the band changed its departure schedule from midnight to 5 a.m. to allow for sight-seeing and rest.

A bus-load of the band members' parents arrived back in South Hadley at 4:30 a.m. today.

David W. Lewis, assistant principal of South Hadley High School, today praised the band's performance as "excellent." He noted that the Nixons, whose daughter Julie has visited the high school, flashed wide smiles as the Commonwealth's official band passed in review.

Sporting their colorful uniforms and led by four young ladies carrying the South Hadley High School banner, the Tiger Marching Hundred marched past the Presidential reviewing stand shortly before 4 p.m.

Area television viewers heard the commentator's remark about the band's growth and progress in recent years.

Asst. Principal Lewis said the band's appearance was "quite impressive." He said parents and friends of the band would greet the young musicians upon their return to the high school today.

Classes at South Hadley High School were let out at noon Monday to allow students to watch the Tiger Marching Hundred on television. The band members were excused from classes today, pending recovery from an exhausting but rewarding adventure.

SOUTH HADLEY BAND REPRESENTS MASSACHUSETTS IN PARADE

(By Jo An Sanborn)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It was cold and blustery along the Inaugural Parade Route in the Capital today as 121 band members from the South Hadley High School Marching Tigers moved into their assembly point at 1:05 in the Capitol area. Yesterday at noon the band, plus six chaperones left the school

grounds by bus and arrived in Alexandria, Va., at 8:40 p.m. They are pictured here, just prior to leaving for Washington as they receive final instructions from South Hadley band director Roger W. Farnsworth.

Five students, who were bus sick were recovered today and the full complement will march in the Parade which began at 2. The South Hadley contingent was in the eighth division about the middle of the parade. The bandmen reported to Bolling Air Force this morning and were army bused from there to the parade staging area. Earlier this morning the group went to Arlington Cemetery to see the grave of the late President Kennedy. They were due to leave Alexandria about midnight tonight. Sightseeing tours were arranged for the group after the parade. William Bernstein, a South Hadley student photographer for the school newspaper, the Spotlight, had clearance to take pictures of the band as it paraded.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD copies of three letters outlining the band's history of accomplishments and its selection as the Massachusetts representative in the inaugural parade.

TOWN OF SOUTH HADLEY,
OFFICE OF SELECTMEN,

South Hadley, Mass., December 12, 1968.
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDDIE: We have contacted Mr. Donald Lynch, Head Co-ordinator for the Presidential Inaugural Parade, at the Governor's Office and asked him to consider the South Hadley High School Tiger Marching Hundred when planning his program.

Listed below are some of the band's achievements:

First place in the March 1968 Holyoke St. Patrick's Day Parade for outstanding band.

First prize against thirteen (13) other bands in New England Fall Follage Festival held in North Adam, October 6, 1968.

Bronze Trophy, third place—competed against ten (10) championship bands in Eastern United States who were asked to perform.

Performed at half time at Boston Patriots' football game on national T.V.

Band received highest possible rating at Music Festival in May, hosted in South Hadley.

We would appreciate your assistance in recommending that the South Hadley band be a participant in the parade.

Very truly yours,
ALAN K. ROOT,
Chairman, Board of Selectmen.

THE 1969 PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL
COMMITTEE, COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, Mass., December 18, 1968.
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: This is to inform you that the South Hadley High School Band has been chosen by the Massachusetts Inaugural Committee to represent the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in Washington, D.C. in the 1969 Inaugural Parade.

The Executive Committee considered many qualified bands from throughout the Commonwealth before making a final decision. Heartiest congratulations are due to the students of South Hadley High School as well as the very interested members of the South Hadley Community.

Your interest in behalf of the Tiger Marching Hundred Band is appreciated by the Executive Committee.

Sincerely,
RICHARD P. MILANO,
Executive Director.

SOUTH HADLEY HIGH SCHOOL
MARCHING AND CONCERT BANDS,
South Hadley, Mass., December 18, 1968.
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SEN: As you already know, the South Hadley Tiger Marching Hundred has been named Massachusetts' representatives to the Presidential Inaugural Parade. We wish to express our appreciation to you for your help in obtaining a part in the Parade as the official band to represent Massachusetts.

Our performance on January 20, 1969 will show you how thankful we are for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,
ROGER W. FARNSWORTH.

STANLEY DILLER TO BE HONORED
AT ACHIEVEMENT AWARD DINNER

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, January 26, 1969, the Samuel A. Fryer Yavneh Hebrew Academy of Los Angeles will hold its achievement award dinner to honor Stanley Diller, who has been its dedicated president since 1962.

Yavneh is a full day school with facilities for 1,000, which offers religious and secular studies to elementary school students. Mr. Diller has been widely acclaimed for his crucial role in raising the necessary funds for the construction of Yavneh's attractive new school building.

Diller, who is the owner of Diller Floor Covering Co. and the Stanley Diller Enterprises, has been in the United States since 1947. Prior to that he had been held for several years in a Nazi concentration camp.

Diller is a board member of Shaarei Tefillah Congregation; Sabras Bond Committee; Sportsmen's Club of the City of Hope; American Jewish Committee; Torah Emeth Academy; Yeshiva of Lakewood, N.J.; B'nai Yitzchok Congregation of New York, and Rambam Torah Institute. He is treasurer of College Yeshiva of Trzebin, Jerusalem, and Congregation Mogen Abraham. He was named "Man of the Year" in 1967 by the Young Israel of Los Angeles. He and his wife Dorothy, who has been a great inspiration to him in his many community-related activities, are the parents of four children: Arthur, Michael, Sheryl and Brigitte.

Also, I wish to commend the following four outstanding community leaders who are the cochairmen of this event:

Mark Boyar, builder and developer of the city of Lakewood, Calif., and past chairman of the United Jewish Welfare Fund, had been appointed by Governor Brown to the positions of parks commissioner and director of the rapid transit district here in Los Angeles. He has throughout his professional life devoted himself tirelessly to his community and to California.

Nathan Shapell, housing development genius and community leader, hailed for his role in the construction at Temple Beth Am—of which he is a past president—of the Memorial Wall in memory of the 6 million Jewish martyrs.

Stanley Black, leading west coast developer of office buildings; president of the Westwood Shrine Club—the youngest in its history—active in many charitable activities, including Vista Del Mar, City of Hope, Los Angeles Home for the Aged, and United Jewish Welfare Fund.

Elliot B. Feldman, prominent attorney and civic leader.

I should like also to congratulate the academy's deans, Rabbi Osher Zilberstein and Rabbi William Spiegelman, for their efforts in behalf of the students and the community.

Yavneh's executive board includes Abraham Spiegel, Jack Nagel, Sanford Deutsch, Leo Presser, and Frank Horny.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON, District Attorney Evelle Younger, Mayor Sam Yorty, and myself are among the honorary co-chairmen of the dinner.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1863
POLISH INSURRECTION

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to remind my colleagues of a historic date of special significance to our great body of Polish-Americans who yesterday celebrated the anniversary of the 1863 Polish Insurrection.

At a time when this Nation was sadly divided and engaged in a war pitting brother against brother and State against State to eradicate slavery, youthful Polish patriots fought valiantly month after month to manifest opposition to the untenable educational and political reforms ordered by the all-powerful Czar Alexander II upon the people of Poland.

These young insurrectionists employed guerrilla warfare tactics from hideouts established throughout the country. Their persistence and their bravery succeeded in the establishment of a secret national government in Warsaw. But when the czar decided to employ his mighty military establishment to eradicate those in opposition to his rule, he easily crushed the movement and instituted a reign of terror and repression. Poland was made a vassal province under Russian rule.

January 22, Mr. Chairman, should remind all Americans that in spite of adversity, in spite of generation after generation of oppressive domination by Russian czars and Russian Reds the people of Poland still covet freedom and the precious rights involved in self-determination.

This anniversary should remind us too of the importance of the upsurge of a proud people's demands for independence which has been manifested in Poland in recent months. Because of our

deep bonds of friendship and kinship with the people of Poland we should extend the maximum of material and moral support for their efforts to throw off the shackles of enforced servitude to the Soviet Union and the puppet slave masters installed over them by the Kremlin.

It is a privilege to share in the observance of this historic date with our fine Polish-American organizations. May their relatives and friends in Poland be made aware of the depth of our affection and real concern for them.

**RESOLUTIONS FROM THE SENATE
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS**

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to present resolutions urging the President of the United States to order an immediate increase in the discriminatory allocation of barrels of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England and to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine, passed by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, we have spoken in behalf of this project many times. We have testified before the Foreign Trade Zones Board and before Senator McINTYRE's committee. This project is greatly needed and entirely justified. The New England region has had critical and dangerous shortages of home fuel oil. We can not allow this to continue. The Machiasport project would solve not only this great problem, but would contribute to the local, regional, and national good.

It is such an excellent project that my surprise was as great as my dismay that it was not approved immediately.

I now submit the resolutions of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I hope that they are effective for gaining approval of the Machiasport project:

MASSACHUSETTS SENATE RESOLUTION

Resolution urging the President of the United States to order an immediate increase in the discriminatory allocation of barrels of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England and to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine

Whereas the consumers of home heating oil in the Commonwealth, as well as those of the other New England states, have been discriminated against for the past decade because of stringent quotas relating to the imports of No. 2 fuel oil; and

Whereas according to the Massachusetts Consumers' Council the consumers of Massachusetts are overcharged forty-two million dollars annually because of the imposition of such quotas under the Eisenhower Administration; and

Whereas said Consumers' Council and the New England Council consistently presented the facts of such discriminatory policies before the appropriate federal bodies; and

Whereas there has been no decision to rescind the executive order establishing such quotas; and

Whereas Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has reportedly indicated a willingness

to recommend an allocation of 30,000 barrels a day of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England; and

Whereas the proposed Foreign Trade Zone in Portland, Maine could help to correct the inequities occasioned by the No. 2 fuel oil quota discrimination, by allowing an additional allocation of 90,000 to 101,000 barrels of No. 2 imported fuel oil; and

Whereas the establishment and operation of an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine would relieve the shortage of No. 2 fuel oil for the consumers of heating oil in the Commonwealth in peak heating seasons and retard price increases of this necessity of life; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges President Johnson to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce to implement forthwith the Udall recommendations relative to the allocation of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England; And be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate supports the efforts of Senator Kennedy and other members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation to gain approval of the application by the Maine Port Authority to establish, operate and maintain a general-purpose foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine and a subzone for the purpose of oil refining in Machiasport, Maine; And be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, January 15, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

Attest: JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

**HON. J. FRANK WILSON, JUDGE AND
MEMBER OF CONGRESS**

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the passing of one of our former colleagues, the Honorable J. Frank Wilson, of Dallas, Tex., on October 13, 1968.

Frank Wilson served as a Member of the Texas delegation in the Congress from 1947 through 1955 with distinction. He was a fine Member and had a rare sense of humor that touched all with whom he came in contact. He was actually a constituent of mine, having been born in Corsicana, Tex., and educated in the public school system there. He attended several military schools in Texas and graduated from Baylor University Law School in 1923. He was admitted to the bar that same year and engaged in law practice in Dallas. He had a long tenure of public service having been chairman of the Dallas County Democratic Executive Committee from 1942 to 1945, was a delegate to the Democratic convention in 1936 and was district judge of the Criminal District Court of Texas in 1943 and 1944. He served as a Member of Congress from the 80th to the 83d Congress from which he resigned to accept a judgeship on the Criminal District Court No. 1 of Dallas.

His presence in the legal community of Dallas will be sorely missed as was his presence here in the Congress when he departed. He was truly a public servant and will be well remembered by his many friends.

**CONFIDENT DETROIT PUTTING ITS
MONEY ON THE MINICAR**

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Members may recall that, on August 19 and 26, 1965, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of letters I had exchanged with the four leading American automobile manufacturers. The letters dealt with my proposal that the American automobile industry challenge the predominance of European manufacturers in the production of subcompact cars, which were capturing a substantial—and growing—segment of the U.S. market. I had suggested at that time that such action by the American industry could have several significant benefits for our country: lessening the balance-of-payments drain caused by purchase of European-made automobiles; creating additional employment opportunities in the United States; and helping to ease highway congestion and urban traffic jams by progressively reducing the average size of American cars.

Replies from the American automobile industry, however, laid such stress on the obstacles to production of subcompact cars that I was led to fear for the competitive spirit traditionally displayed by American business. Market potential was insufficient, we were told; Americans were looking for less austere transportation; costs of tooling up for a subcompact would be quite prohibitive; and the combination of American compacts and subcompacts manufactured by American subsidiaries abroad were presented as an adequate response to existing demand. Thus, no new initiatives were foreseen in this field. The competitive spirit, if not moribund, was certainly flagging.

It is with this background in mind that I will greet with special pleasure the appearance in April of the first Maverick, Ford Motor Co's initial entry in the subcompact sweepstakes, as I will greet with similar delight the subsequent debuts of its competitors. For these new models represent the realization of the suggestions which I put forth three and a half years ago, with their promise of benefits for all Americans, and at the same time bring welcome reassurance that the competitive spirit of American industry has regained its normal vigor.

I insert, at this point in the RECORD, a recent New York Times article describing the new cars:

**CONFIDENT DETROIT PUTTING ITS MONEY ON
THE MINICAR**

(By Jerry M. Flint)

DETROIT.—Will car sales go up or down? What will Senate investigators and Ralph Nader uncover next?

Will Bunkie sock it to Ed?

These are some of Detroit's questions for 1969. But perhaps the biggest question—regarding the timing and scope of the automobile industry's response to competition from abroad and climbing costs at home—is answered.

The small-car revolution begins officially in April when the Ford Motor Company shows its new Maverick, a sleek two-door vehicle that is a few inches shorter than the traditional compact car, using Ford's smallest six-cylinder engine. In the fall the American Motors Corporation will show its smaller car, also several inches shorter than the compacts.

THE SECOND STAGE

The second stage of the revolution arrives in the summer of 1970, when the General Motors Corporation brings out its tinier XP-887 with a new four-cylinder engine.

Ford is developing a second small car, rear-engine, to match the G.M. Minimodel.

The Chrysler Corporation is working to adapt its French and English small-car designs for American production. American Motors is developing a luxury small car three and a half feet high.

These small and minicars are more than new models aimed at pleasing the whims of buyers. They are more than vehicles designed to win back sales from the foreigners. They embody the pride of Detroit's executives, their belief that they can outdesign and outproduce anyone in the world.

They are gambling hundreds of millions of dollars that their stylists, engineers and technology can lead the high-wage, high-profit American auto industry to victory over low-wage, low-profit foreign competition.

If Detroit loses, the automobile industry could go the way of textiles, depending on Government production for survival, but there is a scent of success in Detroit.

"Why not wait for a Maverick?" a Ford executive advised a friend.

The friend did not buy the Japanese import and is waiting.

"DRIPPING WATER"

A G.M. vice president wants the new mini-car body for a Pontiac sports car and says he will be "dripping water" on the heads of his bosses until he gets it. Translation: The new small body must be a winner if Pontiac wants it.

Detroit's revolution may be coming just in time. Last year, 9.6 million cars were sold, a record, compared with 8.3 million sales in 1967 and the old mark 9.3 million, in 1965. But one million of the car sales last year were imports, mostly from Germany, Japan and England. The import flood meant no sales or production or profit for the combined American industry.

The new small American cars, with more power and room than the imports, are to carry price tags in the \$2,000 range, not far from the imports. How can Detroit hold the prices down?

For one, it has cheapened the new cars. The rear side windows of the Maverick do not roll down, they push out, saving the cost of the window mechanisms.

For another industry is seeking technological breakthroughs to speed production. G.M. engineers say they plan to roll the XP-887 off the lines at 100 an hour, almost twice the speed of the ordinary United States car line.

The new small cars may affect the 1969 sales outlook. The auto company's own predictions call for a mild downturn. Henry Ford 2d, Ford's chairman, said that 1969 would be a "normal" year, with 9.4 million car sales, down 2 per cent from 1968's record.

James M. Roche, General Motors chairman, talked of "continuing the high-level volume" and 9.3 to 9.5 million car sales. Roy D. Chapin Jr., American Motors chairman, predicted a "flattening out" and 9.2 to 9.4 million sales.

Chrysler says that 1969 will match last year's record.

SALES INFLATED

"Everything still looks strong, there's no sign of any letdown," said Virgil Boyd, the company's president.

But if the new Ford and American Motors small cars can chop several hundred thousand sales from the import total and slide them to the American side, the industry could match or improve on 1968.

Why do most auto executives expect a slump this year?

One reason is merely a feeling that the boom "can't go on," plus their experience showing that record years are often followed by declines.

Also, General Motors figures that 1968 sales were inflated by about 200,000 cars, which would have come in 1967 but for strikes. Thus, the company says, its estimate for 1969 is still in line with its projections for steady growth.

In addition, the rate of economic growth is expected to slow, with personal income and employment gains slackening because of tighter credit, the Government's spending lld and the effects of the income tax surcharge, particularly in the second quarter, when 1968 tax bills come due.

However, auto officials concede that they are still puzzled by the size of the 1967 boom, which not even Ford, the most bullish, predicted.

"I just didn't believe the third quarter," said one Big Three analyst who had told his car divisions that a slowdown was coming. "I haven't gone back to them."

The boom is credited now to faster-than-expected economic growth, plus sharp price cutting by dealers in the summer.

The possibilities for a strong showing, particularly in the last half of 1969, are bolstered by expectations that the Government's spending lld will be lifted, along with the possibilities of peace.

"With a combination of favorable developments, including a ceasefire in Vietnam, accompanied by some demobilization of the military forces, sales for the year could go above 9.6 million units," Lynn A. Townsend, Chrysler's chairman, said.

Some analysts believe they have been regularly underestimating the long-term growth of the economy and that the surcharge will hurt car demand. The expectation sales also is only a guess.

The four auto companies have scheduled 2,400,000 first-quarter car assemblies, up from 2,320,000 built last year. Most of the increase comes from General Motors, which lost production because of strikes early last year.

Ford's schedule is down from the year before, when the company was catching up with its strike losses. The schedule can be cut back if sales slacken—some overtime has already been cut from January—but the projected pace is at boom level.

One question about the industry's long-term outlook—the effect of new mass transit systems to end car-caused congestion—is considered answered in Detroit, although most officials will not say so publicly.

FUTURE HELD BRIGHT

One Detroit executive said:

"Listen, America is irrevocably on wheels. It can't get off. The other forms of transportation, excepting air are dying off."

Detroit's engineers say they can meet the air-pollution standards set by the Government. Whether the standards lead to a reduction in air pollution may be questionable, but the industry apparently has a big say in setting the standards.

The most serious attack in 1969 is expected to come from an investigation of car warranty and service problems by Senator Philip A. Hart, Democrat of Michigan.

The personalities of the industry's giants, General Motors and Ford, are also under-

going change, sharpened by the rivalry between Semon (Bunkie) Knudsen, Ford's president and a former G.M. officer, and Edward N. Cole, the General Motors president.

Mr. Cole was elected president of General Motors late in 1966; Mr. Knudsen, the son of a General Motors president then quit and moved to Ford.

Little is heard about far-out items such as the electric car.

Despite a host of innovations in the last decade—the best-selling compact, the first intermediate-size car, the luxury model standard-size car, the first and best-selling sports car—Ford has not been able to increase its share of the market. Even the 1969 models have not led to the increase in the market share that Ford had expected.

General Motors seems to be making a serious effort to appear as a friendly giant, rather than the cold, impersonal monolith that sent detectives to spy on the auto industry's chief critic, Ralph Nader.

Mr. Cole and his boss, James Roche, are personable men who seem able to talk easily to newsmen or Senators.

At Chrysler, car sales and profits keep going up. Some executives are unhappy with what they consider to be the lack of innovation and conservative approach shown by Mr. Townsend, with his tendency to move up men with accounting backgrounds.

American Motors turned huge losses into a small profit in 1968, paid off its debts and showed a retail sales gain.

WE'RE OLD FASHIONED—STILL HONOR THE FLAG

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week we witnessed the dramatic inauguration of the President of the United States and we saw evidence of the great spirit and faith of our country.

Coinciding with this memorable and historic occasion, I noted with great interest an editorial in the January 16 edition of the Southwest Messenger Press, a chain of community newspapers serving southwest suburban Cook County, which presented a timely and succinct commentary honoring the American flag. It follows:

WE'RE OLD FASHIONED—STILL HONOR THE FLAG

An interesting little pamphlet, issued by one of the country's larger life insurance companies, tells the story of the flag of the United States. In describing the birth of the Stars and Stripes, it quotes George Washington: "We take the star from Heaven, the red from our Mother Country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

According to the pamphlet, nearly a year passed after the signing of the Declaration of Independence before anything was done relative to the establishment of a national flag. But on June 14, 1777, the American Congress adopted the following resolution: "Resolved, That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." There is a story that the American flag was first flown on July 4, 1777, when it was hoisted by Captain John Paul Jones over the war vessel Ranger. In the

years since then, the original thirteen stars have been added to many times as new states joined the Union.

In commenting on his growth, the pamphlet says, "Now it waves majestically over forty-eight States, extending across the continent; and flies over islands of the Atlantic and Pacific, and other outlying possessions. More than one hundred and thirty million people owe it allegiance, a vast assemblage composed of nearly every race in the world, but all united by one bond of loyalty and devotion to the Flag which symbolizes Liberty."

Yes, the figures are a little out of date. The pamphlet was written more than forty years ago. In these days of strife and defamation of the flag, it is a wonder that we do not see the story of the American flag in print more often—or is it too old-fashioned?

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY—SDS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many awakened Americans are concerned over the undisciplined little army of professional students known as SDS.

Many ask: "Is SDS an agency of the Communist Party, U.S.A., or of a splinter group?" "Does SDS have international ties?" "What is its relationship with other radical and subversive groups?" "Has SDS peaked or is it still growing in membership?" and "How is it financed?"

The Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace—in the absence of Other State or Federal reports—has rendered a comprehensive report to inform the American people.

I feel the report is of interest to all our colleagues and place it at this point in my remarks:

SPECIAL REPORT: CAMPUS UNREST—STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

(By the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace)

In the scheme of things on the left, how important and how dangerous is the group of student radicals who operate under the label of Students for a Democratic Society?

This question cannot be considered merely academically in view of the overt violence and revolutionary tactics employed by this group and its followers. In addition to the overt acts by the SDS and its allies, the often stated philosophies and aims of this group take it out of the area of harmless protest. We must, then, examine it not as a student protest movement but as a present and potential threat to our society and its institutions—even as a threat to the very existence of our government.

Because this group has been, and is, operating in the State of Alabama and is now seeking to extend its influence into all colleges, and even high school, student bodies, this Commission has attempted to examine it from the inside as well as from the outside. We are aware of the fact that Students for a Democratic Society has often been described as communist controlled but that no agency of government, state or federal, has made an official citation as to its status.

For the sake of clarity in this report, we shall examine the following questions:

I. Is Students for a Democratic Society an agency of the Communist Party, U.S.A., or of any recognizable communist splinter group?

II. Does SDS have international communist ties?

III. What is the relationship between SDS and other radical and subversive domestic groups?

IV. Has SDS reached its zenith of influence—or is it still growing?

V. How is SDS funded?

I. SDS—IS IT A COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION?

Students for a Democratic Society traces its heritage to the radical Socialist group, League for Industrial Democracy. Its predecessor was the student arm of LID in the 1940's and became known as Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID). SLID was taken over by the young communist movement and ended in 1948. SDS emerged 10 years later.

The parent organization, LID, is not a communist front by pure definition. Organized by ten Socialists and Marxists in 1905, it quickly became the harbour for intellectual radicals. As an organization, it has often fought bitterly against communist party-line politics. On the other hand it has a consistent record of more than half a century of supporting most major social and economic aims of the Communist Party. Many LID members rose to high places in government, education, journalism and literature while remaining faithful supporters of LID's brand of radical socialism. These include such names as Columist, Walter Lippmann; Labor leader, Walter Reuther; Socialist leader, Norman Thomas, and many others.

Also noted among the membership of LID are many of the most noted Communist Party liners such as Jay Lovestone, former Communist organizer (now defected); Francis J. McConnell, former Methodist Bishop and identified party functionary; Babette Deutch, poet and Marxist; Communist, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, along with scores of others who fit into the same category.

It was not until 1921 that LID changed its name from Intercollegiate Socialist Society. It was done, according to LID leaders at that time, because they thought the American public would be more tolerant of an organization with the word "democracy" in its name than it would with a socialist designation.

Basis for citation

1. Students for a Democratic Society adopted a non-exclusion policy when it broke away from LID, which was to say they would not exclude communists from their ranks. (New Left Notes, April, 1964)

2. SDS participated in a conference in Chicago in May, 1967, to organize action against the war in Vietnam. Participating in this conference with SDS, were the Student Mobilization Committee, the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance and the W.E.B. Dubois Clubs. (Report to Appropriations Sub-Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, May, 1968, by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, FBI.)

3. Fred Davis, of SDS, was a speaker at demonstrations before the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, Oct. 21, 1967, which preceded the march on the Pentagon. This march turned into a violent confrontation with military guards. Communists and radicals participated in the assault on the Pentagon, and communist literature was distributed in the crowd. Hoover, said some 125 known communist party members, some of them of high rank, participated in the action.

4. Communist Party leader, Gus Hall, described SDS as a "group we have not going for us." (Speech by Gus Hall to 1968 party convention)

5. In his report above referred to, Mr. Hoover said SDS was infiltrated by commu-

nists. In a separate report he said it was financially supported in part by the communist party.

6. SDS has openly advocated violence in overthrowing our social institutions and the government itself.

7. It has encouraged resistance to the draft and has attempted to prevent the arrest of soldiers who have gone AWOL. It publishes a draft guide in which it suggested feigning homosexuality as a draft-dodging technique. (Chicago Tribune, October 17, 1965.)

8. SDS has advocated the repeal of anti-communist laws; abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; recognition of Cuba; unilateral disarmament by the United States; and admission of Red China to the United Nations. (AP report, May, 1966, May 7, 1966.)

9. SDS has formed an alliance with Progressive Labor Party, left radical communist splinter group. (report of 1968 SDS convention)

10. SDS sponsored the speech by Paul Boutelle, Socialist Workers Party candidate for president, at the University of Oklahoma. (Militant, October 30, 1967)

11. At an organizational meeting in the home of a professor of a Birmingham, Alabama college in August of 1965, Claude Williams, veteran communist party member, was active as an organizer of the SDS chapter. The meeting was held off campus. (Report by the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace)

12. SDS leaders called for action to "destroy the myth of American democracy" on October 14, 1968. (U.S. News & World Report, October 28, 1968)

13. SDS led riots that closed the campus of Columbia University in May, 1968 and again in September, 1968; aided in the closing of San Francisco College, November, 1968; seized and held a building at City College of New York, where they cut fire hoses, rifed and burned files and tried to keep federal and state officials from arresting a soldier who was AWOL (press reports, including National Guardian, November 16, 1968).

14. SDS called for student strike nationwide to protest national election on November 5, 1968. They used the slogan "No Class Today, No Ruling Class Tomorrow". (National Guardian, Nov. 16, 1968.)

15. According to reports from government investigating agencies at least 35 members of Students for a Democratic Society have traveled to Cuba, most of them illegally, during the past year. One of its leaders, Tom Hayden, made an unauthorized trip to Hanoi in 1967 and conferred with Ho Chi Minh. He was accompanied by Communist party ideologist, Dr. Herbert Apteker.

16. Phillip Abbott Luce, former member of the Communist Progressive Labor Party, testified in May, 1968, that SDS gives open support to guerrilla warfare in the United States. In his testimony he recited the following quotes attributed to SDS officials:

"We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment . . . We are actively organizing sedition." (Gregory Calvert, SDS National Secretary)

"Urban guerrillas are the only realistic alternative at this time to electoral politics or mass armed resistance." (Tom Hayden, former SDS President)

"We are getting ready for the revolution . . ." (Dee Jackson, Assistant National Secretary, SDS.)

We could further point out that SDS claims chapters at some 100 colleges and an unknown number of high schools, claims a membership of some 35,000, with 6,000 dues payers. In the call for disruption of the Presidential Election, SDS was able to get from a few hundred to several thousand students to demonstrate at colleges across the nation, according to the National Guardian.

The activities of SDS are given broad coverage by all elements of the communist press, including *The World* (formerly *The Worker*) *People's World*; *National Guardian*; *Militant*, and even the Cuban communist organ *Gramma*.

The heroes of SDS include Fidel Castro, Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Minh, Che Guevara and, of course, Karl Marx. It has threatened to create terror on campuses all over the nation and even tried co-ordinating a world wide revolutionary student movement. SDS leaders have been quoted as saying they would create "many Columbias".

SDS was active in a leadership role in the Chicago riots that virtually wrecked the Democratic Convention. Its former president, Tom Hayden, was one of those arrested. Police reported the presence of a number of known communist leaders in the riots in Chicago. (Special report by Intelligence Dept., Chicago Police)

Some of the SDS "intellectuals" such as Carl Davidson, have continued to write SDS position papers while contributing to communist publications. Davidson, while he was an active official of SDS in 1966 wrote a paper called "Toward Student Syndicalism." In that paper he outlined how demands should be made on school authorities and if met, how greater demands should be made until authorities were forced to deny them. These denials would then become "issues" around which demonstrations could be held and radical organizing encouraged. Davidson's paper was a blueprint for campus subversion and he even advocated the setting up of "student soviets" on the campuses. Today he is a writer for the Communist publication, *National Guardian*.

We agree with J. Edgar Hoover when he warns that it would be an error to simply label SDS and the rest of the "new left" as communists. It goes beyond political structure. Mr. Hoover said:

"The mood of this movement, which is best typified by its primary spokesman, the Students for a Democratic Society is a mood of disillusionment, pessimism and alienation. At the center of the movement is an almost passionate desire to destroy, to annihilate, to tear down. If anything definite can be said about the Students for a Democratic Society, it is that it can be called anarchistic . . ."

II. DOES SDS HAVE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST TIES?

As pointed out above, SDS has developed close ties with Cuba, and with Hanoi.

Last spring the SDS chapter at Columbia University, under its leader, Mark Rudd, hosted Communist student groups for a 3 day conference. The conference was attended by communist student groups from seven countries, including France, Italy, Germany, and Mexico. (Widner Report, SDS, August 1968)

III. TIES WITH OTHER SUBVERSIVE AND RADICAL GROUPS

The SDS ties with Progressive Labor and the Communist Party have been pointed out above. It also maintains an intimate relationship with Southern Student Organizing Committee (SSOC) and Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee. Both of these groups advocate the same violent tactics and revolutionary aims as does SDS. (SSOC publication PREP, 1965). It acts openly and jointly with avowed and identified communist groups.

IV. IS SDS INFLUENCE GROWING?

It is difficult to estimate the growth rate, or potential growth, of SDS. This is due partly to the proliferation of "single action" groups with more or less the same base as SDS.

It is significant that SDS has announced that it is setting up M.D.S., Movement for a Democratic Society, for the stated purpose of bringing off-campus radicals into the

revolutionary struggle. MDS was announced in a release from SDS in early 1967. Since that time MDS has become a reality. It now publishes the MDS Newsletter from New Orleans. This publication claims MDS has entered the field of labor agitation and is receiving help from SDS college and high school groups, from SNCC and Progressive Labor.

The MDS Newsletter of November, 1968, recommends articles in *Challenge* the official publication of Progressive Labor. (MDS Newsletter, November, 1968)

Progressive Labor and SDS have joined to sponsor a group to be known as SLAP (Student Labor Action Project). Admittedly, this was blueprinted by Progressive Labor. (Ibid) SLAP explained its aims at an SDS-Progressive Labor Meeting this year in Boulder, North Carolina:

"Exploitation of the workers is the basis of this imperialist society! Students are also victimized both materially and intellectually by the same system that exploits and oppresses working people. Thus, there exists the basis for a common fight . . . We must develop a class approach, build support for the working class in all struggles, defeat anti-working class ideas, support workers' struggles, and launch anti-ruling class battles that covertly link workers and students in fighting their common enemy." (Ibid)

The growth of SDS, and its coalitions, is indicated unless there are strong forces set in motion against it.

V. HOW IS SDS FINANCED?

As we have already pointed out, SDS is receiving financial help from the Communists, according to J. Edgar Hoover. Through the sale of publications and membership dues, SDS realizes what would appear to be a small percentage of the money it spends. For special projects, such as the demonstrations in Chicago, and the assault on the Pentagon, SDS advertises for funds in such communist publications as *The World* and *National Guardian*.

In some cases, SDS has sought funds from foundations which support radical causes. It is not known whether they have actually received any such funds. The travel to Cuba project was one in which some SDS leaders said they were seeking foundation help.

FINDINGS OF THIS COMMISSION

We conclude from the foregoing evidence that Students for a Democratic Society has as its aim the overthrow, by violence and subversion, of the institutions of our society and our government; that its aim is identical with that of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the various splinter communist groups; that it has actively and overtly conspired with known communist groups in this purpose and has attempted, and is attempting, to prosecute this course of action.

We further conclude that Students for a Democratic Society has received, and is receiving, aid and financial support, knowingly, from communist groups; that it is under substantial direction and control of one or more communist groups.

Based on its demonstrated ability to move and motivate masses of students on a large number of campuses across the nation, we find that SDS has demonstrated itself to be more than a passive threat.

Great institutions, such as Columbia, CUNY, University of Wisconsin, University of Michigan and scores of others, have discovered that you can't deal with SDS as merely another student protest, or social action group. Some of these institutions have banned SDS as a recognized student organization. This has been at both Columbia and CUNY, following serious acts of violence, destruction of property and intimidation of students, faculty and administrative officials.

While recognizing the absence of political structure at this point, we, nevertheless, conclude that Students for a Democratic Society

should be considered a dangerous, radical organization which poses a threat that is equal to that of a structured communist entity.

In considering the total effect of the SDS and the new left, we cannot overlook the accompanying phenomenon on the campuses where it has exerted its greatest influence. Radical student action has been accompanied by an alarming increase in drug use, and a moral decline.

When rebellious students were forcefully removed from administrative offices at Columbia, President Grayson Kirk, expressed shocked disbelief at the evidences of drug use and sexual promiscuity that had gone on. In addition, the students had smeared the area with human excrement, cut fire hoses, destroyed records and displayed posters of Karl Marx, Castro, Che Guevara and other communist "heroes." (Report from Young Americans for Freedom at Columbia).

The rise of the student left is accompanied in virtually every case by the emergence of "under ground newspapers." These usually carry the theme of rebellion; are anti-establishment, lionize the left, and use a profusion of pornography and four letter words.

It is reasonable to assume from the evidence that rebellion of the type exemplified by SDS feeds on itself, and the by-products are predictable.

It is immaterial which comes first. Whether drug use follows rebellion, or rebellion follows drug use is as relevant as the classic "chicken or egg" debate.

Whether underground publications merely mirror a situation, or promote it, is not as important as the fact that the elements are homogeneous.

In this regard, this commission must point out that underground publications are common today on nearly all college campuses in Alabama. Underground papers are advertised in all communist publications. Some of these are produced on campuses and some are independently produced.

Drug abuse is growing on some campuses in our state and the increasing threat cannot be ignored. We feel, at this time, these are more in the nature of warning symptoms than of a full-blown disease.

The growing alliance of campus radical groups, with off-campus organizations, will pose a growing problem in the future. This is especially true where single-purpose movements such as SLAP employ their energies and talents in the field of labor agitation.

We doubt that name calling at this point would serve any useful purpose. For this reason we are not, in this report the names of faculty and instructors who are known to be encouraging student protest-type organizations. Further investigation will be required to complete the list and to verify reports now in our hands. We realize that every precaution should be taken to prevent injury to individuals and institutions. However, our decision not to use names of individuals or institutions at this time may be subject to change in light of future events.

We cannot overlook the important role in student rebellion that is played by adult, professional people who declare their commitment against the institutions which employ them and the state which helps to finance those institutions. We do not, as a legislative creature, presume to suggest what steps should be taken to insure our educational institutions against such intellectual erosion from within and to insulate the students against the influences of faculty activists who counsel rebellion. In light of the rising tide of student revolts—many causing great loss in money, time and prestige to the institutions so victimized—we respectfully suggest that this problem must be addressed by the proper authorities. The files and facilities of this commission are, of course, open to authorized agencies in this regard.

We conclude from the evidence before us that we cannot realistically expect a lessening

ing of student unrest within the near or intermediate future. We feel, conversely, that the forces now in motion will serve to feed a growing militancy in this field.

This commission is fully aware of the problems of intelligence that is posed, and the need for close liaison with local school administrators and civil authorities in areas that are affected or will be affected. Within the limits of our capabilities, we are undertaking this task.

Under the legislative mandate of this commission we respectfully recommend that Students for a Democratic Society, and any group under whatever name is an alter-ego of SDS, be denied administrative recognition as a student organization at any state supported institution.

SENATOR JOHN H. HAWKINS, JR., *Chairman.*

Representative IRA D. FRUITT, *Chairman.*

SENATOR JAMES S. CLARK, *Vice Chairman.*

Representative W. M. COLLINS,

Representative ROBERT C. GAFFORD,

C. EDWIN STRICKLAND, *Staff Director.*

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1969]

CLASHES ERUPT AFTER MARCH

More than 6000 New Left demonstrators staged a lusty counter-inaugural parade down Pennsylvania Avenue yesterday amid cries for an end to the Vietnam war, racism, and capitalism.

Less than an hour after the parade, club-swinging Park police on horseback clashed with bands of demonstrators who were heckling guests going to a reception for Vice President-elect Spiro T. Agnew at the Smithsonian Museum of History and Technology on the Mall.

At least 22 persons were arrested during the day, three of them during the museum melee, the rest as the parade came to a close at the east end of the Mall.

As demonstrators were cleared from in front of the museum a number of officers were pelted and two were hospitalized. Allen Sullivan and David Lennox were reported in satisfactory condition at Washington Hospital Center.

George Washington Hospital reported five demonstrators were treated and released.

The police action started when about 1000 demonstrators blocked the Madison Drive entrance to the museum. Some were throwing mud and dirt at arriving guests.

Eight mounted policemen and several patrolmen waded into the crowd, forcing it south across the Mall.

The demonstrators screamed obscenities and threw sticks and mud at the police. A few flicked burning cigarettes and firecrackers at the police horses.

Officers clubbed at least a dozen demonstrators and attempted to catch several who had climbed trees.

After about 90 minutes, when full darkness had fallen, the situation became a stand-off. The demonstrators gradually withdrew.

Earlier, at about 4 p.m., demonstrators spread tacks and nails on the pavement at 15th Street and Independence Avenue, causing several flat tires and a brief traffic tie-up. A police escort bringing President-elect Nixon into town from Andrews Air Force Base had to be rerouted.

The counter-inaugural parade went off smoothly, and scuffles between demonstrators and police and between demonstrators and march marshals erupted only near the end of the route.

Fifteen men and three women were arrested at 3d Street on the Mall when police said they refused police orders to keep to the west side of the street and move on. Several marchers threw mud at police.

When ordered to move, the demonstrators linked arms and stood their ground. There was little violence during the arrests.

The protesters came in a wild assortment

of clothes, masks and body paint. They carried everything from billowing banners to symbolic coffins and toy machine guns.

The counter-inaugural activities started with a rally at 1:30 p.m. in a huge circus tent at 15th Street and Independence Avenue s.w. After several speeches, during which some demonstrators shouted their impatience with the speakers and eagerness to "go into the streets," the parade got under way.

It went north up 15th Street, turned east on Pennsylvania, then south on 3d Street and ended in front of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Building at 4th Street and Independence Avenue s.w.

There, demonstrators fought among themselves for control of a flagpole. Some wanted the American flag at the top pulled down. Others wanted it to stay up.

A dozen persons grappled with each other for control of the pole as hundreds watched and cheered. March marshals and Phillip Hirschkopf, a lawyer for the protest organization, tried to persuade demonstrators to leave the flag alone.

Finally, police arrived and took control of the pole. After demonstrators dispersed, police lowered the flag themselves.

From that point, large bands of demonstrators drifted toward the Museum of History and Technology when someone announced on a bullhorn that the Agnew reception was taking place there.

An anonymous leaflet distributed earlier in the day also urged demonstrators to go to the museum "while the fat cats are reveling."

David Dellinger, chairman of the National Mobilization Committee to end the war in Vietnam tried to deter demonstrators by announcing on a bullhorn that there were no further activities planned until the counter-inaugural "ball at 7 p.m. in the circus tent.

Most went to the tent or dispersed elsewhere, but about 1000 went on to the museum where they clashed with police.

Earlier, during the parade, most participants followed the Mobilization instructions for an orderly march. Only small clusters of Yippies and other persons calling themselves "crazy-asses" occasionally strayed from the line of march or tried to disrupt traffic. Mobilization marshals ran along the march line endeavoring to keep order.

At the pre-march rally, Dellinger set the note for the day.

"There is a lot of confusion here . . ." he said, "but one thing's for damned sure. We know why we're here—to stop that war. We're here to do our part to liberate the black man, and we're here not only to liberate Saigon but Washington."

Other speakers at the crowded rally were Tom Melville, the ousted Maryknoll priest convicted of destroying Selective Service records in Baltimore; James Johnson, one of three Fort Hood, Tex., soldiers imprisoned in 1966 for refusing to go to Vietnam; Marilyn Webb, who spoke for the "Women's Liberation Movement"; and two active duty servicemen, Jesus Cruz and Derrick Alexander.

Singer Phil Ochs regaled the crowd with caustic antiestablishment songs.

The speakers condemned the war in Vietnam and what they called American imperialism, racism and militarism. Several said capitalism lies at the root of America's problems and should be eradicated.

"Free enterprise is the right of the powerful to oppress the weak," said Melville.

Later, as the protesters marched down Pennsylvania Avenue, they flashed V-for-victory signs to passers-by and urged them to join. Some did.

As they passed the Justice Department buildings, hundreds raised their fists and shouted "Sieg Heil, Sieg Heil."

About two dozen young men, some in uniform, who said they were active duty military servicemen, headed the parade. Viet-

cong, anarchist and other flags streamed over the heads of the paraders.

Members of the Rapid Transit Guerrilla Communications Theatre, some wearing white-face, marched to the lugubrious beat of a drum, humming "America" and acting out the horrors of civilian death in Vietnam.

The crowd was mostly young, mostly white. It included Yippies, hippies, clergymen, housewives, Democrats, Socialists, students and drifters.

In addition to police, Justice Department officials and Secret Servicemen warily watched the parade.

Two staff members of the President's Commission on Violence also were on hand to observe.

The counter-inaugural "ball" at the circus tent finished up yesterday's activities. An estimated 8000 persons jammed the tent inside and surrounded it eight and ten deep outside.

Loud rock music played while a light show spun across the tent's ceiling. The tent was extremely crowded and the ground became a sea of mud.

The ball was late starting after the generator for the lighting system broke down. District Fire Department officials helped restore power.

Protesters plan to observe today's Nixon-Agnew Inaugural parade from four points along Pennsylvania Avenue.

They have 100 bleacher seats at 11th and 15th Streets and will stand on the north sidewalks at 12th and 15th Streets. Mobilization leaders say no disruption is planned.

Arrested for disorderly conduct were Thomas Wodetzki, 27, New York City; John Portela, 20, Vergennes, Vt.; Robert J. Cross, 24, 1701 East-West hwy.; Henes A. Medina, 22, New York City; George B. Spears, 20, Glen Ellyn, Ill.; David J. McLaury, 21, Jackson, Mich.; Leslie H. Bayless, 23, 7421 Blair rd., N.W.; Gerald J. Sheehan, 21, Irvington, N.J.; George B. Gibeau, 21, Warrenville, Ohio; Paul H. Kelton, 21, Columbus, Ohio; Ben R. Augusten, 21, Baltimore; James L. Sauer, 23, Three Rivers, Mich.; Anthony Settanni, 21, Upper Darby, Pa.; Mary Anne Jackson, 20, Salem, Ohio; Linda Evans, 21, Fort Dodge, Iowa; Sharon Lee Post, 19, Hampton, Ohio.

Charged with destroying government property was David A. Sugarman, 24, New York City. Charged with violation of police lines were Terry Noble, 32, New York City and Robert Johnson, 23, Ypsilanti, Mich. Charged with depositing trash was James P. Padgett, 23, Silver Spring. Charged with a pedestrian violation was Michael Hyman, 18, Elmont, Long Island. Charged with carrying a dangerous weapon, a night stick, was Glenn Cohen, 21, New Castle, Pa.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 20, 1969]

PROTESTERS AND POLICE CLASH BRIEFLY

(By Barry Kalb)

A day-long series of "counter inaugural" protest activities flared into disorder briefly yesterday at a Smithsonian Institution reception for Vice President-elect Spiro T. Agnew as mounted policemen charged into a crowd of about 1,500 amid a shower of debris hurled by demonstrators.

The melee outside the Museum of History and Technology in early evening was the worst incident of a day that saw some 6,000 protesters from various New Left groups stage a "wrong way" counter-inaugural parade down Pennsylvania Avenue, led by about 50 active-duty servicemen.

The parade was basically orderly but there were several minor scuffles with police. During the day police said, 19 persons—16 men and 3 women—were arrested and charged with disorderly conduct. Two U.S. Park Policemen were treated for injuries at the Washington Hospital Center and released.

As the parade broke up in front of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters at 800 Independence Ave. SW, about a quarter of the crowd walked across the Mall to the Agnew reception that was beginning about 5 p.m.

For about half an hour, protesters crowded around the Mall entrance to the museum, jeering arriving guests and throwing debris at some who had to walk through the ranks of the dissidents to get to the ceremony. There were no reports of injuries.

Then, the scene suddenly became a mass of running protesters, swinging billy clubs and mounted policemen charging into the crowd as slats, torn from park trash disposal baskets, were hurled by the protesters.

The disorder was triggered when clouds of dirt and other objects were tossed at police, and shouts of "Pig" and "Sieg Heil" began to fill the area.

One officer ordered two men in a tree to come down, then began clubbing one as he hung from a branch. One protester, blood streaming down his face, was treated for an inch-long gash in his scalp.

"I don't know who hit me," he said calmly, "I was hit from behind."

Among the policemen injured was Park Police Deputy Chief A. D. Beye, who was struck with a board.

DARK BRINGS STALEMATE

As it became dark and increasingly colder, police and protesters faced off in a stalemate for about 45 minutes.

Then the crowd began to thin and people drifted off toward the counter-inaugural tent, at 15th Street and Independence Avenue, for the evening "ball."

The dissidents' day began with a 90-minute rally in the tent, erected by the sponsoring National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. Permission for the protest activities and a site for the tent was given late in the week by the federal government, with the proviso that the tent come down this morning.

Kathleen Cleaver, wife of Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver, did not show up as announced, and the rally was short, as such events go.

After folk-singer Phil Ochs performed several numbers, Mobilization chairman David Dellinger announced "just one more speaker, a wounded GI who got out of his hospital bed to come here."

The crowd in the tent, which a moment earlier had been shouting to get on with the march, suddenly fell silent as Derrick Alexander, a 25-year-old soldier from Florida, walked to the microphone.

Alexander's right arm is missing. He has a deep scar in his forehead running back across his scalp. Both are the result of wounds he received in Vietnam, he said.

He laughed self-consciously and told the audience that he wasn't accustomed to speaking before crowds. But nobody said a word as he told them, "I represent a relatively new contingent of the peace movement . . . men in uniforms themselves."

After he was wounded, he said, "I decided my mission was to do whatever is humanly possible to end the war." Alexander said his father is a Navy captain now assigned to the Gulf of Tonkin, off Vietnam.

HALTING, NOISY MARCH

The march, which stretched for blocks past sparse Sunday crowds, was halting and noisy, with leaders constantly stopping the line to close up ranks.

Marchers momentarily surrounded a police patrol wagon on 3rd Street NW, prompting Deputy Chief Raymond Pyles to call for reinforcements, and about 10 marchers were arrested near the end of the march at 6th and Independence Ave. SW.

A wild confrontation between different factions of the crowd took place in front of the NASA building.

As marchers poured into the courtyard in

front of the building, one ultra-militant group surrounded the flagpole and began to shout for the American flag to be pulled down. But after tugging by opposing groups, it was left up.

The ball, which was held up when organizers ran out of fuel for their diesel generator to heat their tent and were rescued by fuel supplied by the District, was loud, swinging and jampacked.

The scheduled climax of the ball was the "in-hog-uration," the swearing in of a pig.

DISRUPTION HINTED

About 200 of the more extreme protesters gathered this morning at Franklin Park, K Street between 13th and 14th Sts. NW, to plan activities concerning the parade.

While they gave no details, speakers intimated that there would be some sort of attempted disruption.

One helmeted young man said, "The Mobilization Against the War in Vietnam people are going to be along the route. All we have to do is get together and think alike and we can lead them, because they don't know what they're doing." The groups represented at the park included Students for a Democratic Society and Youths Against War and Fascism.

Capt. Theodore Zanders of the District police spoke with the protesters briefly and explained to them that police would assist them in getting to the parade route if they caused no trouble. But he also warned that police would be on the lookout and they would be promptly arrested for any infractions of the law.

Two arrests did occur when youths apparently grappled for possession of a Viet Cong flag.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 21, 1969]
SOME 250,000 APPLAUD PARADE—PROTESTERS CLASH WITH POLICE—CAR PELTED

Young protesters hurled sticks and other debris at President Nixon's limousine as it passed along the Pennsylvania Avenue Inaugural parade route yesterday.

No damage was done. The car was closed along that part of the route.

A half hour later, hundreds of demonstrators rampaged through downtown streets, stoning police, breaking store windows and blocking traffic. At least 81 persons were arrested and 12 persons injured.

The violence erupted after the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which had planned an elaborate but orderly three-day counter-inauguration here, lost control over about 1000 of the protesters.

These dissidents, largely leaderless but including militant members of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and Youth Against War and Fascism, were already disgruntled with Sunday's counter-inaugural march and were looking for more adventurous action.

They gathered in Franklin Park at 14th and I Streets nw. at noon yesterday to map an independent action. After bickering over routes and tactics, they began streaming south on 14th Street nw. toward Pennsylvania Avenue.

Led by a man bearing a Vietcong flag, the demonstrators wore helmets, goggles, gas masks and a wild assortment of clothes.

Police halted the demonstrators briefly at 14th and Pennsylvania, but through an agreement worked out in part by Phillip Hirschkop, Mobilization attorney, they were allowed to stand in one major group at 13½ Street and two smaller groups at 12th and 15th.

While waiting for the Nixon entourage, they taunted the police facing them along the avenue. Behind the police, tense authorities ordered in a supporting line of 82d Airborne paratroopers with their arms linked and rifle-bearing D.C. National Guardsmen in battle fatigues.

OBSCENE GESTURES

The demonstrators screamed obscene and irreverent slogans about Mr. Nixon and made obscene gestures.

In the crowd, scores of small American flags were burned.

"Hey, hey, Ho Chi Minh, the NLF is going to win," the dissidents shouted over and over. "The next war—revolution."

There were several pushing matches between officers and the front line of demonstrators as the police tried to keep them from pressing against the fiber glass-covered steel cable along the avenue.

At 2:57 p.m., the Nixon limousine passed. It was showered with a dozen to two dozen missiles—sticks, stones, empty drink cans and what appeared to be cherry bombs, none of which exploded.

A heavy stick struck a paratrooper in the head. Companions helped him from the scene.

Secret Service agents, their faces anxious, hovered around the slow-moving presidential car. Agents on the running-boards batted down several of the missiles.

The black limousine slowed momentarily, then sped up past the jeering crowd. Mr. Nixon's back was turned to the demonstrators. He waved to spectators on the south side of the Avenue.

The demonstrators continued shouting at the new Cabinet members-designate as they passed after Mr. Nixon. Of all the dignitaries, only Chief Justice Earl Warren was cheered.

"Walter Hickel (Interior Secretary-designate) is a tree," some shouted. "He's going to turn Alaska into a motel."

LEAVE ROUTE

Then minutes after the President passed, the crowd began to lead north on 14th Street away from the Inaugural route.

At 14th and G sts. nw., several youth suddenly began shouting, "Into the streets . . . the streets belong to the people."

In an instant, hundreds swarmed into the intersection, bellowing war whoops and running north.

In the minutes that followed, a pitched battle occurred between police and demonstrators on H Street at Lafayette Park. Youths pelted police and cars with stones and tried to occupy the street. Officers cleared it with motorcycles and squad cars.

One policeman was set upon by a howling crowd of about 35 persons at 15th and H Streets.

"LET'S GET HIM"

They surrounded Officer W. E. Larmar, shouting "Pig" and "Let's get him." The officer held up his hands in a beseeching gesture as the crowd closed in on him.

He lunged at one of the demonstrators and then they swarmed over him. "Kill the pig!" youths shouted. They struck and kicked. The officer struck and kicked back.

Four more officers arrived and waded into the crowd, their clubs falling. The youths dispersed and moved toward Lafayette Park. Larmar was not seriously injured.

Rocks, some of them large paving stones, rained down on the police cars, smashing windows and denting the bodies.

At one point, a crowd of about 30 demonstrators surrounded an isolated patrol car with two officers inside. They kicked and beat on it. As they attempted to rock it, the driver spun away in a screech of rubber, barely missing some of the protesters.

A phalanx of three-wheeled motorcycle officers moved down H Street along the park, clearing demonstrators. One youth hurled a wire-bound bundle of newspapers under a cycle. Generally, the officers remained in or on their vehicles and did not use their clubs.

Helmeted foot patrolmen soon arrived. Youths threw several trash barrels into the streets. One youth was tackled by officers. A brief melee followed in which a dozen officers clubbed and kicked at demonstrators. A

young man and a girl were knocked into bushes at the Veterans Administration building.

A number of demonstrators left the scene with bleeding heads, but officers had directed most of their blows at the protesters' bodies.

The crowd scattered and ran north up 16th Street and east toward 14th Street. They smashed windows at A. C. Houghton & Son, 1418 H st., the National Housing Center, 1625 L st., the Security Bank, 1510 K st., the Gramercy Inn, 1616 Rhode Island ave., and the St. John's Church on Lafayette Square, which other demonstrators had been using as a sanctuary.

Although splintered into small groups, the youths periodically threw bottles and stones at passing police cars.

Two main groups reformed as dark began to fall. The smaller group gathered at Scott Circle, then dispersed toward Dupont Circle.

The other group, numbering several hundred, gathered in McPherson Square. Demonstrators talked among themselves for a while, then began walking in a zig-zag pattern northwest from 15th and K Streets to Dupont Circle. From there, they went south on Connecticut Avenue, then west on M Street and, as night fell, began dispersing at 21st and M Streets.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 21, 1969]

NIXON CAR PELTED, 82 ARRESTED IN PARADE INCIDENTS

(NOTE.—This story was written by John Flaska from reports by Barry Kalb, John Mathews, Nancy Beckham, Duncan Spencer, Paul Delaney, Kenneth Ikenberry, Harvey Kabaker and Alvin Lorman.)

A fast-moving series of confrontations between police and a group of "New Left" demonstrators spread chaos and snarled downtown traffic yesterday shortly after the start of the inaugural parade.

A total of 82 persons were arrested, police said, including five women and eight juveniles, as a result of incidents during and after the parade.

Most of the incidents occurred after President Nixon's car met a barrage of missiles and obscene taunts as it passed a crowd of youths massed behind police lines at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW.

As homemade smoke bombs, sticks, small rocks, pennies and wadded-up newspapers flew at his closed car from a crowd of about 400 youths, Nixon continued to smile and wave, while Secret Service agents rushed frantically between him and the crowd.

Police, rifle-carrying National Guardsmen and paratroopers pressed against the crowd in a double line as they continued to boo and curse members of Nixon's Cabinet who rode by in separate cars behind the President's limousine.

"Let's go to the White House!" someone shouted as the group began to disperse. Shortly after 3 p.m. a loose, disorganized crowd of youths began moving north on 13th and 14th Streets and then west on H Street and New York Avenue to Lafayette Square.

Dressed mostly in denim, fatigues and other hippie garb, the group included a number of the more radical "New Left" groups, including the Students for a Democratic Society and the Coalition for an Anti-Imperialist Movement (COAIM).

Many of the youths wore helmets and several self-styled "medics" accompanied them. Although several youths shouted, "It's just like Chicago!" to reporters during the events that followed, a check of parade aid stations and area hospitals revealed only 15 minor injuries resulting from police-demonstrator incidents.

The injured included one policeman complaining of chest pains and a paratrooper who was hit on the nose by a flying object as the President's car passed the crowd.

"Judging from the small amount of in-

juries we saw, I think the police used very intelligent restraint," said Dr. Fred C. Heath, deputy director of the D.C. Health Department, who helped coordinate work of the first-aid stations along the parade route.

As the crowd of youths began to converge on Lafayette Park from the parade route, a policeman was seen standing alone in the street near Vermont and I streets.

"He was just standing there as the crowd approached and suddenly he was engulfed. Then I saw him go down, struggling with several from the crowd," an observer said.

At this point a busful of policemen from the Civil Disturbance Unit, parked nearby, emptied. CDU men tore into the crowd, swinging their sticks. The fallen officer was rescued, apparently unhurt.

For about a minute afterward, police officers struck repeatedly at the crowd raising their sticks above their heads. A woman, dressed in a long, white "medic" gown, was clubbed on the head by one officer. Blood flowed down her face as she fell to the ground.

Prevented by police from entering Lafayette Park, the crowd massed for about five minutes in front of St. John's Episcopal Church. Youths pelted officers with rocks and pebbles they collected from a garden area along the side of the church, located across M Street from the park.

POLICE, CROWD CONVERGE

It was 3:25 p.m. A call sounded on the police radio for all available squad cars in the Northwest section of the city to converge on 16th and I and 15th and K Streets as the crowd, pushed by growing numbers of police, moved north.

Several smaller groups of youths fanned out in different directions, pursued by police. Squad cars with lights flashing veered in and out of traffic-clogged streets as a crowd of about 300 demonstrators formed on McPherson Square at 15th and I Streets.

Officers stood quietly along the sides of the square as the youths, a number of bystanders and reporters milled about. Two men climbed to the top of the statue of Gen. McPherson and attached a blue pennant with the word "Peace" to his horse's mane.

For about 10 minutes, there was relative calm. Elements of the crowd seemed about to break up when a young girl wearing a red hat and two other youths began running through the crowd to 15th and I.

"It's a game! Follow us. C'mon, it's a game!" she shouted. Within a minute about 150 youths were running with her. They ran down the middle of the street, around the corner into the 1400 block of I Street where they ran smack into a squad of surprised CDU officers who were getting out of their cars.

SWEARING GIRLS ARRESTED

The crowd suddenly reversed, running back through the park. Several police units began sweeping through the park. In front of the Home Federal Savings & Loan Association at 15th and K Streets, a reporter saw several policemen chasing a crowd, prodding with their clubs those who didn't move fast enough.

A girl turned around and pushed back. A second girl joined her, and they stood, screaming hate and obscenities at the police.

After a momentary standoff, an officer reached for the first girl. She fought back. Several officers wrestled with her and they carried her through the crowd to a waiting wagon. The second girl joined the fray and she, too, was arrested.

Although no clubs were used, officers were seen to strike the girls with their fists before putting them in the wagon.

Several other youths, enraged by the incident, struck policemen and were arrested. "Nonviolence! Peace!" a young man shouted as police and the crowd faced each other. A girl shouted an obscenity at him several

times. "If you don't want to struggle, go home."

By 4:10 p.m., police had cleared the crowd from McPherson Square. The next 90 minutes were filled with minor incidents in the area between the park and Connecticut Avenue.

A rock shattered a squad car's windshield near the square. Several store windows were smashed. Asst. Chief Jerry Wilson arrived near the square and ordered his men to begin breaking up small groups leaving the area.

Wilson ordered CDU officers to begin making arrests for jaywalking. At Scott Circle, Wilson saw one youth ignore a "Don't Walk" sign.

"You see that sign?" Wilson shouted and grabbed him by the shoulder. As a motorcycle patrolman was taking the youth toward a wagon, Wilson arrested another demonstrator for ignoring the same sign.

BADGES MISSING

Some policemen were seen without their badges. One of them, Deputy Chief Raymond S. Pyles, head of the Special Operations Division, said a demonstrator had grabbed his.

Some of his men, he said, removed theirs because they were afraid of losing them. He said he had asked officers to replace their badges whenever he saw one missing.

At 18th and M Streets a reporter saw a demonstrator shout an obscenity at an approaching policeman who wore no badge. The officer clubbed the youth across the back and arrested him.

Demonstrators, riot-helmeted CDU officers and well-dressed parade watchers on their way home all converged on Connecticut Avenue at about the same time, 5 p.m.

A phalanx of officers stood in front of one group of youths at Connecticut and Rhode Island Avenues as parade watchers, coming from the opposite direction, filtered through unimpeded.

Tourists and demonstrators stared at each other. Police began to unscramble a monumental traffic jam as the last groups of demonstrators began to break up around 22nd Street and New Hampshire Avenue.

About 50 youths marched to the quadrangle at George Washington University. As a park policeman and a National Guard sergeant approached them, one of the youths shouted that they were on "private property." The two walked away.

DISCLAIMER CONNECTION

Although David Dellinger and other officials of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam disclaimed any connection with or responsibility for the group causing the disorders, Carl Rogers, a member of the Vietnam Veterans for Peace, charged that Dellinger and the others knew what would happen.

"I told Dellinger this would happen and that he would have to appeal to the kids. But he said that would be abdication of his responsibility. What happened is certainly not what the majority wanted," said Rogers.

Rogers and other leaders said that early Monday morning, members of the SDS and other more militant groups attempted to take over the Mobilization's offices of 1029 Vermont Avenue NW. Police were called and the SDS left without further incidents, they said.

MEMORIAL TO GEORGE V. DIPALAZZO

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, with a deep personal grief, I inform my colleagues of

the death of George V. DiPalazzo of Pittsfield, Mass. I do so not only to note the loss of a very dear friend, but also to pay tribute to an outstanding labor leader and dedicated public servant.

No words could better express my affection and regard for George than those I spoke at a testimonial in his honor, held only 2 months before his untimely passing.

At this time, therefore, I would like to insert those remarks in the RECORD, along with an obituary from the Berkshire Eagle, of January 20, 1969, and an editorial from the same newspaper, which appeared on January 21, 1969:

REMARKS OF HON. SILVIO O. CONTE, AT THE GEORGE DIPALAZZO TESTIMONIAL, NOVEMBER 18, 1968, PITTSFIELD, MASS.

It is a double pleasure for me to be here tonight as we honor an outstanding citizen. It is a pleasure, first, because the guest of honor at this testimonial dinner is an old and good friend of mine; and, second, because looking back on George DiPalazzo's distinguished career recalls enjoyable memories of my own.

You know, my career and George's have many things in common. The threads of our lives have crossed often over the years.

George and I were born in the same year—but on different sides of the Atlantic. Although both our families lived in Pittsfield, George's folks were on vacation in the old country at the time—and that was probably the longest vacation George ever had. He didn't come to America until he was five years old.

I still remember George from our Pittsfield Vocational High School days. I can remember the difficulties which faced graduates then—and how lucky both of us felt to land jobs at the Pittsfield GE. George became an apprentice tool-maker; I worked as a machinist.

When the war came, George took to the air with the Army Air Corps; I drove a bulldozer for the Seabees. And when peace returned, we each settled down to a career. In different forms, both his career and mine turned out to involve a lot of running—for one elective office or another—and a lot of good old-fashioned politicking.

In '47 George won his first office—that of shop steward in Local 255—the first step of what was to become a highly successful career as a union leader. He later became chief steward, and in 1964, he claimed the only full-time post of the local union, that of business agent.

The confidence which his fellow workers feel in him is reflected every time they go to the polls. In election after election, George has scored high. As one who knows a little about politics myself, I can tell you that George DiPalazzo's wide base of support, his organization, and most important, his record of achievement and service—are enough to make any professional politician envious.

I think I know the key to George's success. He revealed it just a couple of months ago, when he spoke at the dedication of the local's new headquarters building. Recalling the contrast between the comfortable new quarters and the union's first home, George said this: "I hope we never forget our early orange crate days, because a good local union needs dedicated members and officers more than it needs an expensive building."

When he said that, George put his finger on what makes any group strong—whether it be a union, a company, a government, or an entire society. The answer is people—and the successful man in any endeavor is the one who never forgets the human side of life's problems and promises. How especially important this is in an age of machines—and you here in Pittsfield know plenty about machines, especially GE ones! George may

have spent his life around machines, but he's never forgotten about the men who operate them. George's concern with the human side is a tribute to his sense of values.

George has been much, much more than an elected official. He has been a concerned and compassionate friend to all of us and to the organization for which he has given so much: his union. George is a union man in the highest and truest sense of that term.

He is completely dedicated to the principles of the labor movement—and if you don't want to take my word for it, go over to the library, and ask how many books on labor and unionism have at one time or another been checked out to George V. DiPalazzo.

Yes, George has always done his homework—and that's why the easy-going, friendly guy you know turns into a tiger at the grievance board or bargaining table. He has led his local through many a scrape. Never afraid to take up the . . . when occasion demands, he is never reluctant to cast them aside when goodwill and good faith prevail.

George is truly a man for all seasons. I have no doubt that George DiPalazzo could have chosen to apply his talents to any number of fields. Had he cared more about his own fortunes and less about ours, he might be a wealthier man right now.

Had he cared more about advancing his own reputation and less about the union's he might be more widely known around this country. But that sense of values I spoke about earlier—the sense of values which George developed back in the days of the orange crates—has never deserted him.

He has remained a man to whom the human aspect of things has always been foremost. I think, therefore, that he will appreciate and agree with this sentiment which another fine American expressed once. Listen to these words: "I have no other ambition so great as that of being truly esteemed by my fellow men, by rendering myself worthy of their esteem."

George, I suspect that your greatest ambition has been the same as Abraham Lincoln's was in 1832—to win the esteem of your fellow men.

This dinner tonight is the outward expression and proof that your greatest ambition has been completely fulfilled.

In closing, let me say this: as a longtime friend and admirer of George DiPalazzo and a one-time member of Local 255, I would be more than a bit disturbed if I thought that George were going to leave the labor movement completely. I'm confident, however, that his great talents will always be available.

It is no secret that the union wants and needs men of George's caliber and experience, not only on the local level but on regional and national levels, too.

George, I think I can speak for all of us when I say that we haven't forgotten the days of the orange crates either. None of us has forgotten or will forget the enormous contribution you have made to your fellow workers, your community, and your land.

[From the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle, Jan. 20, 1969]

GEORGE DIPALAZZO DIES—UNION, COMMUNITY LEADER

George V. DiPalazzo of 5 Arch St., business agent of IUE Local 255, the union for production and maintenance workers at General Electric Co. plants in Pittsfield, died yesterday at his home after a five-month illness. He was 47.

As business agent of the 5,000-member union, Mr. DiPalazzo headed one of the largest locals in the GE chain and the largest local union in Western Massachusetts.

He was Pittsfield's most respected labor leader and one of organized labor's most active civic workers. Civic, labor and industry officials today lauded his efforts for his union and community.

MANY TRIBUTES

Albert F. Litano, president of Local 255, issued the following statement: "Local 255 has lost one of the most militant and dedicated officers in its history. He will be missed by all of our members. May I, on behalf of the members of Local 255, extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and children."

Mayor Donald G. Butler: "Pittsfield has lost its most respected citizen . . . Few men in our city's history have been so generous with their time, knowledge and devotion in their effort to make Pittsfield a better place in which to live. The mere fact that George was associated with a particular undertaking usually spelled success for the project. In spite of the tremendous respect in which he was held, he was most humble to the very end. The legacy which he has left to our city will probably never be matched, because men such as George just don't exist any more. Although his life was cut off in the midst of its usefulness, the remembrance of his virtues shall last until time shall be no more."

Richard L. Reinhardt, manager of relations and utilities for GE: "The death of George DiPalazzo is a loss to his family, to the union movement he served, to our community, and to his many friends here at GE and elsewhere. He was hardworking, honest and sincere. His approach was businesslike and thoughtful no matter what the cause. He will be missed by this community and by those of us who knew and respected him."

Arthur G. Melikan, GE union relations manager: "In every respect he was a man of high integrity and high purpose. He was a dedicated union leader and a true representative of the union membership. In my many years of association with him, I have always found him sincere and fair. We will miss him."

W. Rankin Furey, president, Urban Coalition: "I was shocked by George's death. I had hoped against hope for his recovery. As vice president of the Urban Coalition, we have missed him sorely in recent weeks. His loss will be serious, almost irreplaceable. For as a union leader, he was forward thinking and very sympathetic with all the problems of poverty and the underprivileged and racial and ethnic minority groups."

During the 13 years he had been a major officer of Local 255, Mr. DiPalazzo became one of the most important members of the IUE's contract negotiating committee with GE.

He announced last June that he would not seek re-election in the union's biennial election next spring. Although he did not announce his plans at that time, it was generally expected that he would stay in the union movement, probably with the IUE's GE Conference Board in New York.

Mr. DiPalazzo was born in Italy and came here at the age of 5. He graduated from Pittsfield High School in 1938, returned to take the vocational machine-shop course for two years, and joined GE in 1940 as an apprentice toolmaker. During World War II, he served in the Army Air Corps.

He joined Local 255 when he started with GE, was elected a shop steward in 1947 and held office in the local since then. In 1955 he was elected chief shop steward, the third ranking office in the local, and held that position until 1964 when he won the office of business agent, filling the vacancy created by the death of Arthur J. LaBlue.

In recent years, Mr. DiPalazzo had become one of the civic leaders of the community, serving as a trustee of Berkshire Community College and only last year being elected a vice president of the Pittsfield Urban Coalition.

WORKED FOR THE POOR

He had strong feelings about organized labor's social responsibilities to the community, especially to the poor, and made several unsuccessful attempts last year to have Local 255 participate more fully in the

antipoverty program by donating use of its Woodlawn Avenue headquarters for one year to a neighborhood antipoverty agency.

In what was to be his final speech as a union leader, he formally dedicated the new IUE Local 255 hall on Tyler Street by renewing his call for union members and the union organization to work for the poor.

He urged the members to notice the "persistence of poverty in our land of plenty." And, sharing the blame for not being able to involve Local 255 more actively in the war against poverty, Mr. DiPalazzo said: "Unfortunately, we have not been able to convince many of our members to agree that we should use more of our financial and manpower resources to help out in these problems. If our leadership has failed, then we must redouble our efforts to communicate these ideas and programs."

His last public talk was Nov. 17 when an overflow crowd of more than 500 jammed the Itam Lodge for a testimonial dinner.

Under Mr. DiPalazzo's direction, Local 255 in 1966 developed a strong program of communications to its members during national contract negotiations with GE. Mr. DiPalazzo, who was a member of the national negotiations committee, contacted his office daily during the New York negotiations and dictated information for a daily bulletin.

ACTIVE IN CHURCH

In addition to his union and civic activities, Mr. DiPalazzo was one of the most active laymen in the affairs of his church, All Souls' Chapel in Lakewood. He was a former chairman of the Catholic Charities Drive in the church and belonged to the Holy Name Society.

He had been a director of Hillcrest Hospital, a member of the Berkshire Community College Advisory Board, a member of the Panel for Environmental Studies at Williams College and the Berkshire Mental Health Association, and a director of United Community Services.

Mr. DiPalazzo is survived by his wife, the former Anne Tosetti; two sons, James A., 17, and John G., 7; and a brother, Robert A. of Pittsfield.

Friends may call at the Encivegnia Funeral Home tonight from 7 to 9 and tomorrow from 2 to 4 and 7 to 9. The funeral will be Wednesday at 9 a.m. at All Souls' Chapel. The family has requested that in lieu of flowers, donations be made to All Souls' Chapel.

[From the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle,
Jan. 21, 1969]

GEORGE V. DIPALAZZO

As should have been clear from yesterday's tributes by union spokesmen, GE executives and civic leaders, George V. DiPalazzo was a very special labor leader indeed.

He was a highly respected business agent of IUE Local 255, the largest local union in Western Massachusetts. A conscientious worker, he knew union affairs through and through. When he attended a meeting, he came armed with facts. When he spoke, quietly but firmly, people listened.

This was not just because he told members what they wanted to hear. George DiPalazzo had high hopes for what the labor movement could achieve. When members failed to live up to those high hopes, he said so.

He carried the same concern into civic affairs. In many cities it is common practice to put a labor representative on civic agencies to round them out and convey the impression, at least, of spokesmen from all walks of life. But anyone who appointed George DiPalazzo got a working representative, not a figurehead. When he agreed to serve on a committee, he accepted the responsibilities that went with the appointment.

With a man of such sensitivity, it perhaps was natural that there should be disappointments. He suffered one such last year when

he failed to persuade Local 255 members to approve his recommendation that the union's old headquarters on Woodlawn Avenue be given over to HOPE, the anti-poverty agency for the Morningside section. Characteristically, he shouldered the blame for what he considered the union's reluctance to fight for help for the poor and justice for the oppressed.

For as a student of organized labor, he took the long view. He understood how unionism had grown from its weak, fragmented beginnings into the powerful economic and political force of today; and he was worried by signs of complacency, reaction and racial discrimination within the movement.

Last September at the dedication of Local 255's new headquarters, he referred to the local's first headquarters above the Palace Theatre, where orange crates served as chairs.

"I hope we never forget our early orange crate days," he said, "because a good local union needs dedicated members and officers more than it needs an expensive building."

George DiPalazzo knew what a union needs, and he knew that too dedicated and enlightened labor leaders are very rare. Today, sadly for all of us, there is one less.

JEFFERSON-WHITEHALL UNIT LEGISLATION

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation providing for construction of the Jefferson-Whitehall unit in western Montana. Because of the growing need for an adequate water supply for future Americans, I want to take this opportunity to share a few thoughts about the problems we face in the area of water conservation and the ways in which this project will help to alleviate our situation.

As I look upon the ravaged wastelands of this Nation, its polluted water streams, and the millions of acres that might be brought under cultivation, I am reminded of an early 19th century poet's lines concerning an ancient king whose crumbling statue and shattered visage looked out on nothing. For Shelly truly captured the spirit of that king's barren arrogance when he wrote:

Nothing beside remains. Round the decay
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare
The long and level sands stretch far away.

His dreams, if he had any, came to nothing. How different from the inspiring features of our great leaders carved in the granite of Mount Rushmore in South Dakota. These likenesses of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Teddy Roosevelt can only serve to remind us of their leadership and their compassion for their contemporaries and for all future generations.

Their dreams left us a blueprint for action. Not only did they expand the boundaries of America, they were also responsible for programs of conservation and reclamation that have resulted in the harnessing of our streams and the conversion of millions of acres of wilderness and arid land to fertile plains. Their example should give us strength as we face three major crises in our country today—population, food, and water. And water is the determining factor, for with-

out this commodity, all else will wither and die.

I need not remind this body that a world population of 1 billion has tripled since the beginning of this century; that by the year 2000 another 3 billion will be added to the population now on earth.

In America, our current population of 190 million people will have expanded to 245 million by 1980 and will be approaching 400 million by the year 2000.

In the West, our population will grow from its present 45 million to more than 110 million by the beginning of the next century.

We can expect our food requirements to double, and our demand for water to triple before the turn of the century.

The President's Science Advisory Committee report on "The World Food Problem" reflects the challenge of these crises, when it stated in its report:

The scale, severity, and duration of the world food problem are so great that a massive, long-range, innovative effort unprecedented in human history will be required to master it.

And to quote from Senator Moss' recent book, "The Water Crisis":

Major Powell's dictum—that land use is limited by water availability—applies to the modern West as much as to the one he explored. Irrigation may give way proportionately to industry use of water, but population growth alone requires large additional supplies. For recreation, for agriculture, for industry, or just for personal use, water remains the key to a West of full value to the Nation.

I agree with his further observation that this Nation cannot permit its narrow margin of reserve in water supplies; that water management of the future must put people beyond nature's caprice.

Today we must think boldly and undertake projects to guarantee future generations an adequate water supply. Montanans and other westerners can see at first hand the fish and wildlife contributions made by a reclamation project in Washington's Columbia Basin development. Here water from the Columbia River has developed not only a rich irrigated area of a half million acres, but, in addition, it has developed scores of fishing and hunting areas where virtually no such facilities existed before. These areas contributed 1.7 million days of visitor use by sportsmen during 1966, and added 25 percent to the fish and wildlife harvest of the State.

Also in Washington, they can see the plans for the recently authorized Touchet division of the Bureau of Reclamation's Walla Walla project. Here water storage has been provided for minimum flows in 90 miles of the Touchet and Walla Walla Rivers, which will help restore runs of Coho and Chinook salmon which have been virtually extinct in these streams. These and other fishery benefits constitute 51 percent of the potential contributions of the project.

The great West alternately faces periods of severe flooding and severe drought. Floods inundate vast acres of land; leaving havoc and destruction in their wake. Periods of extreme drought parch the land and impair both agriculture and tourism, two of the West's principal industries.

But even between these two extremes, the West remains today largely a semi-arid region, dependent on an uncertain nature. Thus, westerners who are gulding the growth of their area are determined that water, their most valuable resource, shall be conserved and utilized not only for human consumption, but also for adding value to wasteland by irrigation.

In our efforts to keep pace with the water demands of our great West, we have, since the Reclamation Act of 1902, maintained an effective partnership between State and Federal Governments. This has resulted in the building of dams, reservoirs, and distribution facilities over the past 50 or 60 years. It has also involved the planning of badly needed current facilities.

One project that has been under study for the past four decades by both the State of Montana and the Bureau of Reclamation is the Jefferson-Whitehall unit. In southwestern Montana the water resources of the upper tributaries of the Missouri are, for the most part, generally confined to eroded channels or steep-walled valleys that are remote from potential areas of use, and frequently rather inaccessible. A complex development plan is necessary to get some of this water out of its channels and transported to areas of actual or potential need and at the same time to retain enough water in the streams to sustain fish and wildlife.

Most of the streams involved are valuable for fishing, but Montanans prefer to use their beautiful streams for both fishing and water supply. Now that the studies have been completed, the Bureau of Reclamation has tentatively proposed a plan of development that will provide flood control protection, bolster the economy of a population-declining three-county area, and at the same time, provide improved fishing and wildlife opportunities for residents and visitors.

Now just what does the Jefferson-Whitehall unit propose to do for southwestern Montana?

First of all, it would create storage facilities for spring flood runoffs which, uncontrolled, can erode stream channels, make flowing streams turbid and roily, and cause damage to homes, roads, and agricultural lands. This project would bring flood control benefits estimated at \$360,000 annually.

After the excess flows are stored, the water will be made available for multiple beneficial uses in a large area of western Montana. These potential uses include the irrigation of cropland, fish and wildlife enhancement, and public recreation. This pattern of converting a wasted resource to beneficial use has been applied in the arid and semiarid West for the past century, making large expanses of desertland green and living, creating economic prosperity in the irrigated cases and making increased fishing and water-oriented recreation possible for many thousands of residents and visitors every year.

The irrigation water from this proposed Montana project would be delivered to some 64,000 acres of fertile land in Madison, Jefferson, Silver Bow,

Broadwater, and Lewis and Clark Counties, generally adjacent to the Big Hole, Jefferson, and Missouri Rivers and Canyon Ferry Lake. Nearly a third of this acreage is presently irrigated with an inadequate supply of water from tributaries of the Jefferson and Missouri Rivers. The rest is largely dry-farmed wheatlands, where seasonal and cyclical vagaries of the weather make farming uncertain and economically hazardous. Hence, the production of nearly a half million acres of surplus wheat will be replaced by feed grains, beets, potatoes, and livestock production.

Between 1950 and 1960, the total population of Broadwater, Jefferson, and Madison Counties decreased by approximately 5 percent, while the rural farm population in these counties declined by 37 percent. We can ill afford this loss.

Besides stabilizing and diversifying the farm production of this declining area, the Jefferson-Whitehall project would provide new economic opportunities in project area communities, both during the 10-year construction period and afterward. New farming opportunities would be created for about 135 farm families and about 80 farm laborers. Jobs in service and trade establishments would be created for about 200 persons, making a total population increase of about 1,200 people in the five-county area. This extra population and business activity would generate nearly \$3 million annually in increased spendable income, and produce about \$675,000 annually in Federal, State, and local tax revenue.

These project purposes would be achieved by the constructing of the proposed Reichle Dam and Reservoir on the Big Hole River; the offstream Milligan Dam and Reservoir, two diversion dams, the Jefferson and Townsend canals, more than 400 miles of supply and lateral canals, and necessary drainage works. Reichle Dam and Reservoir would be the principal storage and regulatory facility, with a storage capacity of 530,700 acre-feet of water. In addition to valuable flood control benefits, this reservoir would yield annually some 350,000 acre-feet of water—13.3 billion gallons—for irrigation, as well as recreation, and fish and wildlife sanctuaries.

Access roads, sanitation, parking, picnicking, camping, and boat launching facilities at Reichle and Milligan Reservoirs will be built at an investment cost of approximately \$1 million, according to a National Park Service plan. Reichle Reservoir alone would provide about 10 square miles of boating, water skiing, and lake fishing, and 32 miles of shoreline.

I have urged the construction of the Jefferson-Whitehall project because it not only benefits the State of Montana but, more important, it is a link in the chain of many conservation projects that must be undertaken if the West is going to prove a suitable place for the masses in the next few years.

Where will 100 million additional people live? Should we not provide a suitable countryside for them, if they prefer the rural areas? Or are we going to repeat the mistake of forcing our masses into overcrowded cities? I believe our people should have a right of choice, and

knowing westerners, it is not difficult for me to foresee their decisions to inhibit the more wide-open areas.

This Nation was founded on the inalienable right of our citizens to life and those common pursuits necessary to sustain life. This will call for millions of additional fruitful acres, for only in such manner can we provide abundant communities for future generations. The time has arrived for action.

We honor the wisdom of our great forebearers when we extend the work they inspired. Let us get on with the grand design before it is too late. Knowing what lies ahead, we should make no little plans.

AKRON, OHIO: PROPOSITION 14
REVISITED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court has again shown its distrust of the people by denying them the right to govern themselves. By an 8-to-1 decision, the Court struck down a municipal charter amendment which prohibited the Akron city fathers from enacting an open housing statute unless it was first approved by a majority of the voters. The amendment further provided that a majority of the voters could in an election change the law.

Certainly the Akron charter amendment did not sound like some sinister plot to deny human dignity. To the contrary, it sounded more like an expression of self-determination by a self-governing people.

This same Court has often rendered opinions, talking of our citizens' having a guaranteed right to vote; but in their opinion they have again held that the voting right exists only if the people vote in such a manner as to please the unelected Federal judges. If, on the other hand, the people do not vote in accordance with the judges' social philosophy, their votes are to be merely thrown out as unconstitutional under some theory of bias or prejudice. In the final essence, only the judges' votes count—and their votes count more and are not equal to the peoples'. This can but be California's "Proposition 14" revisited.

Where under any theory of law or reason can the U.S. Supreme Court derive authority to deny American citizens the right to vote?

Some advocate home rule for the District of Columbia so its citizens can govern themselves by majority vote. Would home rule for the District give them an equal opportunity for self-government as is enjoyed by the citizens of Akron, Ohio—minority rule by nine unelected Judges?

Some shriek "constitutional crisis," and would demand hasty action to abolish the electoral college on a theory that they would be giving the people a popular vote for the Presidency. If there is a crisis today, it is not with the constitu-

tion, but with the Federal courts—judges who refuse to limit their powers and subdue their personal feelings.

Certainly even Federal judges can be as unfaithful to their oath as an unfaithful elector.

Mr. Speaker, there will be many versions and interpretations of the Akron housing opinion. I include a complete text of the Supreme Court opinion following my remarks:

[No. 63.—October Term, 1968]

NELLIE HUNTER, APPELLANT, v. EDWARD O. ERICKSON, MAYOR OF CITY OF AKRON, ET AL.

(On appeal from the Supreme Court of Ohio, January 20, 1969.)

Mr. Justice WHITE delivered the opinion of the Court.

The question in this case is whether the City of Akron, Ohio, has denied its Negro citizen Nellie Hunter the equal protection of its laws by amending the city charter to prevent the city council from implementing any ordinance dealing with racial, religious, or ancestral discrimination in housing without the approval of the majority of the voters of Akron.

The Akron City Council in 1964 enacted a fair housing ordinance premised on a recognition of the social and economic losses to society which flow from substandard, ghetto housing and its tendency to breed discrimination and segregation contrary to the policy of the city to "assure equal opportunity to all persons to live in decent housing facilities regardless of race, color, religion, ancestry or national origin." Akron Ordinance No. 873-1964 § 1. A Commission on Equal Opportunity in Housing was established by the ordinance in the office of the Mayor to enforce the antidiscrimination sections of the ordinance through conciliation or persuasion if possible, but if not then "through such order as the facts warrant," based upon a hearing at which witnesses may be subpoenaed, and entitled to enforcement in the courts. Akron Ordinance No. 873-1964, as amended by Akron Ordinance No. 926-1964.

Seeking to invoke this machinery which had been established by the city for her benefit, Nellie Hunter addressed a complaint to the Commission asserting that a real estate agent had come to show her a list of houses for sale, but that on meeting Miss Hunter the agent "stated that she could not show me any of the houses on the list she had prepared for me because all of the owners had specified they did not wish their houses shown to Negroes." Miss Hunter's affidavit met with the reply that the fair housing ordinance was unavailable to her because the city charter had been amended to provide:

"Any ordinance enacted by the Council of the City of Akron which regulates the use, sale, advertisements, transfer, listing assignment, lease, sublease or financing of real property of any kind or of any interest therein on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry must first be approved by a majority of the electors voting on the question at a regular or general election before said ordinance shall be effective. Any such ordinance in effect at the time of the adoption of this section shall cease to be effective until approved by the electors as provided herein." Akron City Charter § 137.

The proposal for the charter amendment had been placed on the ballot at a general election upon petition of more than 10% of Akron's voters, and the amendment had been duly passed by a majority.

Petitioner then brought an action in the Ohio courts on behalf of the municipality, herself, and all others similarly situated, to obtain a writ of mandamus requiring the Mayor to convene the Commission and to require the Commission and the Director of Law to enforce the fair housing ordinance and process her complaint. The trial court

initially held the enforcement provisions of the fair housing ordinance invalid under state law, but the Supreme Court of Ohio reversed. *State ex rel. Hunter v. Erickson*, 6 Ohio St. 2d 130, 216 N. E. 2d 371 (1968). On remand, the trial court held that the fair housing ordinance was rendered ineffective by the charter amendment, and the Supreme Court of Ohio affirmed, holding that the charter amendment was not repugnant to the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution.

Akron contends that this case has been rendered moot by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, Pub. L. 90-284, 82 Stat. 78, the decision of this Court in *Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co.*, 392 U.S. 409 (1968), and the passage of an Ohio Act of October 30, 1965, Ohio Rev. Code, Tit. 41, c. 4112. It is true that each of these events is related to open housing, but none of the legislation involved was intended to pre-empt local housing ordinances or provide rights and remedies which are effective substitutes for the Akron law.

The 1968 Civil Rights Act specifically preserves and defers to local fair housing laws,¹ and the 1868 Civil Rights Act² considered in *Jones* should be read together with the later statute on the same subject, *United States v. Stewart*, 311 U.S. 60, 64-65 (1940); *Talbot v. Seeman*, 1 Cranch 1, 34-35 (1801), so as not to pre-empt the local legislation which the far more detailed Act of 1968 so explicitly preserves. If the Ohio statute mooted the case, surely the Ohio Supreme Court would have so held when the validity of the Akron ordinance was twice before it after the Ohio statute was passed. Moreover, the sections of the Ohio law which are crucial here apply only to "commercial housing," and on any reading we can imagine do not apply to Miss Hunter's case,³ though the Akron ordinance does. Finally, the case cannot be considered moot since the Akron ordinance provides an enforcement mechanism unmatched by either state or federal legislation. Unlike state or federal programs, the Akron ordinance brings local people together for conciliation and persuasion by and before a local tribunal. It is to precisely this sort of very localized solution to which Congress meant to defer. We therefore reject the contention that this case is moot.

Akron argues that this case is unlike *Reitman v. Mulkey*, 387 U.S. 369 (1967) in that here the city charter declares no right to discriminate in housing, authorizes and encourages no housing discrimination, and places no ban on the enactment of fair housing ordinances. But we need not rest on *Reitman* to decide this case. Here, unlike *Reitman*, there was an explicit racial classification treating racial housing matters differently from other racial and housing matters.

By adding § 137 to its Charter the City of Akron, which unquestionably wields state power,⁴ not only suspended the operation of the existing ordinance forbidding housing discrimination, but required the approval of the electors before any future ordinance could take effect.⁵ Section 137 thus drew a distinction between those groups seeking the law's protection against racial, religious, or ancestral discriminations in the sale and rental of real estate and those who sought to regulate real property transactions in the pursuit of other ends. Those who sought, or would benefit from, most ordinances regulating the real property market remained subject to the general rule: the ordinance would become effective 30 days after passage by the City Council, or immediately if passed as an emergency measure, and would be subject to referendum only if 10% of the electors so requested by filing a proper and timely petition.⁶ Passage by the Council sufficed unless the electors themselves invoked the general referendum provisions of the City

Charter. But for those who sought protection against racial bias, the approval of the City Council was not enough. A referendum was required by charter at a general or regular election, without any provision for use of the expedited special election ordinarily available. The Akron Charter obviously made it substantially more difficult to secure enactment of ordinances subject to § 137.

Only laws to end housing discrimination based on "race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry" must run § 137's gauntlet. It is true that the section draws no distinctions among racial and religious groups, Negroes and whites, Jews and Catholics are all subject to the same requirements if there is housing discrimination against them which they wish to end. But § 137 nevertheless disadvantages those who would benefit from laws barring racial, religious, or ancestral discriminations as against those who would bar other discriminations or who would otherwise regulate the real estate market in their favor. The automatic referendum system does not reach housing discrimination on sexual or political grounds, or against those with children or dogs, nor does it affect tenants seeking more heat or better maintenance from landlords, nor those seeking rent control, urban renewal, public housing, or new building codes.

Moreover, although the law on its face treats Negro and white, Jew and gentile in an identical manner, the reality is that the law's impact falls on the minority. The majority needs no protection against discrimination and if it did, a referendum might be bothersome but no more than that. Like the law requiring specification of candidates' race on the ballot, *Anderson v. Martin*, 375 U.S. 399 (1964), § 137 places special burdens on racial minorities within the governmental process. This is no more permissible than denying them the vote, on an equal basis with others. Cf. *Gomillion v. Lightfoot*, 364 U.S. 339 (1960); *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964); *Avery v. Midland County*, 390 U.S. 474 (1968). The preamble to the open housing ordinance which was suspended by § 137 recited that the population of Akron consists of "people of different race, color, religion, ancestry or national origin, many of whom live in circumscribed and segregated areas, under sub-standard, unhealthy, unsafe, unsanitary and overcrowded conditions, because of discrimination in the sale, lease, rental and financing of housing." Such was the situation in Akron. It is against this background that the referendum required by § 137 must be assessed.

Because the core of the Fourteenth Amendment is the prevention of meaningful and unjustified official distinctions based on race, *Slaughter-House Cases*, 16 Wall. 36, 71 (1873); *Strauder v. West Virginia*, 100 U.S. 303, 307-308 (1880); *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339, 344-345 (1880); *McLaughlin v. Florida*, 379 U.S. 184, 192 (1964); *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 10 (1968), racial classifications are "constitutionally suspect," *Boiling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 499 (1954), subject to the "most rigid scrutiny," *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214, 216 (1944). They "bear a far heavier burden of justification" than other classifications, *McLaughlin v. Florida*, 379 U.S. 184, 194 (1964).

We are unimpressed with any of the State's justifications for its discrimination. Characterizing it simply as a public decision to move slowly in the desegregation area of race relations emphasizes the impact and burden of § 137, but does not justify it. The amendment was unnecessary either to implement a decision to go slowly or to allow the people of Akron to participate in that decision.⁷ Likewise, insisting that a State may distribute legislative power as it desires and that the people may retain for themselves the power over certain subjects may generally be true, but these principles furnish no justification for a legislative structure which

Footnotes at end of speech.

otherwise would violate the Fourteenth Amendment. Nor does the implementation of this change through popular referendum immunize it. *Lucas v. Colorado General Assembly*, 377 U.S. 713, 736-737 (1964). The sovereignty of the people is itself subject to those constitutional limitations which have been duly adopted and remain unrepudiated. Even though Akron might have proceeded by majority vote at town meeting on all its municipal legislation, it has instead chosen a more complex system. Having done so, the State may no more disadvantage any particular group by making it more difficult to enact legislation in its behalf than it may dilute any person's vote or give any group a smaller representation than another of comparable size. Cf. *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964); *Avery v. Midland County*, 390 U.S. 474 (1968).

We hold that § 137 discriminates against minorities and constitutes a real, substantial, and invidious denial of the equal protection of the laws.

Reversed.

MR. JUSTICE HARLAN, whom MR. JUSTICE STEWART joins, concurring.

At the outset, I think it well to sketch my constitutional approach to state statutes which structure the internal governmental process and which are challenged under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. For Equal Protection purposes, I believe that laws which define the powers of political institutions fall into two classes. First, a statute may have the clear purpose of making it more difficult for racial and religious minorities to further their political aims. Like any other statute which is discriminatory on its face, such a law cannot be permitted to stand unless it can be supported by state interests of the most weighty and substantial kind. *McLaughlin v. Florida*, 379 U.S. 184, 192 (1964).

Most laws which define the structure of political institutions, however, fall into a second class. They are designed with the aim of providing a just framework within which the diverse political groups in our society may fairly compete and are not enacted with the purpose of assisting one particular group in its struggle with its political opponents. Consider, for example, Akron's procedure which requires that almost any ordinance be submitted to a general referendum if 10% of the electorate signs an appropriate petition. This rule obviously does not have the purpose of protecting one particular group to the detriment of all others. It will sometimes operate in favor of one faction; sometimes in favor of another. Akron has adopted the referendum system because its citizens believe that whenever an action of the City Council raises the emotional opposition of any significant group in the community, the people should have a right to decide the matter directly. Statutes of this type, which are grounded upon general democratic principle, do not violate the Equal Protection Clause simply because they occasionally operate to disadvantage Negro political interests. If a governmental institution is to be fair, one group cannot always be expected to win. If the Council's Fair Housing legislation was defeated at a referendum, Negroes would undoubtedly lose an important political battle, but they would not thereby be denied Equal Protection.

This same analysis applies to other institutions of government which are even more solidly rooted in our history than is the referendum. The existence of a bicameral legislature or an executive veto may on occasion make it more difficult for minorities to achieve favorable legislation; nevertheless, they may not be attacked on Equal Protection grounds since they are founded on neutral principles. Similarly, the rule which makes it relatively difficult to amend a state constitution is commonly justified on the theory that constitutional provisions should

be more thoroughly scrutinized and more soberly considered than are simple statutory enactments. Here, too, Negroes may stand to gain by the rule if a Fair Housing law is made part of the constitution, or they may lose if the constitution adopts a position of strict neutrality on the question. See *Reitman v. Mulkey*, 387 U.S. 369, 389 (1967) (Dissenting opinion of HARLAN, J.). But even if Negroes are obliged to undertake the arduous task of amending the state constitution, they are not thereby denied Equal Protection. For the rule making constitutional amendment difficult is grounded in neutral principle.

In the case before us, however, the city of Akron has not attempted to allocate governmental power on the basis of any general principle. Here, we have a provision that has the clear purpose of making it more difficult for certain racial and religious minorities to achieve legislation that is in their interest. Since the Charter Amendment is discriminatory on its face, Akron must "bear a far heavier burden of justification" than is required in the normal case. *McLaughlin v. Florida*, 379 U.S. 184, 194 (1964). And Akron has failed to sustain this burden. The City's principal argument in support of the Charter Amendment relies on the undisputed fact that Fair Housing legislation may often be expected to raise the passions of the community to their highest pitch. It was not necessary, however, to pass this amendment in order to assure that particularly sensitive issues will ultimately be decided by the general electorate. Akron has already provided a procedure which is grounded in neutral principle, that requires a general referendum on this issue if 10% of the voters insist. If the prospect of Fair Housing legislation really arouses passionate opposition, the voters will have the final say. Consequently, the Charter Amendment will have its real impact only when fair housing does not arouse extraordinary controversy. This being the case, I can perceive no legitimate state interest which in any degree vindicates the action taken by the City here.

As I read the Court's opinion to be entirely consistent with the basic principles which I believe control this case, I join in it.

MR. JUSTICE BLACK, dissenting.

Section 10, Art. I, of the Constitution provides, among other things, that "No State shall . . . pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts . . ." But there is no constitutional provision anywhere which bars any State from repealing any law on any subject at any time it pleases. Although the Court denies the fact, I read its opinion as holding that a city that "wields state power" is barred from repealing an existing ordinance that forbids discrimination in the sale, lease, or financing of real property "on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry . . ." The result of what the Court does is precisely as though it had commanded the State by mandamus or injunction to keep on its books and enforce what the Court favors as a fair housing law.

The Court purports to find its power to forbid the city to repeal its laws in the provision of the Fourteenth Amendment forbidding a State to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." For some time, I have been filing my protests against the Court's use of the Due Process Clause to strike down state laws that shock the Court's conscience, offend the Court's sense of what it considers to be "fair" or "fundamental" or "arbitrary" or "contrary to the beliefs of the English-speaking people." I now protest just as vigorously against use of the Equal Protection Clause to bar States from repealing laws that the Court wants the States to retain. Of course the Court under the ruling of *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137 (1803), has power to invalidate state laws that discriminate on account of race. But it does not have power

to put roadblocks to prevent States from repealing these laws. Here, I think the Court needs to control itself, and not, as it is doing, encroach on the States' powers to repeal its old laws when it decides to do so.

Another argument used by the Court supposed to support its holding is that we have in a number of our cases supported the right to vote without discrimination. And we have. But in no one of them have we held that a State is without power to repeal its own laws when convinced by experience that a law is not serving a useful purpose. Moreover, it is the Court's opinion here that casts aspersions upon the right of citizens to vote. I say that for this reason. Akron's repealing law here held unconstitutional, provides that an ordinance in the fair housing field in Akron "must first be approved by a majority of the electors voting on the question at a regular or general election before said ordinance shall be effective." The Court uses this granted right of the people to vote on this important legislation as a key argument for holding that the repealer denies equal protection to Negroes. Just consider that for a moment. In this Government, which we boast is "of the people, for the people and by the people," conditioning the enactment of a law on a majority vote of the people condemns that law as unconstitutional in the eyes of the Court! There may have been other state laws held unconstitutional in the past on grounds that they are equally as fallacious and undemocratic as those the Court relies on today, but if so I do not recall such cases at the moment. It is time, I think, to recall that the Equal Protection Clause does not empower this Court to decide what state ordinances or laws a State may repeal. I would not strike down this repealing ordinance.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Nothing in the federal statute is to be construed "to invalidate or limit any law of a State or political subdivision of a State" giving similar housing rights, and deference is to be given to local enforcement. Civil Rights Act of 1968, Tit. VIII, §§ 815, 810(c), 82 Stat. 73, 89, 86.

² "All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property." C. 31, § 1, 14 Stat. 27, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1982.

³ The Ohio statute makes it unlawful for "any person" to "[r]efuse to sell . . . or otherwise deny or withhold commercial housing from any person because of the race [or] color" of the prospective owner. 41 Ohio Rev. Code §§ 4112.02(H) and 4112.02(H) (1) (1965) (emphasis added). "Commercial housing" is defined to exclude "any personal residence offered for sale or rent by the owner or by his broker, salesman, agent, or employee." 41 Ohio Rev. Code § 4112.01(K) (1965). The statute makes it unlawful to "[p]rint, publish, or circulate any statement or advertisement relating to the sale [of a] . . . personal residence . . . which indicates any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination based upon race. . . ." Since Miss Hunter does not seek commercial housing, or complain of the affront to her sensibilities of hearing a "circulated" statement (if the Ohio statute goes that far) she cannot obtain the relief she seeks under the Ohio statute.

⁴ See, e.g., *Evans v. Newton*, 382 U.S. 296 (1966); *Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority*, 365 U.S. 715 (1961); *Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948).

⁵ Thus we do not hold that mere repeal of an existing ordinance violates the Fourteenth Amendment.

⁶ Ordinances may be initiated through a petition signed by 7% of the voters, and the city charter may be amended or measures enacted by the council repealed through a

referendum which may be obtained on petition of 10% of the voters.

The people of Akron had the power to initiate legislation, or to review council decisions, even before § 137. See n. 6, *supra*. The procedural prerequisites for this popular action are perfectly reasonable, as the gathering of 10% of the voters' signatures in the course of passing § 137 illustrates.

*Section 25 of Akron's City Charter exempts the following ordinances from the referendum procedure:

(a) Annual appropriation ordinances. (b) Ordinances or resolutions providing for the approval or disapproval of appointments or removals made by Council. (c) Actions by Council on the approval of official bonds. (d) Ordinances or resolutions providing for the submission of any proposition to the vote of the electors. (e) Ordinances providing for street improvements petitioned for by owners of a majority of the feet front of the property benefited and to be specially assessed for the cost thereof.

It is not suggested that any of these exceptions were made with the purpose of dis-advantaging Negro political interests.

I'M FOR THE UPPER DOG

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the recent adjournment of the Congress a friend of mine forwarded to me a copy of a speech given by a Rotarian at an annual conference in April of 1968 which I felt I should share with my colleagues in the House. It follows:

I'M FOR THE UPPER DOG

(An address given by Bob Choate, Elyria Rotary Club, at the noon luncheon, April 20, 1968)

I suspect that most of you in this room are not too different from me. You've had ten, twenty, thirty, perhaps 40 years in Rotary. You're a Rotarian because you believe in what the organization stands for, and life has taught you that the Four-Way Test is just good business.

You've been active in Boy Scouts, in the YMCA, in the Chamber of Commerce, in the hospital, in your church. You've manned the kettles at Christmas time for the Salvation Army, and you've worked on the War on Poverty Committee in your community.

You've been, and you are "Joe Good Citizen."

And so have I, but I'm having some second thoughts.

I'm still for the YMCA, the Salvation Army, the Center for Sightless, the March of Dimes, and I shall continue to work for them to the best of my ability—with qualifications.

I am going to have to look at the recipients of my efforts and my money, and say, "Just a minute buddy, what have you done for me today?"

Let me hasten to make myself clear. I do not expect the boy being helped by my Big Brother membership in the YMCA to come now my lawn, or even buy his shirt in my store.

I don't expect the school drop out that I am trying to help through my involvement in the War on Poverty to come around to my shop and offer to sweep the floor or wash the windows.

I'm not looking for the gal whom the Salvation Army saw through her period of motherhood, to show up at our house and offer to do the dishes. Far from it.

What I want is that boy from the YMCA Summer Camp, who got in free so far as he was concerned, and the high school drop out who got a second chance under the War on Poverty program, and the unwed mother whose burden in part was accepted by the Salvation Army, to look around and say, "Thank God for America."

I don't want them to thank me, and I don't want them to do anything for me. I do want them to take a good hard look, and to realize that, underprivileged they may be; unfortunate they may be; abused they may be; none-the-less, no other nation under the face of the sun has tried to rectify wrongs as has this one. No other nation has poured out its heart and soul in the doctrine of the second chance as have we. No other nation has given so much and asked so little in return.

And only one thing makes this possible. You.

You, the upper dog.

You, the privileged.

You, the fortunate.

You who worked 16 hours a day when it was necessary and gambled your life and your earnings that you could be a success.

You, who accepted the burden of the community and on top of every other obligation that was piled on your shoulders, willingly took on one more. You, the upper dog. I'm for you.

I was deeply distraught and still am at the godless, senseless, brutal slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King. I am irrevocably opposed to these men, white or black, who think problems can be solved by threats, by reprisals, by murder, by revenge.

Whether or not I agree with Martin Luther King is of no consequence. He had the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit, not of happiness, but of an inspired goal. The fool who cut him down deserves no mercy from society.

But with all of this goes a corollary. I am fed up to the gills with the publicity given the H. Rap Browns, the Leroy Jones, the Adam Clayton Powells, the draft card burners, the acid heads and all their ilk, be they green, blue, black, white, or just plain yellow.

I am sick of the false aura of grandeur that we have permitted these people to assume through the medium of excess publicity.

I'll be a whole lot more impressed with their civil liberties when I see them being more civil and taking fewer liberties.

Every time one of these public bleeders climbs up on his soap box and berates the United States, our laws, our courts, our enforcement, our economy, he is doing it with my money.

My taxes make it possible for him to exist without visible means of support.

My obedience to the law makes it possible for him to flaunt it.

The willingness of others to serve under arms makes this country safe for him to point with scorn and burn his draft card.

I hold no brief for wrong in high places. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the doctrine of change. I know that growth is one of the inexorable laws of life. Grow or die.

But, I do not subscribe for one moment to the theory that every cockeyed nut, confused in economics, bewildered in politics, and pinked by "pie in the sky" has the right to tear down the government under which we live by whatever means he may see fit.

I don't believe that the man who never met a payroll can tell me how to meet mine. I have a growing suspicion that, in all too many instances, the proverbial under dog is content and happy with his lot. He willingly assumes the title "inferior" as an easy escape from responsibility. He capitalizes on "under dog" to his benefit and your detriment. I'm for the upper dog.

I have no quarrel with the wild-eyed as such. Society needs them. Much of progress is the result of men who cannot stay within

conventional bounds. What in one generation is anarchy, in the next is looked back upon as the first stirrings of advance. Fine. I buy all of that.

What I do not buy is making a hero out of every stumble bum that comes down the pike waving his own particular flag and to hell with everything else.

Some of this "everything else" means a great deal to me. That I can read, or study, or work, as I wish; that I can worship or refuse to; that I can vote for or against without coercion; that I am the beneficiary of generations who found this "everything else" to be worth struggling and dying for. These mean a great deal to me.

So I'm middle class, I'm bourgeois, one of the unenlightened. Fine. Just quit using my money. You make your way on your own and let me do the same. You be for the under dog.

As for me, I'm for the upper dog. As President Upton said, "I'm for the one who sets out to do something and does it."

"I'm for the one who recognizes the problems at hand and endeavors to deal with them."

"I'm for the one who isn't blaming someone else for his failings."

"I'm for the one who doesn't consider it 'square' to wonder what more he can do, instead of how little."

Whether privileged or under privileged, each of us must be judged on what he does with what he has.

This nation was founded in justice, in tolerance, in honesty, in understanding, in faith, in work. We live by law, or we die for lack of it.

I'm for the man who subscribes to this. I'm for the upper dog.

I'm for you.

INEQUITABLE IMMIGRATION SITUATIONS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, I was pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN), in cosponsoring legislation to correct the inequitable immigration situations arising from the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the transition from a quota to a preference system, countries which have traditionally contributed large numbers of immigrants are now experiencing a decline of overwhelming proportions. The country hardest hit by the revision is Ireland, which averaged 7,000 immigrants annually prior to the change. In 1965 and 1966, this rate dropped to nearly 25 percent and the full impact of the act reduced this figure even further.

Under the provisions of the bill, any country whose immigration has dropped below 75 percent of its yearly average during the 10-year base period 1956-65, would be allocated additional spaces sufficient to raise its total to this 75 percent figure. The annual allotment would not exceed 10,000, and countries whose immigration rate increased would not be affected. It is estimated that in about 10 years, the preference system should equalize sufficiently so as not to require this emergency measure.