

Gordon R. Wade, Jr.
James P. Wagner
Larry F. Walters
Lowell A. Walker
Bernie J. Wallace
Robert T. Wallace
Henry L. Watson, Jr.
Carl V. Watts
John R. Watts
Richard D. Webb
Thomas H. Weber
Robert J. Weeks
Sammy N. Weeks
James M. Wheatley
Marvin A. Whitten
Earl K. Wiles
Leroy L. Wilson, Jr.
Donald L. Wise
Peter A. Wood
Samuel J. Wood
James M. Woods
James R. Wyatt, Jr.
Theodore A. Youngblood
Donald L. Zumwalt
Walter H. Agee
Bobby G. Akers
Junior M. Albritton
Valentine P. Amico
Wenceslao U. Aquino
Robert L. Atkinson
James D. Bacon
John C. Bardon
Odis L. Barrett
Bernard R. Barton
Angelo Battista
George B. Bebout
Edward H. Bell
James L. Bell
Raymond L. Bernard
Edward J. Bierdzyski
Robert C. Biedman
Bertha P. Billeb
William J. Billeb
Carl L. Blum
Robert E. Blum
Charles C. Boger
Bridgie E. Bolen
Laurence B. Botts
Kempereth D. Box
Robert N. Boyd
Egbert M. Brady
Herbert R. Bratcher
John E. Brennan
Francis E. Bridges
Charles H. Brittain

Harley A. Butler
William F. Campbell, Jr.
Ferdinando J. Capria
Bert P. Chadd
Frederick W. Chadwick
Normand J. Charest
Joseph G. Chisholm
Robert S. Collins
Charles M. Christensen
Robert S. Collins
Robert M. Conley
Claude R. Cordell, Jr.
Leon R. Coxe
Aaron H. Daniels
Edwin S. Davis
Robert K. Davis
James O. Dease
Donald A. Debarge
Thomas J. Dempsey
Neil S. Deremer
Beauvin J. Deshotel
James P. Diantonin
June R. Duberstein
Raymond R. Ebner
Wesley E. Eckley
George W. Elliott
Stephen D. Ellsworth, Jr.
William T. Estes
Frank H. Falkson
Albert A. Feeley
Donald W. Felty
Andrew C. Ferris
William J. Fitzgibbon
Raymond O. Florence
Daniel E. Folles
Ray Fritz
Leonard E. Gaede
Thomas P. Gend
Jack E. George
Horton A. Glidewell
Raymond F. Golon
Norbert B. Grabowski
William F. Green
Robert A. Green
Leroy R. Greth
William F. Gross
James F. Guenther
Adan Guerra
George R. Hammond
Curt A. Hanke
Joseph B. Harbin
Ivan K. Heinlein

Robert L. Herrington
Francis Hington
John R. Hoagland
Samuel V. Hooten
Robert M. Hooven
Maurice V. Howard
Lee J. Huffman
William M. Humphreys
Wilburn Ivy
Julius M. Jackson
Joseph P. Jerabek
Herman H. John
Dan C. Johnson
George G. Johnson, Jr.
John L. Johnson
John H. Kelley
Mark M. Kenney
Elmer R. Kimbro
Rex B. Kirkbride
Edward A. Koss
Nartin Kusturin
Neil B. Labelle
Donald E. Lambert
William C. Lantz
Albert L. Larson
Gene D. Larson
Robert J. Larson
Richard B. Latondre
Luke E. Littlepage
Warren G. Litzburg
Jackson T. Love
Joseph W. Luckenbach
Arthur T. Manuel, Jr.
Ernest L. Marble
John B. Marks
Charles A. L. Marlow
Travis E. Martin
John H. Martinez
Gary R. Mayfield
William S. McClintan
Leason McCoy
Francis J. McDonald
George N. McIntyre
Joseph A. McIntyre
Patrick J. McTiernan
Samuel S. Michaels, Jr.
Richard W. Miller
Everett E. Millett
Luke B. Mills
Stanley S. Minatogawa
John M. Mitchell
Donald E. Monnot

Lawrence Morgan
William P. Moriarty
Gerald D. Morris
Robert J. Mulligan
Charles L. Mungie
Charles R. Munson
Roy L. Myers, Jr.
Richard J. O'Brien
Robert F. Okamoto
Michael O. O'Loughlin
Robert H. Page
Virginia R. Painter
John P. Pangrace
Peter P. Panos
William J. Parker, Jr.
Gordon V. Farnell
Mary E. Pease
Charles D. Peck
Clement S. Perreault
Thomas B. Perrone
Len E. Pierce
Michael Pietrotforte
Lynn M. Porter
William H. Powers, Jr.
Virgil Rankin
Robert C. Reedy
John E. Robertson
Robert A. Roche
Charles B. Russell
Glen F. Salter
Clifford C. Scheck
Robert T. Seek
John V. Sisson
Theodore F. Skill
Ernest U. Smith
Frank R. Smith
Jesse W. Smith
Lucius T. Smith, Jr.
Frank M. Spady
Amos N. Sparks
Jack G. Spence
John L. Stark
William A. Stokes
Kenneth C. Sullivan
Robert P. Sullivan
Joseph M. Sweeney, Jr.
James D. Taylor, Jr.
J. T. Tenpenny
Ralph H. Thient
Frank L. Thompson, Jr.
William F. Trenary
Gulford D. Tunnell
Conrad B. Turney
Christopher Van Diver, Jr.
Erwin G. Van Sickle

Harry R. Waite
Walter E. Waldie
Charles A. Waller
Henry R. Walsh
Granderson P. Walton, Jr.
John R. Waterbury
Fred L. Weaver
Robert R. Wenkelmer

Charles E. Whitaker
George E. Windsor, Jr.
Robert F. Wolf
Charles W. Woods
Leslie Yancy
Charles M. Yarrington
Wallace E. York
James A. Zahm

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 10), 1969:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Paul W. McCracken, of Michigan, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, Hendrik S. Houthakker, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Herbert Stein, of Maryland, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert F. Froehke, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Barry James Shillito, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Robert C. Seamans, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of the Navy.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

George A. Lincoln, of Michigan, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

James E. Johnson, of California, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring March 1, 1971.

MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE, UNITED NATIONS

Lt. Gen. John W. Carpenter III, ~~XXXXXX~~ (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10, of the United States Code.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Charles T. Booth II, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Paul P. Blackburn, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DRAFT LAWS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, many Members are receiving correspondence from deans of graduate schools and from graduate students throughout our land concerning students being drafted into the military service during the term or during a time when they are engaged in particularly important research.

It seems to me that our present draft laws must be rewritten. I believe that a lottery system should be adopted and that each of our young men should be eligible for the draft during a 1-year period only, after which time he would be permitted to proceed with his educational training or to go into a profession or a trade, except in case of a national emergency. It is a known fact

that only one out of every four eligible men is drafted.

The obligation of every young man to serve his country in time of need is recognized by all loyal American citizens. However, undue interruption of educational careers could result in fewer trained scientists, engineers, and other professional people so necessary to the future development of our country.

Today I received an exceptionally well-written letter from an eminent Kentucky educator which explains the problems of many of our graduate students. I commend it to the Members for their perusal:

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Ky., January 21, 1969.

Congressman TIM LEE CARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARTER: Only a matter of the gravest concern prompts me to write you at a time when I realize how extremely busy you must be with all the problems which the Congress faces. However, the present Selective Service situation and its impact on the production of advanced scholars in

all fields poses a real threat to the survival of our nation in a highly technical age. I realize that a letter from a graduate dean on this matter can be readily interpreted either as expressing a highly parochial interest or the thinking of a fuzzy-minded intellectual, but serious reflection on the matter will indicate that we have here a problem of the utmost importance. None of us in university circles have requested an out and out deferment of graduate students; what we have asked for is some arrangement whereby people could satisfy their military obligations at times when their academic careers would not be destroyed. The present arrangement is doing just that. Hardly a day goes by but that two or three of our graduate students are ordered to report for induction. Regardless of whether a student's research project is within a few months of completion or whether an additional few months would allow him to finish all his work, he can only be postponed until the end of the current term and then he is off to the service. In the highly specialized studies and research involved in graduate education, there is grave doubt that such an interrupted career can be picked up again after an absence of two years.

Three years ago I lectured at Moscow State

University and saw the laboratories and seminar rooms crowded to overflowing with bright, young graduate students in all fields of study. I am sure that the Russians have an arrangement of compulsory military training, but it is synchronized with a student's academic career so that he is not hindered in the pursuit of his graduate studies. The evidence that we have at the present time seems to indicate that Russia is producing three times as many graduate engineers as we are and probably twice as many physicists and chemists. A simple extrapolation over the next ten years will indicate what a desperate situation this nation will face. If the present Selective Service arrangement continues for another five years, a very serious scholarship gap will be inevitable; surely we are ingenious enough to devise a system of universal national service which will prevent this from happening.

I, therefore, respectfully request that in your deliberations you take this serious problem into consideration. It is not a matter of an ivory tower group attempting to set up an intellectual elite. It is rather an honest question of whether we can supply our country with the type of people who are absolutely indispensable if the future is to be what we all hope it will be.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this problem.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. DILLON, Jr.,
Dean of the Graduate School.

INDUSTRIAL GROWTH, EXPORTS INCREASES, WILL STRENGTHEN WEST VIRGINIA ECONOMY AND HOPEFULLY CREATE NEW JOBS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, reports on employment changes in West Virginia during the past 5 years indicate a net gain of 8,500 jobs in manufacturing employment, 7,500 of them in durable goods industries for a 10.3-percent increase. The nondurables increased by 1,000 jobs for a 1.9-percent advance during the same period. At the same time, average weekly earnings for durable goods workers went up 11.8 percent from \$106.27 to \$118.80 and for workers in nondurable goods jobs the trend was upward by 9.7 percent from \$102.06 in 1963 to \$112 in 1967.

Those statistics from an article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of January 26, 1969, demonstrate the healthy increases which have been taking place as West Virginia continued its efforts to regain a place in the mainstream of the Nation's healthy economy. Indications, although not supported fully as yet by firm statistical compilations, point to an even better result for the year 1968 and for a continuing uptrend as this new year's economic pattern develops.

Other statistical data have demonstrated a climb of West Virginia products placed in the export market. During the period from 1960 to 1966, exports of manufactured products went up 52 percent and the dollar value of manufactured products in export in 1966 alone reached \$215.4 million, with mineral products second at \$185 million of value at mine mouth. Agricultural products

based in export trailed at a value of \$6.2 million.

One of the major coal companies producing in West Virginia, Eastern Associated Coal Corp., estimates that when four of its new mines reach full employment late this year, \$12 million annually will be added in coal miners' wages and fringe benefits to the State's economy. Millions more will be added by other coal producing companies.

Mr. President, the demand for coal continues to expand domestically and in export—and the future will be brighter as research and development create new uses for coal in both gaseous and liquid fuels. Over the years since I joined with Senator Joseph O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, in having Government research authorized and funded by law, I have watched with interest the building of the many new uses for coal that are on the horizon and the new methods being developed to achieve those uses and others yet to come.

With these expansions surely developing, coal's future remains bright, but only if forthright steps are taken to attempt to keep coal mine safety and the occupational health of coal miners improving at least at the same pace that production is increasing. We need to act in this Congress to modernize Federal coal mine safety laws and to add to the body of laws new provisions for the control of coal dust in the interest of both improving mine safety and coal miners' health.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles to which I have made reference—articles which were in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Sunday, January 26, 1969.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEW JOBS: EMPLOYMENT IN STATE INCREASING SLOWLY DESPITE FAST TREND TOWARD AUTOMATION

Careful study of employment statistics for the past five years indicates that the increasing employment in many West Virginia plants, where no appreciable expansion has taken place, totals approximately 4,800 more jobs. Additional employment, resulting from new installations and expansion of existing plants, approximating 9,600 jobs added to the above mentioned 4,800 jobs, projects a total of 14,400 jobs.

While the obsolescence of older plants, and shifting economic and market factors brought many new plants to West Virginia last year, these same factors caused some of our plants to leave the State. In addition, automation and mechanization in industry continue to reduce the total number of available jobs in certain existing industrial facilities.

Loss of jobs in the state due to the above mentioned factors approximate 5,900 over the five year period. The State's net gain in manufacturing employment was 8,500.

It is acknowledged that rarely is it possible for new industrial projects to start full scale operations immediately upon completion of construction. Workers must be trained and "mechanical kinks have to be ironed out" before full and efficient employment is attained. This is the so-called "start up" period and duration of this period will range from six months to two years.

As a "rule of thumb" measurement, for every one hundred basic industrial jobs added, about one hundred and seventy new

jobs open up in the so-called services industries. Thus the previously mentioned 8,500 increase in industrial employment actually should result in 14,400 other West Virginians finding gainful employment in service industries. Additional coal mining jobs have a similar impact on the state's economy.

Manufacturing employment is usually divided into two broad groupings known as durable goods and nondurable goods production. Durable goods jobs showed an increase of 7,500 (or 10.3 per cent) and Nondurable Goods had an increase of 1,000 (or 1.9 per cent) during the five year period ending with calendar year 1967.

Average weekly earnings for workers, in durable goods during this period, increased from \$106.27 to \$118.80 (or 11.8 per cent and nondurable goods weekly worker's earnings rose from \$102.06 in 1963 to \$112.00 in 1967 for a gain of 9.7 per cent.

Bituminous coal mining jobs were 42,200 in 1963 as compared to 43,000 in 1967; average weekly pay in 1963 was \$130.28 compared to \$156.21 in 1967 for a gain of 20 per cent. Contract Construction employment was 18,400 in 1963 and increased to 24,600 in 1967, a gain of 33.7 per cent while average weekly pay went from \$130.76 to \$158.79 for an increase of 21.4 per cent.

FOUR NEW MINES WILL ADD \$12 MILLION A YEAR PAYROLL

The West Virginia economy will enjoy an addition of \$12 million a year in miners' wages and fringe benefits when four new mines of Eastern Associated Coal Corp. reach full employment late in 1969.

This will raise to \$47 million annually the total wages and benefits earned by Eastern Associated's employees of 12 mines in West Virginia and two others in western Pennsylvania. Additional new mines are under consideration.

In developing the new mines, Eastern is adding about 50 per cent to its annual production. Eastern is the nation's sixth largest bituminous coal producer.

At full production and employment, the four new Eastern mines will employ nearly 1,200 miners. The mines are:

Federal No. 2 mine in Monongalia County, northern West Virginia. This mine went into limited production just recently. When it reaches full output late next year, the mine will employ approximately 500 men.

Harris No. 1 and No. 2 mines in Boone County, southern West Virginia. These mines also are in limited production. When they attain capacity a few months from now, they will employ approximately 350 men.

A new Keystone mine in Raleigh County, also southern West Virginia. This mine, at Stotenburg, will reach full production in late 1968 and will employ 50 men.

The new Keystone mine will be part of Eastern's Keystone complex, which also includes mines at Keystone, McDowell County and Herndon, Wyoming County.

"Total demand for coal will continue to climb dramatically. This is particularly true in the electric utility market. Coal markets can be significantly expanded in the future by development of process which convert coal to gaseous and liquid fuels," A. P. Boxley, Eastern president, said at the company's Pittsburgh headquarters.

"The long-term contracts now associated with the bituminous coal industry, together with its high pay scale, offer steady employment at rewarding economic levels which should attract men to our industry."

EXPORTS TOP \$215 MILLION, COAL STATE'S BIG PRODUCT

The West Virginia Department of Commerce is vitally interested in the State's export trade, and encourages the state's industries to engage in the export field.

The following information on West Virginia's export trade has been taken from the

publication by the United States Department of Commerce, "Exports from West Virginia 1968," which was published in April of 1968 and represents the most recent statistics on the State's export business.

During 1968 West Virginia exported manufactured products having a dollar value of \$215.4 million, mineral products with a dollar value of 185 million at mine mouth, and agricultural products valued at \$6.4 million.

West Virginia ranked 25th in total foreign exports of manufactured products among the 50 states during 1966. The dollar value, f.o.b. producing plants, was 215.4 million.

West Virginia's exports of manufactured products increased 52 per cent over the period from 1963 to 1966. The dollar value of exports per capita in 1966 was over \$116. Only 17 states exported manufactured products with a higher dollar value per capita than West Virginia. Considering neighboring states, Kentucky had a dollar value per capita of \$92 and Maryland \$75, while Pennsylvania, Ohio and Virginia were higher than West Virginia with \$136, \$168 and \$123 respectively. Two highly industrialized states lagged behind West Virginia, New York with \$107 and California with \$113.

Eighty-one per cent of the state's exports in this classification consisted of chemical and allied products; primary metals; non-electrical machinery; stone, clay and glass products. West Virginia ranked fifth among all the states in exports of chemicals and allied products. The state was tenth in foreign sales of stone, clay and glass products and eleventh in exports of primary metals.

West Virginia's most significant mineral export is bituminous coal and in 1966 the state led the nation, exporting 37 million short tons; three-fourths of all United States bituminous coal exported during the year. The dollar value, at mine mouth, of bituminous coal exported was \$185 million.

West Virginia's farm exports were estimated at \$6.4 million during fiscal 1965-66. Foreign sales accounted for 6 per cent of the state's cash receipts from farm marketing during the same year.

CAREER MEN IN NIXON ADMINISTRATION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest an editorial from the Glasgow (Ky.) Daily Times, presumably written by its publisher, Mr. Carroll Knicely.

Mr. Knicely is well known for his forthrightness and for his keen insight into political affairs. His paper has been Democratic for 103 years. However, he has unhesitatingly endorsed men of different political faiths when in his opinion they were steadfastly promoting principles of sound government.

This particular article, in my opinion, is worth close perusal by all Members:

CAREER MEN GIVE NIXON EXPERTISE ON PRIME ISSUES

It is now clear the Nixon administration will depend heavily on craftsmen in high places.

This would seem to confirm predictions that Nixon will seek pragmatic rather than doctrinaire solutions to hairy foreign, defense and domestic problems.

Take the State and Defense Departments as examples:

The reliance on craftsmen is seen in the unprecedented appointment of veteran foreign service officer U. Alexis Johnson to the No. 3 post in the State Department and the

selection of career diplomat Robert Yost as ambassador to the United Nations.

It is seen again in the appointment of David Packard, head of Hewlett-Packard electronics, as deputy secretary of defense and scientist Robert C. Seamans, former deputy chief of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as secretary of the Air Force.

It is apparent in the reappointment of the skilled negotiator, Ellsworth Bunker, as ambassador to South Vietnam and the selection of Henry Cabot Lodge, former ambassador to the United Nations and two-time ambassador to South Vietnam, as chief negotiator with Hanoi in Paris.

Except for Lodge, these men are professionals in their fields, not politicians. Lodge, of late, by his considerable service in Vietnam, the United Nations and West Germany, has also become a professional.

In addition, President-elect Nixon has made it clear Secretary of State-designate William Rogers was picked in considerable measure because of his technical skill at negotiating.

Taken together, these appointments have significance.

In his Defense and State Department selections, Nixon is bringing the United States closer to the British and Japanese systems. In those countries, permanent undersecretaries provide continuity and great technical skills at high levels of the government, regardless of the party in power.

With some noted exceptions, the British have been known over the centuries for their pragmatic approach to foreign and defense problems.

In foreign affairs at this time, pragmatic professionalism may be just what is needed.

For despite their doctrinaire fixations, Leonid Brezhnev, Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tseung are quite pragmatic men in their own way, especially when faced with serious problems.

Each of these men has an uncanny ability to find doctrinaire reasons for whatever practical solutions they decide on.

At present, all three are temporarily over-extended and need some relaxation.

But it will take highly skilled, hard-headed practical U.S. negotiators to winnow grain from the chaff and prevent the United States from being "taken" by these experienced opponents.

DEATH OF REV. JOHN LOFTUS, VICE
PRESIDENT, BELLARMINE-URSULINE
COLLEGE, LOUISVILLE, KY.

HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, recently the community of Louisville, Ky., lost a man of great stature with the passing of Rev. John Loftus, vice president of Bellarmine-Ursuline College. Father John's devotion to humanity knew no bounds. His crusade for social justice was the very fiber of his being.

I ask unanimous consent that a very fitting tribute, written by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, president of Bellarmine-Ursuline College, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND JOHN T. LOFTUS

As I think about Father John Loftus in these days following his death, I keep coming back to that beatitude of Our Lord that reads, "Blessed are those that hunger and

thirst for justice's sake, for they shall be filled." His life was marked by a remarkable variety of activities and commitments. His was a complex personality of which vast areas remained unmapped even for people who worked side by side with him for years. But with all this, even his most casual acquaintance was immediately aware of his passion for justice—his concern for decency and dignity and fairness in human affairs.

He supported many an unpopular cause, and paid the price without flinching. At one stage of a particularly difficult controversy some years ago, it was necessary for him to change the phone number in his living quarters to escape the incessant flood of vicious crank calls which made sleep impossible night after night.

Even the most imaginative and reckless of letterwriters and namecallers could not persuade him to take one backward step from a friend he admired or a cause in which he believed. His convictions took him to Selma and to countless other frontiers of the cause of justice because his whole being left him no choice in the matter.

Father John was a gifted educational leader. Most of the 37 years of his priesthood were involved one way or the other in school work. He has left impressions and memories and ideals with two generations of seminarians and college students. His administrative methods varied in orthodoxy and predictability from one time and one situation to another, but there was never any question of the impact that was made.

Administration in education or any other area can be a pretty chilling and dehumanizing kind of business. Salvation is not to be found in trifling demands for the abolition of all systems and structures. The answer which Father John understood superbly is to never let the systems and the structures obstruct your view and love of the people for whose sake they are supposed to exist.

Despite his many long years in administrative work, office routine always remained something of a bore and very much of a cross to him. What he really liked to do was to talk to students—any time, anywhere, about anything. It is a comfort now to recall his pleasure in this most cherished of his activities in this past year. The reorganization of the college last summer gave him the opportunity for this on a scale which had not been possible for a number of years.

Father John's hunger and thirst for justice, for human welfare, for the problems of the young, made him an inevitable subject for such standard labels as "liberal," "progressive," and a colorful variety of other less temperate terms. The best sense of these labels was, of course, fully justified.

Not only in the civil rights field, but in ecumenism and in many other areas, he was indeed a bold pioneer. I suspect that some of his ecumenical and liturgical adventures in past years caused many a shudder in the Chancery Office. Time has vindicated most of his instincts and anticipations, but there is an even more basic aspect of the matter.

Father John was a great traditionalist, even a romanticist, in the most precise sense of that term. Newman and Chesterton and Camelot grew more important for him the more vigorously he moved forward on the cutting edge of the waves of new thought and renewal of our times. He had an uncannily accurate insight into the principle that change is always sterile unless it is organically linked with tradition.

Father John's association with Bellarmine College began one year before its formal opening in 1950. It was a question of love at first sight, and until the moment of his death he maintained a consuming devotion to the college, to what it was, and to what it could be. In a report written last summer he said this:

"One could well make the argument—I can do it myself—that education on a mass basis must to a larger extent be done in the state-supported, technically efficient community

colleges and multiversities. I dread that thought because it will necessarily lead to blandness of thought, loss of discrimination, and imposition of standards without the balancing voice of critical judgment. Neither our country nor our world can afford to lose private, independent, philosophically committed, liberal arts colleges. Let me conclude on a very optimistic note drawn from experience. As many of you know, my dedication to Bellarmine-Ursuline is a passion. I love it because I find in it the qualities of which I have been speaking. I know its effect upon the students who are dear to me and the delight of my life. They often come to our doors with small vision. They leave with a world view that will equip them to make their own particular kind of contribution to the welfare of mankind."

My guess is that Father John would be happy to be remembered for what he says in the above lines.

SETTLE THE ISRAEL-ARAB BORDERLINE DISPUTES NOW

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the majority of the nations who make up the United Nations voting strength is aligned against independence for any nation who desires self-government. The international Communists seem to have more strength within the halls of the United Nations than the forces who are fighting for freedom and self-government throughout the world.

Nasser and his Middle East allies are part of this international Communist conspiracy and it is their intention to destroy the free nation of Israel either through blitzkrieg attack or through the slow process of undermining its economy and its progress toward independence and freedom.

The Iraqi Government vowed yesterday to hold more espionage trials despite protests over the execution of 14 men accused of spying for Israel. The Iraqi Government indicated today they will put 35 more prisoners, including 13 Jews, on trial for spying and sabotage. The Baghdad radio reported that other spies will be tried soon.

The Jewish population, not only in our country, but throughout the world, is unanimous in protesting the attacks and sabotage which have become an organized and almost daily occurrence against Israel. Israel is the only nation within the Middle East complex of nations who opposes tyranny and is fighting to preserve democracy and freedom for its people.

For 20 years, notwithstanding the armistice and cease-fire agreements, the Arab States have waged war against Israel. The organized assassins quartered in Arab countries are ordered by their masters to murder men, women, and children in Israel. This small free nation is engaged in a struggle for its life. The United Nations seem to have abandoned the purpose for which it was created—to safeguard justice and peace over the globe. Why does not the United Nations protest the Arab terrorists in their concentrated effort to kill Jews, not only in Israel, but elsewhere? For some

reason the United Nations has disintegrated and is silent when the Arabs, by reason of their barbarous instincts, kill Africans by the tens of thousands in the Sudan, persecute citizens of Algeria, Egyptian pilots fly Soviet planes, and add flames to the murders in Biafra.

The Government of the United States, through its State Department and connections with other free nations, should start immediately with effective warnings against the Arabs to cease their international crimes and terminate their attacks to destroy their neighboring nation of Israel.

I am satisfied that the American people of all nationalities and categories will support all efforts to terminate the Soviet-Arab air conspiracy to annihilate a free neighbor.

An avalanche of actions by Nasser and his tyrannical associates will justify all steps that our Government will take to preserve the only democracy, the only nation with self-government in the Middle East area. Israel is entitled to this consideration by the free world as a matter of right and justice.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY ARTICLE SHOWS GRIEVANCE ARBITRATION A TRIUMPH OF FREE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the greatest triumphs of American labor and management is the grievance and arbitration system, now written into about 100,000 separate company-union contracts, for settling disputes arising during the contract term. Because it works so effectively, this private system gets almost no public plaudits. However, in the Atlantic Monthly for January 1969, Ben Rathbun, the associate editor for the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., has written a first-rate commentary on the system's importance to our economic stability. Mr. Rathbun, who also has written on labor matters for Harper's magazine and the Yale Law Journal, pays a well-deserved tribute—not only to labor and management—but to the private arbitrators who have contributed so much to making the system work.

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

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

LABOR ARBITRATION: BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Ben Rathbun)

About a year ago at the Ford Motor Company plant in Dagenham, England, an employee was told to put a new drill in his machine, a simple chore he'd always done before. But now he balked for no apparent good reason. When he was suspended temporarily, 100 of his co-workers walked out in protest. Within two days, 9000 Ford employees were laid off because of the crippling effect of the walkout.

As is the case with about 95 percent of all the strikes in Britain, the stoppage was "un-

official," without the sanction of the national union. It could hardly be called illegal because almost no strikes are illegal in Britain. But legal or not, these "wildcat" strikes have been characterized by Lord Carron, the ex-president of the one-million-member Amalgamated Engineering and Foundrymen's Union, as "hammer blows at our [Britain's] existence." Largely because of the "quickie" strikes, the *Economist*, that fount of measured judgments, describes the labor relations picture in Britain as "a uniquely horrible mess."

If the Dagenham case had arisen, for example, at the Ford stamping plant in Cleveland, Ohio, it would have been handled differently. The recalcitrant employee's protest against being sent home would have been referred to a formal union-management settlement process for resolution. The odds are 1000 to one against a strike, but if the episode had boiled into a crippling walkout, the United Auto Workers' national staff would have moved in to end the stoppage.

GRIEVANCE

This private system for avoiding wildcat strikes about a multitude of issues from tardiness to the quality of washroom toilet tissue has been written into close to 100,000 separate private contracts between management and labor. It is founded upon a voluntary union pledge not to strike over so-called grievances arising during the period when the contract is in effect. Instead, union and management agree to the arbitration of all unresolved grievances. Those not settled by the supervisor and the union steward or by higher officials in joint conference are sent to a private arbitrator. The parties agree in advance that the arbitrator's decision will be accepted as final and binding.

Except in highly regulated industries like the railroads and the airlines, the entire system is strictly a matter of private agreements. Neither state nor federal law requires the no-strike pledges given and honored by unions, and only a relative handful of the more than 40,000 arbitration decisions rendered annually ever wind up in court. Each year literally millions of grievances are resolved peacefully. For those not settled at the local plant or office, the arbitrator's ruling is unreviewable, uncontestable, and unimpeachable. With the rarest exceptions, the incident is terminated utterly. In Alva Johnston's phrase, it's "like a building falling on a man."

There are basically two types of strikes in this country. The first is that which occurs in the legally authorized period after a contract terminates. When the parties cannot agree on new money terms and other benefits, the union has the right to strike.

The second is the strike over grievances that erupt during the contract term. This report deals only with the latter. And, make no mistake, these strikes are no mere side-show to the crucial emergency affairs. Despite the gravity of the questions raised by major strikes over new contract terms, most of today's ablest managers would regard the return of mid-term "wildcat" strikes as an equally serious menace.

Management's willingness to pay a high price in return for strike-free day-to-day stability is generally overlooked by the press. This attitude was aptly summarized some years back by Harry W. Anderson, General Motors vice president for industrial relations at the time: "The public doesn't understand about these highly-publicized settlements: the big thing we're buying is the union's collaboration in making that grievance system work. That day-by-day union performance on dealing with grievances and keeping production going smoothly is a damn-sight more important than the money deal we make with Walter [Reuther]."

In Britain, no such gystabilizer for day-to-day employee relations has been developed. As Theodore W. Kheel, the American labor troubleshooter, pointed out recently, the

most important practical difference between the U.S. and British systems is the power of a local shop steward in Britain to "call a nuisance walkout any time he chooses." Recent causes of these walkouts include a welder's changing a light bulb instead of waiting for an electrician to do it; the installation of automatic tea dispensers to cut down excessive tea-break time caused by individual tea brewing; the disciplining of an Andy-Capp-like brewery employee who regularly "knocked-back" more than his two free pints of on-the-job bitter each day; the hiring of a Negro at Alcan Industries in preference to several white applicants; the reduction in the number of saucages at tea breaks at a Liverpool shipyard.

Harold Wilson's Labor government declared that a wildcat tie-up on the Royal Docks in 1967 was a major factor in driving the government to its November, 1967, devaluation of the pound sterling. The broader result of these walkouts is what Lord Carron called the "suicidal strangling of trade."

By contrast, as Kheel argued, the U.S. union leader uses his economic muscle to get big gains after the contract expires: "Because the U.S. union delivers the wage-and-fringe goodies when the contract is reopened at the end of its term," the union leader can say: "Okay, you bastards, you can't strike for the next three years. Then we'll exercise our collective strength again and get something more that's really good."

Kheel raised a storm in Britain last year by declaring that the British employee relations system is "at least 50 years behind that of the U.S." Kheel indicated that Britain could be doomed economically unless there is a drastic revision of the current system under which anyone can call a strike anytime he feels like it. He noted that the economic damage of these wildcat strikes is enormous.

Kheel insists that British management fails to comprehend the need for "predictability" in its day-to-day relations with the employees. The British manager "doesn't know when the hell he's going to be hit by a strike," Kheel says, "and he has even less idea of how to settle it, except by giving in." As Kheel put it: "The ultimate consequence of this inability to plan" is to discourage industry from "going out and buying the machinery and making the other capital improvements that British industry desperately needs and isn't getting."

MINISKIRTS AND MOONLIGHTING

In this country, the agenda of issues going to arbitration gets ever longer. It includes disputes about math tests required for promotions; favoritism in overtime assignments; premium pay for five-foot, five-inch operators who can fit into the motor case of a NASA missile; company policy on long hair and beards; the right to take a second job (moonlight) at another company; the effect of miniskirts on production; and civil-rights picketing as an excusable absence. Also on the arbitral agenda: the right to buy "numbers" tickets during working hours, on-the-job sodomy, and a blizzard as an act of God. From dots to dope addicts, the arbitrators deal with all the variant personalities and problems in employee relations. Of the major issues, the staples are absenteeism, vacation-and-holiday scheduling, insubordination, abuse of sick leave, overtime, ability versus seniority in promotions, and discrimination against women in promotion, assignments, and so on.

Although arbitration of employee grievances in the United States ranges back to an 1865 steel puddler's case in Pittsburgh, only in the last twenty-five years has the system been broadly used. Prior to that, the New York cloak and suit industry, with Louis D. Brandeis as the arbitrator, under the famous 1910 Protocol; the newspaper industry and the typographical and printing pressmen's unions; and Hart, Schaffner & Marx, with its

1911 arbitration pact engineered largely by Sidney Hillman, the president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, did the most important pioneering with grievance arbitration. In the 1930's, Dr. George W. Taylor of the University of Pennsylvania attracted attention with his resourceful services as the arbitrator in the hosiery and men's clothing industries.

But the real breakthrough did not come until June 10, 1939, at a dramatic meeting of the United Auto Workers' General Motors Council in Detroit. The 119-day sit-down strike at GM's Flint plants in 1936-1937 was followed by GM's capitulation to John L. Lewis, the CIO president. But the auto workers were no more appeased than the Paris Communists had been by the Vicomte de Noailles's 1789 offer to surrender the rights and privileges of the French nobility. Several frenzied years followed in Detroit, Flint, and Pontiac.

One hundred and seventy wildcat stoppages hit General Motors between February and June, 1937. In 1938, there were at least 300. In most of the GM plants, the militant UAW members were cocked for instant strike action at the mere raising of a foreman's voice. They were about as concerned about GM's dependence on efficiency as H. Rap Brown is about the future of the Grasse Pointe Yacht Club.

By 1939, Walter P. Reuther, the head of UAW's GM Department, saw clearly that wildcat strikes could impair the infant CIO's opportunity to move into the economic and political big leagues. Advised by Sidney Hillman, Reuther began exploratory talks with GM officials. At the June 10, 1939, showdown of UAW's GM Council, Reuther spoke out against wildcat strikes: "I don't want to tie up 90,000 workers because one worker was laid off for two months. That is a case for the arbitrator." To many in the UAW, this was unacceptable appeasement, but Reuther managed to carry the day.

For its part, GM management was looking hard at the idea of a grievance-and-arbitration system before they'd even heard of Walter Reuther. They proceeded in the manner described by longtime GM adviser from the investment house of Morgan Stanley: "When GM takes up a question, they don't just discuss it, they pulverize it." The result of Reuther's initiative and GM's homework was the 1940 agreement for a grievance-and-arbitration system.

RULE OF LAW

This agreement, coming at a crucial time, had an influential impact after America entered World War II. The War Labor Board, charged with handling wartime labor disputes, seized the occasion to write grievance-and-arbitration clauses into thousands of contracts. Despite their imposition at many companies as pure diktat, these clauses plainly answered what Justice Holmes has called "a felt need." They were widely embraced and became the sole point of labor-management unanimity at President Truman's post-war Labor Management Conference on the whole range of labor policy. Both the NAM and the CIO agreed on the desirability of private arbitration of employee grievances under a plan based on no-strike pledges by local unions.

The practical significance for management, unions, and the economy was summed up a few years ago by Archibald Cox, the former U.S. Solicitor General, now Boylston Professor of Law at Harvard:

"The extraordinary accomplishments of collective bargaining in the . . . years since [1935] . . . are all too easily forgotten. It is hard to think of any institution that has accomplished so much in the short span of [a few] years. . . .

"Take . . . the vital goal of establishing a rule of law in the mine, mill, and factory—the substitution of a rule of law [through the arbitration process] for the arbitrary and

capricious power of the boss. Men have few greater concerns than this kind of justice. What equal example is there of extending a rule of law—both substantive rights and duties and also the machinery to administer them—into so large an area of human life affecting so many people within so short a time. Nothing less has been done by collective bargaining through the rules it brings into the shop and the industrial jurisprudence being made and administered through grievance procedures and arbitration."

In addition to Dr. George W. Taylor, who became a special adviser on labor relations to Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, a remarkably able and wise group of arbitrators deserves credit for their role in the grievance-and-arbitration experiment. Most played important roles on the World War II War Labor Board. Thereafter, many served as arbitrators for key companies and unions during the formative and trying stages of collective bargaining. For example, Ralph T. Seward at General Motors and International Harvester, Harry Shulman at Ford, Sylvester Garret at U.S. Steel, Gabriel N. Alexander at GM, Harry Platt at Ford and Republic Steel, and Saul Wallen at Sylvania Electric Products and B. F. Goodrich contributed mightily to make the grievance systems work. Their constructive influence and example also were felt in many other fledgling relationships and were emulated by new arbitrators.

An arbitrator can be fired at any time by either party. He decides very few "great" cases, and his career can be lonely and often drab. But the luminaries in what is called the arbitrators' "College of Cardinals" move into the bright public light from time to time as White House mediators and fact-finders in the big labor-relations "spectaculars." In these national emergency cases, the role of the mediator is entirely different from that of the arbitrator, although many in the profession exchange the two hats with alacrity. The arbitrator makes like a judge and decides a case; the mediator makes like a high-level conf man and tries to get the parties to resolve their differences themselves.

Others who have served with distinction in both categories include Ben Aaron, director of the Industrial Relations Institute at UCLA and a member of the Presidential Automation Commission of 1965; David L. Cole, President Eisenhower's Mediation Service Director; Archibald Cox; John T. Dunlop of the Harvard Economics Department, who is a dynamic legend even among his fellow "Cardinals"; N. P. Feinsinger of the Wisconsin Law School, who was chairman of the National Wage Stabilization Board; Robben W. Fleming, the president of the University of Michigan since 1968; Ted Kheel, who "plays God" in the tangled labor relations of New York City the way Dunlop did until recently in the construction and atomic energy industries; and W. Willard Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

In some ways, the second wave of arbitrators has not been of comparable quality. The unions and management have been far too slow in extending their confidence to new arbitrators and in seeing to it that arbitration was made an attractive career. Some of the new arbitrators like Paul Hanlon, David Miller, Richard Mittenthal, and Rolf Valtin are excellent, but more are needed.

Today, about twenty-five years since arbitration was imposed from Washington on a reluctant management, the system is widely accepted. Although some procedures work poorly, and although the nature of the system, with winners and losers in every case, guarantees a hall of off-the-cuff contumely for the arbitrators, the system is under no serious challenge. The quick peek at the British "wildcat" strikes is bound to give pause to the harshest critics of the U.S. system.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN
LANGEN AT NATIONAL WHEAT
MEETING

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to read the remarks of our colleague from Minnesota that he gave regarding the farm problem at the National Wheat Growers Association meeting in Boise, Idaho.

Mr. LANGEN's long experience as a farmer, an elected member of the local committee to administer the farm program, and as a dedicated, capable lawmaker, makes his remarks very worthwhile and pertinent.

In addition, Mr. LANGEN has been chairman of the Republican House task force on agriculture.

For those who have longed for a greater understanding of how the wheat program has worked, of the actual workings of our international wheat agreement and its cost to you, I commend reading this statement. The statement follows:

SPEECH PRESENTED BY THE HONORABLE ODIN LANGEN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM MINNESOTA, AT THE NATIONAL WHEAT GROWERS ASSOCIATION MEETING, BOISE, IDAHO, THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1969

Probably no greater satisfaction has ever come my way than this opportunity of sharing a few observations with the National Wheat Growers Association gathered for their annual meeting. These satisfactions are generated by several personal, as well as economic, concerns.

I find both pleasure and satisfaction in coming to the great State of Idaho: a State that has contributed so much to the growth and progress of agriculture, and the strength of rural people throughout the Nation.

Having technically been a wheat farmer all of my life, I quite obviously have a very personal interest in the future of wheat production throughout this country—even though I now no longer operate a wheat farm, my boys having grown up and taken over that operation.

I feel sure that I share a very common concern with each of you, namely, what does the future hold economically for the producers of wheat throughout the country. Wheat farmers of course are a part of the great economic dilemma that confronts agriculture in general throughout the Nation. I know about these problems as they have prevailed in my own state of Minnesota. I am sure they are not much different in any one of the states that are represented here this evening.

And, while the agricultural problem has been recognized and discussed in great complexity, and seemingly has defied solution, yet the problem is really very simple in that, namely, prices are too low.

And this of course, is the exact nature of the major problem to wheat growers today. Their prices are too low. In fact, the lowest they have been in some twenty-six to twenty-seven years.

But let me discuss with you for a moment the general agricultural problem, of which wheat production is a major segment. There is a very direct relationship between the problem of any given agricultural commodity and the overall problems as they affect all farm people and rural areas.

I think the case is rather well-stated by a writer who, I noted, made the observations some time ago that two veteran farmers were asked this question: "What would

you do if you inherited a million dollars tomorrow?"

The first said he would invest it and live off the income, quit work, and take life easy. The second pondered a while and then said, "I reckon I'd just keep on farming until it was all gone."

That about sums up the current state of American agriculture as we begin the new year of 1969. Which is too bad, when you consider that never before in history has the man of the soil produced so much food per acre or man-hour of work. Never before in history has the American housewife spent such a small percentage of her husband's pay check for food. And never before in history has the American farmer trailed so far behind the rest of the economy in rewards for his efforts.

As we enter the year that will close out the sixties and launch the seventies, there is much speculation and uncertainty about the future of American agriculture and the related industries that constitute the agribusiness community. It is no secret that the Federal Government is more involved in the future possibilities for Agriculture than in any other industry in this country.

Accepting that fact of life, you naturally wonder what is in store, as a new Congress has convened and a new Administration takes over. Many eyes will be upon us, looking for the signs that will indicate either a change in direction or a continuation of present policies.

I, of course, can not answer that question for the Administration at this point—and I don't know whether anybody can—or will be able to—until such time as the necessary appointments have been made and a new policy and attitude developed.

The fact remains, however, that somebody better do something to effect some changes that will produce better prices, or the future is dark indeed.

It doesn't take a great mathematician to determine that we can't continue for long to have the farm mortgages increasing at the rates of 10% a year while the net income remains about constant, to know that the time is very limited in which such an economic atmosphere can keep farms throughout the Nation solvent.

I have already stated that presently agriculture is more directly dependent upon government in its economic welfare than any other single segment of our complex social, civic, and industrial complex. They are restricted in production by government, prices are basically established by government, and the majority of the farmers find themselves in a position of having to accept the general direction of their operation by planners of every description in Washington.

What are the factors that have significantly affected, and contributed to, the agricultural problem that confronts the American farmer throughout the country today. It is essential that we first recognize that all of agriculture has been affected by a tight budget; inflation, which has increased the cost of production; and a constant increase in interest rates during recent years.

These factors have affected not only the options of Congress, but the general public as well. A balanced budget, curtailed inflation, and interest rates reduced to more acceptable levels would change the general attitude toward the funding of agricultural programs and would certainly ease the great interest burden that now plagues many a farm operation.

As an example, farmers pay \$1-billion-4-million more in interest today than they did just eight years ago. This has been brought about because of what I referred to earlier as a 10% increase in the mortgages against the total agricultural unit each year, and the increased interest rates on those mortgages which now total more than \$50-billion. It is alarming to note that this increase amounts to more than \$440 per farm, with the total interest obligation of over \$900 per farm.

As recent as 1957, this figure was only \$226. This fact leaves a clear cut identity of the need for a more equitable return on investments and efforts that are necessary to produce the quantity and quality of foods needed to satisfy the demands of all of our own people as well as many others throughout the entire world.

It doesn't seem to be equitable that agriculture, which is the largest industry of this country—and it doesn't have even a close second—should be subject to this kind of economic burden when they have made such great advances in production efficiency and contributed so greatly to the growth and progress of our Nation.

In the past twenty years, the farmer has increased crop production per man-hour by 148 per cent, and livestock production per man hour by 149 per cent. Agriculture has written the best production story of any industry in this nation.

What a fortunate people we are as United States citizens in having available to us the best quality, the greatest per capita supply, better packaged and retailed food at a cost of only 17.7 cents of the income dollar. This is a great advantage to every man and woman and child throughout the United States, and finds no comparison anywhere else in the world.

Now, how does all of this affect the wheat farmer? And to what extent has he suffered the consequences of these most unfortunate circumstances? As I stated earlier, he receives the lowest price for a bushel of wheat today that he has received in the last more than quarter of a century, but yet he has to pay production costs that generally have doubled during the past twenty years.

If we are effectively to cope with this price problem, as it affects wheat producers, I suppose it is essential that we are alert to some of the factors that have been the cause in the development of such an economic situation.

Referring to the low market prices, possibly we should first recognize that present price levels are a product of the existing wheat program which was actually designed to lower market prices. To this degree it has been most successful. It has brought the prices down. The object at the time of that legislation was to satisfy a theory that lowering the market price in this country would encourage expanded exports, and so reduce the surpluses; create a demand which in turn would improve the prices. In the meantime, we were to make up for the reduced prices by diversion payments and wheat certificates. An excellent theory, except for the fact that it hasn't worked. The prices are down now, but exports are also going down, and going down at rather an alarming rate.

During the first five months of this fiscal year, from July to November, there was a drop in wheat exports in excess of 112-million bushels, with indications that further drops may be forthcoming. This experience should alert us to the fact that merely reducing the market price of the commodity in this country is not the only factor that determines the extent to which we can export. There are many other factors which include tariffs, world prices, production and prices in other countries, and so forth.

So, while the farmer substantially reduced his production, he finds his reward to be one of a reduced price, coupled with a reduced export market.

I would refer you to an article appearing in a Department of Agriculture bulletin entitled "Import Levy is Biggest Price Item in U.S. Exports to E.E.C."

Some of the facts in this regard are pathetically alarming. With the average market price being paid to Kansas wheat farmers being \$1.24, or 81¢ a bushel lower since 1962, yet that wheat sells in the Netherlands today for a price that is 24-cents a bushel higher than it was at that time. Not only that, but the selling price in the Netherlands as of December was \$3.33 a bushel, or \$2.09 higher

than the average price received by the Kansas farmer.

One could well say that's impossible—but it's not. I must quote some additional figures. I think you may find them interesting.

You know the present wheat program has worked so badly, or reduced the price so effectively that it now becomes necessary for the exporters of wheat grades and varieties of American wheat to pay to the American government an inverse tariff that has ranged from 15¢ to 22¢ a bushel during the past several months in order to bring our reduced price up to the level of the International Wheat Agreement which we as a Nation were a party to designing, and signing, during the middle of last year.

What folly to have participated in the signing of an International Wheat Agreement which was intended to increase the world price of wheat, and consequently the price of wheat in our own country, only to find that it results in nothing but the levy of an inverse tariff that does the producer no good at all. No one benefits from the arrangement. It becomes a liability to the producers of this country, a liability to the taxpayers, and no benefit to the consumer. It doesn't serve the cause of the processors, or the consumers in the foreign country any better, because they still pay the full price of more than \$3.30.

The fact is that it is possible to pay the producer the full parity price of wheat in this country, and with the removal of some of these trade barriers, our wheat could still be sold more cheaply in common market countries than it is being sold there today.

Now here are millions of dollars that belong no where else except in the bank accounts of the wheat producers of this Nation. But the folly doesn't stop there, for if we explore this matter further, we will then find these items to be a reality. When this wheat then reaches one of the common market countries, let's say the Netherlands for our purpose here this evening. They, having that is known as a variable duty which, during 1968 was at an average rate of about \$1.56 per bushel—meaning that the Netherlands government got more money but of this bushel of American-produced wheat than did the producer in this country who provided all of the work, took all of the risks, and produced it with today's high production costs. Again, here is millions and millions of dollars that rightfully belong nowhere else but in the bank account of the American producers.

Now adding the inverse tariff to this country, the variable import levy to the foreign country, plus the transportation charges involved, this is what accounts for the price of \$3.33 as the cost of our wheat to the Dutch processors. The folly doesn't stop here, however, because they then use these dollars to subsidize other agricultural products that they produce in surplus, then place them on the world market at reduced prices so that we find ourselves in competition with these reduced prices that actually our dollars were instrumental in establishing.

It doesn't seem like we could do much worse than this.

Now, it might be interesting to note what this import levy to the Netherlands was in 1962, before the present program went into effect. The import levy at that time was 9 cents per bushel—and so ever since we started the program to reduce the market prices in this country, they have watched the Chicago market more closely than we have. And every time it went down, they increased their variable import levy to where it is now \$1.46 a bushel higher than it was in 1962. It seems to me that it is time that all of us, whether as wheat farmers, Members of Congress, farm organizations, agri-business, or even the American taxpayer, ought to begin raising some objection to this kind of inequity in our trade policies.

I am sure that the future will demand the voice of everyone of those interests in order to correct it—but correct it we must.

There are further comparable follies in this field too numerous to mention tonight, because I also want to talk about a few inequities that exist within our own country, and our own domestic market.

While the wheat producer's return for his efforts have gone down substantially, there have been little or no gains for either the consumer, the taxpayer, the processor, or anyone else in either this country or in foreign countries.

About the only economic benefit that one could mathematically connive would be to say that a part of our benevolent wheat distribution program costs less money because we're giving away cheaper wheat.

Let's see how this whole combination works out in this country. The cost of a loaf of bread hasn't gone down any. In fact, the reverse is true. In the 1947-49 period, the average retail price of a one-pound loaf of bread was 13½ cents. The farm value of that wheat in that loaf was 2.6¢, and the total cost of all the ingredients was 3.3¢. Today that loaf of bread sells for 22.4¢, up almost 9¢ from the 1947-49 average price, yet the cost of the wheat in the same loaf is still only 2.6¢, with all ingredients still at 3.3¢. An interesting comparison might be made. This is a positive indication that the increased costs in the loaf of bread is certainly not due to the cost of the wheat, or the raw materials from which it is made.

In 1959 a bushel of wheat would have bought almost sixteen one-pound loaves—today it would buy less than ten. This is also one of the first times in history when a bushel of wheat will no longer buy a haircut. And so we see that the increased costs of a loaf of bread to the consumer have all originated from the increased costs of processing, storage, shipping, retailing, packaging, and so on.

This is an increase of 84% in the price of the bread. Had the farmer received a comparable increase, the price of wheat today would have been \$3.94 a bushel—and this would have added only 2.2¢ to the total costs of the same loaf of bread. This would seem like pretty good business. A 10% increase in the cost of the loaf of bread would bring an 84% increase in the price of wheat.

I doubt that anyone can explain to me, or to any of you, why it is that the consumer can supposedly pay for every other increased cost that's associated with the loaf of bread, whether it be processing, packaging, labor or any of the many other factors, but can't pay for the increased costs in producing a bushel of wheat. In fact, seemingly they can't even pay the same costs, because the prices are lower now than they were at that time.

These are a couple of examples of why the wheat farmer is having economic difficulty today. The same factors, with other circumstances, apply to the producers of other commodities. It is my opinion that if the American people are going to continue to enjoy the great food quantities, with excellent quality, at the cheapest prices in the world, these inequities are going to have to be corrected.

It is time that we began directing our attention to the establishment of improved markets and prices so that the greatest resources throughout the Nation can once again occupy its rightful place in the economic spectrum.

This is why I have suggested by legislation a program which deals entirely with prices. It is not my purpose here this evening to burden you with the details of this legislation, but only to talk for a moment or two about the principle, for it does provide an entirely different approach to the matter of achieving the objective that we all desire, namely, an improved price.

By means of this legislation, farmers could achieve full parity prices for voluntary participation. Such a program would subject them to far less government restriction and would provide them with bargaining

power and authority to deal with their own problems.

The encouraging element of such a program is that had it been in effect during the past year or two, it would have increased net income \$2-billion a year, while the cost of government would be reduced by at least \$2-billion per year. Some of the money saved in this manner could then be used for purposes of generating a realistic export program and policy.

The very same type of program could also be applied to feed grains and it seems to me that if we are ever going to have an adequate domestic, as well as world price structure, we of necessity are going to need to change our approach to some variations of these plans so that adequate prices can be established. To do so would serve to benefit the producers, processors, consumers, and taxpayers of this country, and would grant assurance that there will be an adequate supply of high quality food to meet the demand of this nation and the world.

At times I think we have lost sight of the great benefits that have accrued to this country because of the great contributions that have been made by agricultural producers of every description—wheat farmers included.

I should recall during World War II, when farm prices reached levels of 114 to 116% of parity, and many products were rationed, but I can't recall hearing any consumer complaints—in fact, I'm told there were times when gratuities moved under the counter in order that a little more generous portion might be provided.

I think all of America, and hungry people throughout the world, should not only be grateful, but cognizant of the too often unmentioned advantages that have accrued to this country because of the American farmers' ingenuity and unparalleled know-how.

While this factor is generally associated with rural America, let it be known that the industrial world has found just as great advantage from this fact, for it is only because of the more than \$24 that are left out of every income dollar available to buy other goods and services that the industrial world has been able to grow and progress as it has. Yes, the price of food has got a direct relationship to the availability of color television, or the many other conveniences that characterize our country today.

So what needs to be done in order to correct all of this?

It is a difficult public relations job. The steel people, the oil people, the trucking people, and other groups are telling their story about the wonders of their products. Why not agriculture?

We in agriculture and agri-business have been too busy filling the silos, mixing the feeds, developing the crop strains, and worrying about our individual problems, to sell American agriculture to our Nation. We must get out of the barns, out of the laboratories, and out from behind our desks and tell the American consumer that food is the greatest bargain in America. We must let the people of the Nation know where their cheap bread and butter really come from.

I think it is well that every citizen of America should be made aware of how serious this problem is, because every citizen throughout the country will be affected by our success, or failure, in meeting these needs in the immediate future. It might be well for everyone to remember that we are not talking about six per cent of this Nation's population; we are rather talking about the 40 per cent of our population who are directly affected by the economic future of America's largest industry today—and there isn't any other that runs even a close second.

Agriculture ranks first in the total number of workers employed, first in the total amount of money spent for equipment, first in the total amount of assets—which is now in excess of \$281-billion, yet their returns in

relationship to assets is only 17.7 per cent; while the next eleven largest industries of this country have a return of 107 per cent in relationship to their total assets.

These, of course, are problems that Congress also needs to be concerned with. To effectively correct them, there is every evidence that it needs the unanimous support of every agricultural interest, whether farms, agri-business, farm organizations of every description, small rural towns, or what have you.

What we must get across to the nation is that 40 per cent of our national population is either engaged in farming or dependent upon it through agri-business or in providing other services to agriculture. This is a sizable percentage compared to the six per cent of the population actually living on farms.

There may be tragically little political power left on the farm itself, but there is plenty of political power in that 40 per cent of the population dependent upon agriculture. If agriculture is to be properly considered in future Congresses, we must take the story of agriculture and agri-business to the people affected. That is where you come in.

It must be apparent that anyone engaged in the manufacture of farm machinery and equipment, in the fertilizer business, in agricultural research, or in the production of a multitude of products and services purchased by rural Americans, should be made aware of the fact that his future is no more secure than the future of our farm population.

The public relations effort to restore the farmer to his rightful position in the economy could start here today. If the farmer's story is told effectively, the voice of agriculture and agri-business will be heard in Washington, just as loudly as the voices of big labor, big business, big cities and other sizable blocs of voters. Only then will farm programs and other agricultural legislation really receive adequate consideration in Congress.

As a farmer myself, I particularly like the closing words of an article I noted last year in the Pelican Rapids Press of Minnesota. "A farmer is both Faith and Fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an Act of God can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage, but you can't restrain his ambition. Might as well put up with him. He is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food and fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman, a denim-dressed, business-wise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be re-charged anew with the magic words: 'The Market's Up!'"

Let's all help to re-charge him. To do so would be good for the country.

THE HONORABLE PAUL F. SCHENCK

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of a former Member, the Honorable Paul F. Schenck, who so ably represented the State of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States for a number of years.

I thoroughly enjoyed serving with Mr. Schenck and I am certain history will show that his service in the Halls of Congress was of the highest caliber and a number of outstanding pieces of legisla-

tion, now laws on the statute books, received his active support. My sympathy and best wishes go out to his family.

REFORM OF METHOD OF ELECTING
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about the need for reform of the method of electing the President of the United States. I believe discussion about the best way to amend the Constitution is necessary and wise, and I support the proper change.

The distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota has contributed to a better understanding of this question by giving a thorough explanation of his district plan proposal in the January 18, 1969, edition of Human Events. Senator MUNDT notes that under Senate Joint Resolution 12:

Each district electoral vote would be a separate entity. No longer would the voter of a suburban district see his vote become the unwilling captive of the core city, or, conversely, that of a city dweller find his vote cast with a slim majority that may represent a more rural interest.

Mr. President, I believe it is important to also take notice of the federalism inherent in the allocation of the electoral vote. I agree with my good friend and colleague that—

Adoption of a direct vote plan would wipe out this principle of equality of states. Federalism, which is still the cornerstone of our republican form of government, would be ignored.

I recommend this Human Events article to every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives and to every interested citizen. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

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

THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT PLAN: A WORKABLE PLAN FOR ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

(By Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota)

The 91st Congress has before it many controversial proposals. None could have a greater impact than a change in the Electoral College system. The Senate and the House could set in motion a chain of circumstances that could end up with either an enlightened and realistic method of selecting our President or one which obliterates state jurisdictions, nationalizes our elections, repudiates a promise of nearly 200 years and destroys our two-party system of government.

The possibility is staggering but the potential is true. The American people want a change in the present Electoral College. Furthermore, a change is needed. Reform of the College is long overdue. The present method of electing our two top executive officers is woefully inadequate, patently unfair, and at times, exasperatingly uncertain.

The irony is that this has been true for many years. Historically, it is possible to trace the desire for change to the period almost immediately following the election of

George Washington as the first President. Congressional reform movements have flourished ever since.

In recent years the demand for reform has been pushed in many quarters. This was particularly true following the 1948 election and the narrow victory of John F. Kennedy in 1960. In neither instance, however, were the reform proponents successful, nor did they receive the press build-up we are experiencing today, proving once again that it is a matter of "whose ox is gored."

The necessity for reform stems not from the fact that the system was ill-founded. The concept of independent electors selecting the President was perhaps sound in 1787. Our Founding Fathers, in the Constitutional Convention, certainly gave long and careful consideration to the method of electing the President.

At first it decided he should be elected by the Congress. Then it changed its collective mind and transferred the power of choice to an Electoral College that was to be an exact counterpart of the Congress with the representation of the states as units, corresponding to the senators, as well as population of the states, corresponding to representatives, and which should meet at the seat of government.

Upon further consideration this plan was dropped because of the fear that the electors would not travel so far for a single purpose. It took days in those times to cover distances that we now span in a few hours. The convention went back to its original idea that a President should be elected by a joint session of Congress. They did this with reluctance because it ran counter to their strong beliefs in the principle of separation of powers of the executive and legislative branches of the new government.

At this point the idea developed that the electors could meet and cast their votes in their own states and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of government.

Accordingly, the work of electing the President was divided. The convention transferred the act of voting from a joint session of Congress to electoral colleges in the several states, the results to be transmitted to the President of the Senate. It left with Congress, in joint session, the function of counting the certified results from the states, as would have been the case had Congress done the voting.

Unfortunately no uniform method of choosing electors was followed. Electors were chosen in a variety of ways: election by legislatures, election by the people in districts, and election by the people on a general ticket, which means that each voter in the state could vote for every one of the state's electors. In Massachusetts each of the eight districts chose two electors from which the legislature selected one per district and added two electors at large.

It was at this point that the political party system emerged and moved into the vacuum created by that phrase in the Constitution which states that electors shall be appointed "in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct."

After George Washington's two elections, the presidency was contested every four years on a party basis as it is today. The majority party in each state was quick to see the advantage of consolidating its electoral strength either through legislature selection or through use of the general ticket system forcing every electoral vote in the state to go one way or the other so as to exert maximum influence in electing a President. Federalists did this where they were in control, in the New England states for example, and the anti-Federalists, later Jeffersonian Republicans, soon did the same thing in their states.

Thus, an election procedure, conceived in a philosophical-political atmosphere, had been transformed by the development of political parties into a political-philosophical procedure more concerned with swinging a large

controlled bloc of votes behind a particular candidate than anything else.

The "winner-take-all" development has resulted in the major defect in the present electoral system, the disproportionate power that some areas operating under the general ticket system have in selecting the President.

As it stands now, a presidential candidate winning a state by a small margin takes all of that state's electoral votes. The result has been a concentration of presidential campaigns in the large cities of key, pivotal states. Such concentrated campaigns can control the outcome of our nationwide elections, even though they may represent the minority view in the nation as a whole.

Of the 270 electoral votes necessary for elections, 267 are controlled by only 11 states. Basically, however, the real power base is in the major metropolitan center or centers in each of these states—New York City, Chicago, Detroit, etc. If the rest of New York State divides relatively evenly, a heavy vote for one candidate in New York City can carry the entire state's 42 electoral votes into the camp of that candidate. This in effect makes captive votes out of the remainder of the state's voters.

The dangers in such a system are obvious. The invitation to vote fraud is inescapable. By the same token, disproportionate campaign contributions and expenditures gravitate to these areas. It excludes from the office of President all men, no matter how able and outstanding they may be, unless they come from a state with a large bloc of electoral votes. The exceptions to the rule have been either vice presidents succeeding because of the death of the President or candidates with a large national following as a result of their exploits in other areas, such as President Eisenhower.

There are other drawbacks to the present system, although the general ticket "winner take all" is unquestionably the worst.

Electors are not bound to vote for the popular vote winner. This has not happened as often as many people believe, only nine times since 1820. Two of these errant votes, however, have been cast in the last eight years. If it were one time or one hundred times, nevertheless, the principle remains the same and should be prohibited by a constitutional amendment so that it will not occur again.

Finally, there is a definite inequity in the event of contingent elections. Under the existing provision of the Constitution, if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, the contest goes to the House of Representatives. That body, however, votes by state and not by head. Each state must decide within itself and then cast a single vote. If the members of a state delegation deadlock, the state cannot vote at all.

Pinpointing those areas that need changing is only half the problem. Making the correct change is just as important. A step backwards or sideways is after all no progress and it could be retrogressive.

Three major alternatives have been proposed. The first and most feasible is the district plan. The others are the proportional system and the direct vote plan; the latter being the equivalent of killing a fly with a shotgun.

THE DISTRICT PLAN

The District Plan, as encompassed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, which I have introduced along with several other senators from both parties and from all sections of the country, is relatively simple and yet strikes immediately at the critical problems.

Under this proposed constitutional amendment, each state, as now, would be entitled to a certain number of electoral votes depending on how many congressmen the state is allotted plus two electoral votes for its two senators. The state, however, would be divided into districts comparable to congres-

sional districts (or at the proper time utilizing the existing congressional districts themselves).

The presidential ticket receiving the most popular votes in each district would receive one vote and the ticket obtaining the most popular votes statewide would receive two electoral votes. Thus each voter in the United States would, in effect, have the same voting power and the right to vote for three electors—no more, no less, regardless of where a voter may live. These electors (or simply unit votes in some variations of the plan) would be bound to cast their votes for the state's winning presidential ticket.

Viewed against the background of the defects in the present system, it is readily apparent that this proposal is a "problem solver."

As I have indicated, the major fault with what we have now is the general ticket system. And let me make it clear that this is not a phantom danger.

In the last election, the possibility of a deadlock in the electoral College received most of the publicity and few people realized how close we came to having a minority President selected by the machines of big-city politics. The fact remains, however, that the shift of a few thousand votes in only three states—California, Illinois and New Jersey—would have changed the outcome in the Electoral College while leaving the popular vote decision the same.

Under the District Plan, this potential is diminished almost to the point where it is non-existent. It would no longer be possible to transfer large blocs of electoral votes to one candidate or another simply on the basis of the statewide outcome. Each district electoral vote would be a separate entity. No longer would the voter of a suburban district see his vote become the unwilling captive of the core city, or, conversely, that of a city dweller find his vote cast with a slim majority that may represent a more rural interest.

I might add that this reform proposal, had it been in effect in the last election, would have eliminated in this instance the problem of the errant elector. One elector from North Carolina pledged to Richard Nixon cast his vote for George Wallace instead, because he said that he was nominated as a district elector and that his district went for Wallace. After lengthy debate, Congress allowed his switched vote to stand.

Under the general ticket system, his was presumed to be a captive vote. Under the district system there would have been no question. He would not have been elected in the first place. The Wallace elector would have been and therefore no problem of putting conscience above loyalty would have arisen. The action of the North Carolina elector clearly points out what is wrong with the present system and why the district plan is needed.

Should the voters of a district express their collective will, that decision should be final. S. J. Res. 12 assures this by removing any possibility of a vote designated for one candidate being constitutionally cast for another. It requires, through constitutional mandate, that each elector follow the instructions provided by the election results.

Finally, we have the problem of a potential contingent election. The present method is as unfair to the large states as the initial election is to the small states.

Under the district plan proportionate weight is returned to the larger states. Instead of voting by state in the House of Representatives, the election is by both the House and Senate, in joint session, with each member voting individually. This recognizes the valid arguments of the bigger states that they should have more authority in determining the outcome should the electoral vote be indecisive.

Before wrapping up the case for the Dis-

trict Plan, an explanation is perhaps due as to why this proposal, so simple and yet so effective, was not long ago adopted.

The answer is multiple. Much of it goes back to an inherent and correct tendency on the part of Americans to avoid changes, if at all possible, in the Constitution. In addition, there was the question of equity under the district system.

During Senate debate on Electoral College reform in the 84th Congress when we were able to obtain a majority vote for a variation of the District Plan, but not the necessary two-thirds required, the question was raised as to how equitable representative congressional districts, instead of some obviously gerrymandered and others unequally represented from a population standpoint, would be provided.

To meet this criticism, the amendment was later redrawn to provide for the establishment of electoral districts to be composed of "compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the states to one representative in the Congress."

Such language was, I believe, considered fair and acceptable by those who earlier had harbored some reservations as to the district system. Subsequently, however, doubts were raised as to the enforceability of this provision. From a practical viewpoint, the question was asked whether Congress would exercise its power to refuse to count the electoral votes not chosen in "compact and contiguous" districts.

Of far greater importance was the question of judicial enforcement. Serious doubts existed as to whether the judicial branch could, or should, accept jurisdiction of a case alleging malapportionment. The legal precedents on judicial enforcement of districting were not clear and, although many of us felt that by placing the provisions in the United States Constitution we had overcome this hurdle, the doubt remained, even among those who by this time believed that the revised system was a fair and acceptable method of reforming the electoral college.

On March 26, 1962, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its historic decision in *Baker vs. Carr*. The result, of course, was the important fact that the court held that legislative apportionment problems were within the jurisdiction of the federal courts, that a justifiable cause of action exists and that a voter within a district that is allegedly malapportioned has standing to challenge such an arrangement.

In the wake of its *Baker vs. Carr* opinion, the court has handed down additional decisions spelling out further what has come to be known as the "one man, one vote" principle. One of these subsequent decisions, and from a practical viewpoint the one that has had the greatest impact on the question of electoral college reform, was *Wesberry vs. Sanders* which was rendered on Feb. 19, 1964.

Not only was this the first instance in which the court applied the "one man, one vote" principle on a nation-wide basis, but the objects of its directives were the congressional districts rather than state legislative districts. In fact, whether the court has acted wisely in tampering with state and local apportionment is still open to serious question.

As a result of *Wesberry vs. Sanders*, however, great strides have been made over the last three years toward bringing congressional districts into line with "one man, one vote" standards. In addition, legislation has been introduced and is well on the way to passage, which would establish minimum population standards for House districts.

This clearly points out that the judicial and legislative branches have both accepted the proposition that congressional districts should be equal and equitable in composition. This situation will eventually allow the District Plan, in complete fairness, to evolve back to the original and simpler plan of using the concept of congressional districts.

Other plans, as I have indicated, have also been proposed. The one receiving the most publicity has been the direct election plan. In my estimation, this is worse than the present system.

In the first place, such a proposal is a direct attack on our federal system of government and if such a plan were ever adopted, it would mean we have reneged on a promise made to our forefathers, in particular those representing the smaller states.

When the Union was formed, the small states feared that the government would be dominated by the larger states. A compromise was reached whereby all states were guaranteed equal representation in the Senate regardless of size while the House of Representatives would be determined by population. This same guarantee and compromise was carried over to the allocation of electoral vote strength.

Adoption of a direct vote plan would wipe out this principle of equality of states. Federalism, which is still the cornerstone of our republican form of government, would be ignored.

Going hand in hand with this problem is the question of who supervises the election process if the states are ignored. If we are to be completely fair to citizens of all the states under a direct vote for President, the election laws and regulations should be uniform. The only body with jurisdiction to do this is the federal government.

In spite of denials by advocates of the direct vote plan, it is clear that by adopting it we would be setting ourselves on the road to complete federalization and centralization of our election machinery and process, a step many of us believe should not be taken.

In addition, the direct vote plan, as well as the proportional proposal, poses a threat to our traditional two-party system of government. By recognizing the votes cast for all minor parties, it will be impossible for any candidate to receive a majority and frequently difficult even to receive a 40 per cent plurality.

This is not only sows the seeds of multi-party government with all the drawbacks so familiar to the European system, but should a runoff election be necessary, it could be that the new President is not determined until December or even later, thus leaving him little time to select and form his administration.

In reality, arguments over the operation of a direct vote system are moot because it could never be adopted even if it were passed by Congress, which is also highly doubtful.

Simple arithmetic argues against ratification. Such a constitutional amendment would have to be approved by 38 state legislatures. Any 13 state legislatures could defeat ratification.

As an example of the problems faced by a direct election plan in the state legislatures, let me cite statistics from the 1968 election. Official returns now show that Massachusetts produced a majority of 792,379 votes for Hubert Humphrey. On the other hand, 17 states ranging in size from Alaska to Wisconsin all went decisively for Richard Nixon and yet their total majority for Nixon was only 691,156.

In practical political terms, this means that 17 states with an aggregate electoral vote of 84 would have their votes completely cancelled out by one state representing only 14 electoral votes. The legislatures of these 17 states and many others can recognize the fact that their influence would be diminished by a direct vote plan and for the most part, accordingly, would not vote for a constitutional amendment providing for a direct vote for President.

If we truly want reform, and I believe reform is needed, we must unite behind a plan that is practical and possible of being adopted. The only plan that fits that definition, in my estimation, is the District Plan.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON REPORTS ON THE NIXON INAUGURAL: A CALL TO PEACE AND GREATNESS

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the report on the inauguration of President Richard M. Nixon made recently by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON). In reporting on this historic event to his constituents, Mr. HORTON gives to all of us a vivid account of the full meaning of President Nixon's inaugural address.

The full report of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) is as follows:

THE NIXON INAUGURAL: A CALL TO PEACE AND GREATNESS

It was a moment which inevitably reminded one of the past while at the same time holding a summons to a greater role in the future.

To the thousands of people filling the Capitol Plaza and to the countless millions who watched the event on television, the inauguration of Richard M. Nixon as President was a truly majestic ceremony, one symbolizing our freedom and unity.

It was an event tied to the heritage of our country. It was a reassuring event giving evidence to the world that peaceful change—that quadrennial "revolution" envisioned by our Founding Fathers—was really possible.

Certainly the new President was keenly aware of this sense of history as he said: "I ask you to share with me today the majesty of this moment. In the orderly transfer of power, we celebrate the unity that keeps us free."

Mr. Nixon took the oath of office under strained circumstances. More than half the country had voted for other candidates. Both houses of Congress remained in the control of the opposition party.

His speech, however, went to the core of the problems facing us. His words set a course for the coming four years which could lead us out of a trouble period into a tranquil one.

In the historic place hallowed by the oaths of his predecessors, enshrined by the memories of national triumphs and tragedies, the new President sent forth a clear call to national unity, to the role of peacemaker.

The inaugural scene was one that with only a change in costume and principal figures could well have been the inaugural of Lincoln, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy—any of the 30 Presidents to take the oath at the east portico of the Capitol since Jackson.

The status of freedom surveyed the festive scene from her majestic throne atop the Capitol dome. Music and prayers were offered in the overcast January day. And the words of the new President were in the tradition of many great men who had taken that solemn oath at 45 previous inaugurations.

What President Nixon called "our summons to greatness" is a challenge to Americans to fulfill the promise of a free land to give its best to make life good, spiritually and physically for all citizens.

Reviewing the accomplishments of this century, the new President spoke of our advances into space, enormous strides in science, industry and agriculture and the sharing of our national abundance with the world community.

"Forces now are converging that make possible, for the first time, the hope that

many of man's deepest aspirations can at last be realized," the President told the nation. "The spiraling pace of change allows us to contemplate, within our own lifetime, advances that once would have taken centuries," he continued in an exciting forecast of the future's potential.

The times are on the side of peace, President Nixon said because, for the first time, the people of the world want peace and their leaders fear war.

In a moving summation of the problems besetting the land, the newly-inaugurated President said:

"We find ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit; reaching with magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord here on earth.

"We are caught in war, wanting peace. We are torn by division, wanting unity. We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment. We see tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them."

The problems constitute a crisis of the spirit, and call for an answer of the spirit, Mr. Nixon said.

He put into words the yearning for domestic and foreign peace that Americans feel so deeply.

It was a simple call to lower our voices so we can hear our words, for government to strive to listen in new ways to all its citizens, an appeal to help the disadvantaged, to build on the legacy of the past to solve the problems of today.

There was no turning away from the past. The President made that clear when he said: "As we reach toward our hopes, our task is to build on what has gone before—not turning away from the old, but turning toward the new."

But he did warn that we are approaching the limits of what government can do—that the time is coming for problems to be met by the energies of the government and the people working together.

"With these, we can build a great cathedral of the spirit—each of us raising it one stone at a time, as he reaches out to his neighbor, helping, caring, doing," the President said.

There was a beautiful dream, a possible dream, woven through the poetic phrases of the inaugural speech.

The President warned that no man can be fully free while his neighbor is not.

His dream was that of an open world—a world open to ideas, open to the exchange of goods and people, a world in which no people will live in angry isolation.

And there was that all-encompassing dream, the greatest dream, of peace.

The President's call for unity was a plea for peace. His challenge to find new answers to meet the old, burgeoning problems was a summons to making peace.

For peace was surely the theme of this inaugural speech.

Listen from time to time and ponder these words, heard first on the gray and chilled noontime at Capitol Plaza. These words are a challenge to bring out the very best in a good America:

"Let us take as our goal: where peace is unknown, make it welcome; where peace is fragile, make it strong; where peace is temporary, make it permanent."

JAMES P. GRIFFIN

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, for no less than 50 years James P. Griffin served on the staff of the House of Representatives. He was our Republican pair clerk

when he retired in 1961. Happily, we were able to express to him upon his retirement our appreciation of the efficiency with which he performed his duties. Flowers for the living are more meaningful than for those who have departed.

Jimmy Griffin is no longer with us. He died last week at the age of 75. I should like now to say for the Record what I was able to say to him personally at the time of his retirement, not only for myself but for the entire whip organization: "Well done, my true and faithful servant." There were many occasions when we were able to arrange a pair for an absent Member, thanks solely to Jim's diligence and thanks also to the high regard in which he was held by the Members on both sides of the political aisle.

All of us will miss Jim Griffin. Even though retired he more or less regularly visited Capitol Hill. He has now gone to his great reward, but he will live in the memory of all of us who were privileged to know him.

QUESTIONS RAISED ON QUALITY OF NATION'S DRINKING WATER

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on January 15, 1969, I inserted into the Record an article by David Peter Sachs, which appeared in the November issue of McCall's magazine and which contended:

One out of every two Americans is drinking water of unknown quality or water that will not measure up to federal standards.

Mr. Sachs went on to describe the substandard conditions of some of our public water supplies and included a table purporting to rate the water supplies of many American cities.

Since that time, a number of other publications have come across my desk, many of them relating to the efforts water suppliers are taking to assure our people have clean, safe, drinking water.

Also, I have received a copy of memorandum from Assistant Surgeon General Charles C. Johnson, Jr., to the State sanitary engineers, containing his observations on the Sachs article.

Mr. President, in an effort to assure that all sides of the discussion over drinking water are heard, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the memorandum from Dr. Johnson, a statement from the American Water Works Association, and an article in Nation's Cities, by Eric F. Johnson.

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

[From Nation's Cities]

LET'S TURN OUR WATER DEPARTMENTS INTO INDEPENDENT UTILITIES—NOW!

(By Eric F. Johnson)

Public water supply, no doubt because of well-publicized inadequacies of service during recent drought years, as well as some unfortunate criticism on its safety in a recent Presidential message, is being counted as one of the municipal problems constituting the urban crisis.

It shouldn't be!

Water supply can take care of itself if left to do so. Not only need it not be a municipal burden, but, freed to operate as a utility, it can contribute to alleviating the burden on the same dollar basis as do taxpaying utilities. Give us our heads, say water supply men to their city fathers, and we'll get off your backs.

Approximately 75 per cent of the nation's 20,000 water utilities are owned by municipalities or other government entities. These utilities differ from the regular departments of government in being revenue-producing, in performing a proprietary rather than a governmental function. Where this distinction is recognized, and to the extent that it is, water departments have found it possible to function as true utilities, developing a separate identity and sense of purpose.

The key to this recognition lies in requiring that water utilities be self-sufficient. As expressed in a 1965 policy statement of the American Water Works Association:

"AWWA believes that the interests of the public and of individual customers of water supply systems serving the public can be served best by self-sustained, utility type enterprises, adequately financed, and with rates to the public and customers based on sound engineering and economic principles designed to avoid discrimination between classes of, or individual customers."

Many cities have made such self-sufficiency mandatory through charter provisions or have otherwise established water utility funds as "sacred." Elsewhere, utilities have been required to operate on such a basis through revenue bonds. However, the effort is made, the kind of utility structure described by the association can, it feels, be realized only if two basic steps are taken:

(1) Adequate and equitable rates, based on metered use and necessary fixed charges, that will provide revenues sufficient to cover all operating, maintenance, and capital costs must be established. Such rate schedules, based on a proper analysis of costs would be designed to derive revenues from each customer class, including municipal users, in accordance with the cost of service to that class.

(2) Water utility funds must be segregated from other municipal funds, accounted for separately in accordance with a recognized system, and restricted in their use to water supply purposes. Such controls over the use of water utility funds would, of course, permit the payment of reasonable charges for services rendered to the utility by other municipal departments and the payment of municipal taxes or a contribution of a reasonable sum in lieu of taxes.

The management structure of water utilities varies widely. In many municipalities, the council votes directly on all utility policies, and, particularly in smaller communities, the mayor or city manager himself acts as the chief executive in their implementation. In some, the water utility manager under the mayor or city manager is responsible for carrying out policy. And in others the public works director or city manager is often interposed between the mayor and the water utility manager, integrating the water department into other city operations and making separation of functions and their costs more complicated. At the other extreme, many municipalities have delegated the authority for policy formation to an independent board, retaining only a few veto and appointive powers. There, of course, the chief executive is the water utility manager, responsible directly to the board.

Each of these management structures has its advantages. Under each of them can be found good examples of efficient, self-sufficient operation. Direct council control over the water department usually permits better coordination of its operations with those of other departments in the municipal family and, in the smaller community, a better ap-

plication of available manpower and equipment to priority tasks. On the other hand, from the viewpoint of providing the best water service to the community, the independent, nonpartisan board—particularly one that calls experienced business and professional men of the community into its service—has a considerable advantage.

Such a board, in addition to putting at the disposal of the utility more management talent than it can usually afford to hire, permits the staff to focus its full attention on the job at hand without concern as to the political implications of its operations. And just as the water utility manager is shielded by the board from political concerns, the council, too, is shielded by the board from immediate responsibility for politically unpopular policies (such as rate increases) in direct proportion to the amount of power it has delegated to the board.

A water department can be a water utility, but it too often isn't. In our special context, the difference between the water department and the water utility is the difference in approach to the overall business of supplying water service to the public.

The water department, as a member of the city family, has the job of keeping safe water running through the mains. Occasionally that is where its assignment ends. More often, though, it is called upon to read meters; sometimes to handle engineering; sometimes to take care of billing and collections. It has a job to do and it does it as well as it can be done with the facilities and men available. Its revenues go into the city treasury. When it needs new facilities or equipment, it asks the city for the necessary money. Its success or failure is not in its own hands.

The water utility, on the other hand, is responsible for its total performance. It is required to be self-sustaining. Its financial health depends directly upon the policies established by its own board and carried out by its own staff. It has an image of its own and its purpose is to provide the public all the water it needs, when and where it needs it, and to make that water not only safe, but of as high a quality as technology permits and its customers are willing to pay for.

Water utilities are not only willing, but anxious to meet the challenge of removing water supply from the list of urban problems. Their goal, as expressed through the American Water Works Association, is to provide "Better Water for Americans," to provide improved water service through water systems that are self-sustained and adequate to meet the growing needs of each community. Water utilities have not only accepted the minimum safety standards of the U.S. Public Health Service, but have established goals of quality far above these levels of potability. They feel that quality water service is a natural extension of the quality standard of living that all Americans now expect. And they believe that people can afford to pay for quality water service without subsidy—federal, state, or local. However much must be done to meet the quality goals in any community, the public's water bill will still be lower than any other utility bill it receives.

Weighted down as they are with worries over crime, housing, pollution control, schools, traffic, training the hard-core unemployed, and meeting the welfare bill, we would think that mayors, city managers, and other city officials would welcome the opportunity to give us our heads to get us off their backs!

[From the American Water Works Association]

QUALITY GOALS FOR POTABLE WATER

(Statement adopted by the Board of Directors on Jan. 28, 1968)

At the 1965 Annual Conference, the Water Quality Division voted to set up quality goals for potable water, and guidelines for the goals to be established were derived. These actions subsequently were approved by the Executive

Committee of the Association. An eleven-member task group [now the Committee on Water Quality Goals] was appointed, expanding the group of four that had previously been working in this area and had published a set of ideal criteria for water quality in the November 1962 *Journal*.¹

GUIDELINES

The Committee on Water Quality Goals was directed to set up realistic quality goals for the water industry—goals that would tend to raise the quality of the water delivered to the consumer by being at once in accordance with advanced thinking and amenable to being grasped by nontechnical personnel. They were not to be impractical objectives, even though they were to be substantially more exacting than existing USPHS Drinking Water Standards with respect to aesthetic qualities. They were to be generally attainable by correct application of known treatment processes and methods.

It was recognized that the goals should not be static, but should be reviewed, and revised if warranted, perhaps every 3 years. The water industry is constantly being faced with the problem of meeting rising esthetic demands. At the same time, because of increasing population and industrialization, the quality of water sources has deteriorated.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR APPLICATION

Public water utilities should adopt quality criteria against which they can gauge the effectiveness of their day-to-day operations. Managers of a given system must decide whether the cost of furnishing quality water is warranted. The expense of approaching or meeting the goals may be very high for some systems. For instance, removal of high dissolved-solids content or color may prove inordinately expensive. Management, then, has to weigh the value of the benefits to be derived against the cost of producing the finer quality water. It may conclude that consumers are satisfied with water meeting goals less rigorous than those recommended here.

The industry has accomplished much in the areas of water treatment, control, pumping, and delivery, but consumers judge quality at the tap, not at the source. Therefore, good consumer relations depend on maintaining high quality to the point of delivery. The goals stated herein are not merely for water entering the distribution system.

The definition of a functionally ideal water is as follows:

"Ideally, water delivered to the consumer should be clear, colorless, tasteless, and odorless. It should contain no pathogenic organisms and be free from biological forms which may be harmful to human health or esthetically objectionable. It should not contain concentrations of chemicals which may be physiologically harmful, esthetically objectionable, or economically damaging. The water should not be corrosive or incrusting to, or leave deposits on, water-conveying structures through which it passes, or in which it may be retained, including pipes, tanks, water heaters, and plumbing fixtures. The water should be adequately protected by natural processes, or by treatment processes, which insure consistency in quality."

The Committee on Water Quality Goals believes it should not set goals for items that primarily and principally concern health, but should defer to USPHS and the medical profession. With respect to toxic substances, the USPHS Drinking Water Standards provide very broad safety factors, and the committee generally accepts these standards. This eliminated from consideration such items as the following: Lead, barium, fluoride, arsenic, cyanide, silver, selenium, cadmium, chromium, nitrates and nitrites, radium, strontium, phenolic compounds, organic phosphorus, chlorinated hydrocarbons, boron, and uranyl ion.

Footnotes at end of article.

RATIONALE OF GOALS

Turbidity

Today's consumer expects a sparkling, clear water. The goal of less than 0.1 unit of turbidity insures satisfaction in this respect. There is evidence that freedom from disease organisms is associated with freedom from turbidity, and that complete freedom from taste and odor requires no less than such clarity. Improved technology in the modern treatment processes make this a completely practical goal.

Nonfilterable residue

Water should be free of observable suspended particles or residue after settling. The goal indicates a virtually suspension-free state.

Macroscopic and nuisance organisms

It is obvious that macroscopic organisms such as larvae, crustacea, and numerous algae that may affect appearance should not be present. Toxic organisms may affect appearance, taste, or odor, perhaps only after standing, heating, or freezing. They include, among others, the iron bacteria, sulfur bacteria, and slime growths.

Color

Because of difficulty in matching the colors of natural waters to the colors of standards, it is suggested that, when difficulty is encountered, a photometric transmittancy method should be employed. Color of less than 3 units will not be noticed, even in a filled bathtub, whereas color of 5 units may be noted by many. Fifty-five per cent of 102 interstate waters in 1961 showed color of less than 3 units.² For the 100 largest cities in 1962, the median color was reported as 2 units.³

Odor

Odor is a nebulous characteristic, difficult to quantify; agreement is seldom obtainable, as to the presence of odor or its character in a given potable water. The goal of water utilities should be elimination of all odor. The presence of odor is to be evaluated by difference before and after contact with carbon. Some materials may be removed by carbon only after treatment with a strong oxidant, which should be utilized when required to demonstrate the difference.

Taste

Taste is also a nebulous characteristic whose determination is complicated by the variability of perception of individuals from day to day. It is generally agreed that all potable waters do have some taste. If the taste is mild and not offensive in character, most individuals become accustomed to it. But water should be palatable to all; individuals first tasting any water should not be offended, and it should not be necessary that one become acclimated to the taste to regard it as characteristic of a good-quality water.

Aluminum

At levels exceeding 0.05 mg/l, precipitation may take place on standing, or in the distribution system. Turbidity and nonfilterable residue will be affected.

Iron

With an iron content exceeding 0.05 mg/l, some color may develop, staining of fixtures may occur, and precipitates may form. The magnitude of such phenomena are directly proportional to the concentration of iron in the water.

Manganese

In concentrations of only a few hundredths milligrams per liter, manganese will cause buildup of coatings in distribution piping, which slough off. It causes staining of laundry items in brown blotches and forms black precipitates objectionable to consumers.

Copper

Copper content of 0.5 mg/l, or less, in some soft waters, will cause staining of porcelain.

In 1961, of 163 interstate supplies, 70 per cent contained less than 0.2 mg/l of the 100 largest cities, 94 contained less than 0.1 mg/l.⁴

Zinc

In concentrations of 5 mg/l, a disagreeable taste may be noted. Zinc is undesirable in water passing through piping systems, as it may aid corrosion. The states of Ohio and North Dakota now limit zinc content to 1.0 mg/l. In 1961, of 163 interstate supplies, 45 per cent contained less than 1.0 mg/l.⁵

Filterable residue

Low dissolved-solids content is desirable, if one is to avoid precipitations in boilers or other heating units, to reduce sludge in freezing processes, and to reduce rings on utensils and precipitations on foods being cooked. The stated limit of 200.0 mg/l is in line with other goals stated herein.

Carbon-chloroform extract (CCE)

This goal is based on equipment design and procedures utilized by USPHS throughout the early 1960's. Other designs need correlation with such units to determine relative adsorption efficiency to determine equivalent goal values. Materials adsorbed on activated carbon are organic. Toxic substances recovered may include chlorinated insecticides, nitrates, nitrobenzenes, aromatic ethers, and many others. Tastes and odors often may be correlated with the amounts of chloroform-soluble materials present, these materials having excessive odor thresholds. Most of the chloroform-soluble materials derive from manmade wastes. Waters from sources remote from concentrated industrial activities or human populations usually show CCE concentrations less than 0.04 mg/l. Where concentrations of CCE of 0.2 mg/l are found, the taste and odor of the water is always poor.⁶ In 1961, USPHS found the average CCE in 139 cities to be 0.068 mg/l. In 1962-63, the average was 0.065 mg/l.⁷ In 1961, of 172 supplies, 48 showed less than 0.05 mg/l.⁸

Carbon-alcohol extract (CAE)

This requirement is supplementary to the preceding CCE. The proportion of materials most commonly found is roughly in the proportion indicated by the limits stated for the CCE and CAE. (See the comments on CCE.)

Methylene-blue-active substances

This classification replaces the designation of ABS previously in use. The change is required because of changes in composition of the new detergents. The analytic technique used determines not only ABS but also alkyl sulfates and related materials that react with methylene blue.

TABLE 1.—POTABLE WATER QUALITY GOALS¹

Characteristic	Goal	
	[Not a standard]	
	Physical factors	
Turbidity.....	Less than 0.1 unit.	
Nonfilterable residue.....	Less than 0.1 mg/l.	
Macroscopic and nuisance organisms.....	No such organisms.	
Color.....	Less than 3 units.	
Odor.....	No odor.	
Taste.....	No taste objectionable.	
	Chemical factors (measured in mg/l)	
Aluminum (Al).....	Less than 0.05.	
Iron (Fe).....	Do.	
Manganese (Mn).....	Less than 0.01.	
Copper (Cu).....	Less than 0.2.	
Zinc (Zn).....	Less than 1.	
Filterable residue.....	Less than 200.	
Carbon-chloroform extract (CCE).....	Less than 0.04.	
Carbon-alcohol extract (CAE).....	Less than 0.10.	
Methylene-blue-active substances (NBAS).....	Less than 2.0.	

TABLE 1.—POTABLE WATER QUALITY GOALS —Con.
(Not a standard)

Characteristic	Goal
Corrosion and scaling factors	
Hardness (as CaCO ₃).....	80 mg/l; a balance between deposition and corrosion characteristics is necessary; a level of 80 mg/l seems best, generally, considering all the quality factors; however, for some supplies, a goal of 90 or 100 mg/l may be deemed desirable.
Alkalinity (as CaCO ₃).....	Change of not more than 1 mg/l (decrease or increase in distribution system, or after 12 hr at 130 F in a closed plastic bottle, followed by filtration).
Coupon tests (incrustation and loss by corrosion)	90-day tests (incrustation on stainless steel not to exceed 0.05 mg/sq cm; loss by corrosion of galvanized iron not to exceed 5.00 mg/sq cm).
Bacteriologic factors	
Coliform organisms (by multiple-fermentation techniques).	No coliform organisms.
Coliform organisms (by membrane filter techniques).	Do.
Radiologic factors	
Gross beta activity.....	Less than 100 pc/l.

¹ For all health-related constituents not stated herein, these goals shall require complete compliance with all recommended and mandatory limits contained in current USPHS Drinking Water Standards. Unless other methods are indicated, analyses shall be made in conformance with the latest edition of Standard Methods of Examination of Water and Wastewater.

Hardness

It is not intended to imply that hardness of waters below 80 mg/l should be increased to that content when corrosion can be otherwise controlled. To the average water consumer, hardness of 80-100 mg/l is not objectionable. It is important that, whatever the goal chosen, the hardness should be maintained at a uniform level. Most important is the degree of stability attained. It has been fairly standard practice, for many years, to soften to roughly 5 grains or 85 mg/l hardness. The individual management, in choosing a standard, must consider that the higher the hardness, the greater the cost to individual consumers; the less the hardness unless corrected, the greater the corrosion tendencies, and the greater the relative cost for treatment.

Alkalinity

This goal is a measure of alkalinity decrease or increase in the distribution system, and also after 12 hr at 130°F in a closed plastic bottle, followed by filtration. This goal is a simple determination, indicating in a practical way that the alkalinity is stable. The maintenance of calcium carbonate stability is the most effective method of preventing corrosion action on iron water mains. Undersaturation will result in reactions causing iron pickup and development of red water. Oversaturation will result in carbonate deposition in utensils, water heaters, household piping, and even in water mains. The point of stability is quite variable in different waters, and even in water from a single source. Various methods have been utilized to determine the point of stability, including the Enslow stability indicator, the Langlier Index, the Ryznar Index, and Oxygen Depletion, the latter three covering only a few of the many chemical factors involved, none of which suffice in practice, being only hypothetical indicators.

Footnotes at end of article.

Coupon tests

Coupon insertion in pipelines is now the recognized method for checking on corrosion properties of vapors and gases. It has been used to a very limited extent in the field of water supply, where at least fifteen factors affect corrosivity. Coupons measure the combined effects both additive and neutralizing, of all the factors of corrosion, both known and unknown, including the physical factors of velocity and turbulence. Thus, coupons can provide valuable standards of comparison. Data on the use of coupons are still limited. Present data indicate levels should be those stated in Table 1 as goals. One design of coupon test equipment for water mains has been published.¹

Coliform organisms

Many water utilities have adopted high standards of operation and their water supplies have shown only a fraction of one coliform per liter over periods of many years. Municipalities that have so raised their bacteriologic quality far above the existing standards have established much improved health conditions with respect to certain significant illnesses, such as intestinal disturbances. Modern disinfection control procedures are such that a practical goal can be the destruction of all coliform organisms.

Gross beta activity

All evidence indicates the effects of radioactivity to be entirely harmful rather than beneficial. Therefore, it appears desirable to limit the intake of radioactivity as much as possible. A goal of 100 pc/l is well below the existing standards, yet it is several degrees above present-day general levels. In 1961, of 136 potable water supplies tested, 132 showed no more than 16 pc/l of 100 largest cities, 92 showed less than 20 pc/l in 1961.⁴ In periods of bomb testing, natural waters have shown double this content; however, in periods free of bomb detonations, the natural background in most areas is only about 10 pc/l, or one-tenth this goal.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Washington, D.C., November 20, 1968.

To: State Sanitary Engineers,
From: Administrator.

Subject: Public Water Supply
A number of comments from Congressmen, State and local officials and others on the article on Public Water Supplies, "Drink at Your Own Risk," which appeared in the November, 1968, issue of *McCall's* magazine have come to my attention. In an effort to clarify the position of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service with regard to this matter, I am pleased to take this opportunity to offer the following observations.

In April, 1968, a writer for *McCall's* approached representatives of the Public Health Service about a proposed article on the status of the Nation's water supplies. As an essential part of its research on the article, *McCall's* requested data on all interstate water supplies, including deficiencies. The requested data were provided. The information included a table showing supplies classified as provisionally approved, with the name, location, type of supply, and the section of the Drinking Water Standards which the supplies failed to meet. The special classifications of water supply systems which appeared in the magazine, however, were developed solely by the *McCall's* staff.

I would like to point out, to begin with, that we had asked *McCall's* to refrain from publishing the table of communities, not through any desire to withhold information but through concern over the possibility of inaccuracies. These tables of provisional water supplies are continually changing, with new communities being added periodically and others, having met our standards,

being removed. Thus, some communities on a provisional status when *McCall's* received the table last spring were back in good standing when the article was published in November. It was our understanding, in fact, that the table would not be used. We found out otherwise only after the magazine was out.

Our own staff also must share some criticism. Providing *McCall's* with the requested information entailed the abstraction of several hundred items of data from our files into a tabular presentation. Apparently two or three errors occurred in this process. I regret this, as I regret that the *McCall's* staff sometimes interpreted the data they were provided in a manner which was not always justified by the facts.

I do not for a moment want to minimize the serious embarrassment to all of us, and in particular to the State and local authorities involved, which results when such inaccuracies occur. Nevertheless, I feel that the *McCall's* article, taken in its entirety, represents a valuable service to the public and that its overall impact is to describe a serious national problem whose dimensions are not widely enough appreciated. In the long run, this article may well be beneficial to our common cause of working towards the creation of better and safer public water supplies throughout our Nation.

For many years, we have discussed among ourselves and our professional colleagues the urgent need for better public understanding of water supply problems and for more resources to step up our water supply programs. This discussion must go beyond the confines of our professional affiliations if we are to obtain the public support necessary to the accomplishment of our mutual goal. And if the discussion is to be meaningful, we must of necessity frankly admit that there are deficiencies in our respective areas of endeavor.

I think, too, that we must begin to plan and outline the programs that will be required to meet our responsibilities over the next few years. We must develop a better understanding of the health effects of trace minerals, organics, and biologics in water supplies as related to the total permissible body burden of these materials from all environmental sources. We must begin to develop the technology needed to economically remove contaminants from waters of marginal quality so that new sources can be used for public water supplies. We must develop systems to provide better data on public water supply quality and on the relationships between quality and health.

The full dedication and cooperation of all levels of government, combined with industry and other private institutions, will be required to bring our public water supply programs up to the levels of effectiveness we all recognize as necessary. Mr. Chris Hansen, Commissioner of the Environmental Control Administration, and I are counting on you and your colleagues in the States to contribute a major share to this effort.

One element which will be of major importance as we work together in the future is rapid and effective communication. Judging by the reaction to the *McCall's* article, it is apparent that some local officials were unaware of the data the States had supplied to the Public Health Service concerning the quality of local water supplies. I will ask Commissioner Hansen to take appropriate steps to improve communications between his administration and State and local authorities.

As another step in improving communications, I am asking the Director of Public Affairs in the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service to make certain that all public information specialists in CPEHS inform State agencies of the public release of any information which is apt to

have a direct impact on State programs. Moreover, the field organization of CPEHS will strive to insure that our Federal efforts in consumer protection and environmental health are carried out in the most effective manner in concert with State and local programs.

CHARLES C. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Assistant Surgeon General.

FOOTNOTES

¹BEAN, E. L. Progress Report on Water Quality Criteria. *Jour. AWWA*, 54: 1313 (Nov. 1962).

²TAYLOR, F. B. Effectiveness of Water Quality Criteria. *Jour. AWWA*, 54:1313 (Nov. 1962) (Oct. 1962).

³DURFOR, C. N. & BECKER, E. Selected Data on Public Supplies of the 100 Largest Cities in the United States, 1962. *Jour. AWWA*, 56:236 (Mar. 1964).

⁴Public Water Supplies of the 100 Largest Cities in the United States. USGS Water Supply Paper No. 1918. US Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (1962).

⁵Tentative Methods for Carbon Chloroform Extract (CCE) in Water. *Jour. AWWA*, 54:223 (Feb. 1962).

⁶Minutes of Advisory Committee on Use of USFHS Drinking Water Standards. Sep. 24-25, 1965.

PROGRAM INFORMATION ACT

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a master catalog containing all Federal-aid program information would provide a windfall to many communities throughout the Nation.

Over \$20 billion a year is spent by the U.S. Government for Federal aid, but there is no coordinated system to help guide communities to the funds. Under present conditions, it is almost impossible for any community to find out what Federal aid is available because of the duplication, redtape, and confusion that exists. A remedy must be found.

The solution to the frustrating problem is to consolidate all Federal assistance information. If this would be done, local, county, and State governments would know exactly what U.S. grants and loans can be obtained, what requirements have to be met, and how to apply for the aid.

Thanks to the brilliant work of our colleague, the gentleman from Delaware, WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., it has been revealed that the \$20 billion in Federal assistance involves more than 1,000 programs. Examples of overlapping and duplication are many. Representative ROTH, the chief sponsor of the proposed legislation, has cited many, but I will list only a few:

In the field of education, over 470 programs are operated by 25 different U.S. departments and agencies.

There are 112 programs that provide aid to the poor.

Seventy-four programs related to economic and business development.

Eight Cabinet units and 12 agencies take part in health programs.

Ten U.S. agencies in three departments direct manpower programs.

Such an appalling lack of consolidation and coordination must be corrected. I know that if the proposed Program Information Act is enacted, thousands of communities in the country would receive Federal grants amounting to many millions of dollars. These grants would enable thousands of projects to be started and completed that are now only in the planning stage.

As one of the many cosponsors of this measure and as a Member of the House, I commend Representative ROTH and his staff for this magnificent legislative contribution. I hope that every Member will join the other cosponsors and then vote for the proposed Program Information Act if it reaches the House floor.

The bill is one of the most practical and valuable ever introduced for helping local, county, and State governments and should be passed during the 91st Congress.

BROTZMAN URGES AUTHORIZATION FOR EAST SLOPE WATER DEVELOPMENT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year in the 90th Congress my colleague from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (Mr. ASPINALL) and I sponsored legislation to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a feasibility study of the Front Range unit of the Missouri River Basin project. Today the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) again has introduced this measure and I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor.

Basically, the Front Range unit study would consider the feasibility of constructing reservoirs and other facilities which would increase the supply of water for domestic and industrial use for such cities as Boulder, Longmont, Loveland, Fort Collins, Greeley, Estes Park, Broomfield, Lafayette, and Louisville, Colo.

The budget submitted to Congress on January 16, 1969, includes \$95,000 for such a feasibility study of the Front Range unit, subject, of course, to congressional authorization and appropriations.

As a nation, we are coming to the realization that our water resources are limited. We are realizing that it is not only possible, but probable that our industrial, agricultural, and domestic thirst will exhaust our supply of water, as we now know.

In my own State of Colorado, and other States of the West and Southwest, the limitation of water supplies has been recognized for decades. Small wars have been fought over the possession of irrigation water. Great court battles have been waged between States over water allocations. The States have been wracked, at times, by arguments between the urban and rural interests over who should have the precious water in times of drought.

Congressional action often has been required to assure full and equitable development of our western water resources. The 90th Congress, for example, will long be remembered, as the Congress which passed one of the landmark bills in the history of comprehensive water planning—the Colorado River Basin projects bill. It was my privilege to join with Members of both parties from Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and California in securing sufficient support for this legislation. As we all know, it passed without substantial opposition.

This act not only will benefit all of the States of the Southwestern United States, but the Nation as a whole will realize tremendous dividends. It would require pages to enumerate these national benefits, but I will mention two which are of towering importance.

The water requirement for eventual development of vast deposits of oil shale now seems assured. This will guarantee the national several centuries of plentiful carbon fuels and petrochemical by-products.

And vast new recreational areas will be developed, thanks to reservoirs which will be built, and roads which will be opened. The Nation has few more pressing requirements, insofar as its pursuit of a life of comfort and dignity for all of its citizens is concerned.

But important as the Colorado River Basin projects are, they concern only a portion of the water resources of the West. This landmark legislation had a direct bearing on the watersheds which ultimately channel into the Gulf of California. Meanwhile, other great river systems—some of them highly developed, some relatively undeveloped—must receive the attention of Congress in the years to come if we are to keep ahead of our great national thirst for water.

The Front Range unit, when completed, will facilitate the development and conservation of a portion of the water resources of the South Platte River Basin in Colorado.

This study would investigate a number of possible reservoir projects on Boulder, St. Vrain Creeks, and the Cache la Poudre River. Augmentation possibilities, improved re-use techniques for cutting losses from seepage and evaporation in existing canals, would be examined.

Flood control benefits to be derived—while a secondary consideration—would be defined.

The water supply problems facing the communities of northeastern Colorado are severe.

For example, despite extensive and expensive water supply facilities installed over the years by the two principal cities of Boulder County—Boulder and Longmont—the Bureau of Reclamation says their water requirements are assured for no more than 15 years. And 15 years is a very short span in the context of city planning.

The Bureau of Reclamation also indicates that three of the smaller communities of Boulder County—primarily Broomfield, Lafayette, and Louisville—probably will need additional water within 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I think the final paragraph of the conclusions in a reconnaissance report released by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1967 summarizes the situation with unusual terseness and clarity. The report said:

The reconnaissance investigation of water resource development in the St. Vrain Creek basin reveals that full development in the St. Vrain Creek basin, coupled with water resources development plans for the Cache la Poudre River . . . will not suffice to meet the increasing demands of Boulder, Longmont, Ft. Collins, Estes Park and Loveland. It is apparent that full utilization of Eastern Slope sources, complemented by additional sources from outside the basin, will be needed to serve demands by 1995.

The report then recommended that:

Feasibility studies be initiated at the earliest possible date to determine the most economical source of water to supply the needs of these Eastern Slope communities directed toward determining the most economic and desirable order of development to keep pace with water needs.

The next move, Mr. Speaker, will be up to Congress. It is my hope that we can assist the dynamic and growing communities of my district and adjacent areas by authorizing the feasibility study which is so urgently needed.

ANTISMUT BILL

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I believe will be very effective in keeping pornographic material out of the hands of minors and in keeping minors away from obscene movies, because it is patterned after a State statute that the Supreme Court has upheld. Under this legislation, it would be a violation of Federal law to knowingly sell, offer for sale, loan, deliver, distribute, or provide to a minor in interstate commerce or through the mails material which is defined as "harmful to minors" under the bill. It would further be a Federal crime under my bill to knowingly exhibit to a minor a motion picture, show, or presentation which falls in the "harmful to minors" category.

For some time the Supreme Court has recognized that "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press." In April of last year the Supreme Court held in *Ginsberg v. New York* (390 U.S. 629), that a New York statute was constitutional which prohibited the sale to persons under 17 years of age of materials defined to be obscene to them even though the same material might not be obscene to adults. My new bill is patterned after the New York statute which was upheld in *Ginsberg*. It would appear from the Court's decision that this approach to the problem of keeping smut out of the hands of our youth would be held constitutional.

The Congress has the power under the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce. That is what this bill would do,

and I do not believe any constitutional freedoms are being violated.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would further remove the appellate jurisdiction or the factual issue of harmfulness to minors, that is, whether a particular material or movie is "harmful to minors" as defined by the bill. What might be considered "harmful to minors" in some areas might not be considered such in other areas. I believe it would be beneficial to permit varying decisions on this point in the district courts, and the Congress is within its constitutional powers in so limiting the appellate jurisdiction.

The flow of smut material to our youth is reaching alarming proportions. Our youth must be protected. With our modern means of communications and transportation, it is almost impossible for parents to keep this type of material out of the hands of their children. Pornographic movies and obscene material can lead to antisocial behavior among our young people, and contributes to juvenile delinquency and all types of sordid behavior. Examples of this degeneracy are found in national magazines and other periodicals and films.

I am hopeful that committee action can soon be taken on this proposal so that the youth can be protected from the ever-increasing smut traffic in this country.

A copy of the legislation with the co-sponsors follows:

H.R. 5171

A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of eighteen years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1466. Exposing minors to harmful materials

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly—

"(1) to sell, offer for sale, loan, or deliver in interstate commerce or through the mails to any minor—

"(A) any picture, photograph, drawing, sculpture, motion picture film, or similar visual representation or image of a person or portion of the human body which depicts nudity, sexual conduct, or sadomasochistic abuse and which is harmful to minors; or

"(B) any book, pamphlet, magazine, printed matter however reproduced, or sound recording which contains explicit and detailed verbal descriptions or narrative accounts of sexual excitement, sexual conduct, or sadomasochistic abuse and which, taken as a whole, is harmful to minors, or

"(2) to exhibit to a minor a motion picture, show, or other presentation which—

"(A) has moved in interstate commerce or through the mails,

"(B) depicts nudity, sexual conduct, or sadomasochistic abuse, and

"(C) is harmful to minors.

"(b) Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both for the first offense, and shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both, for any second or subsequent offense.

"(c) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'minor' means any person under the age of eighteen years.

"(2) The term 'nudity' means the showing

of the human male or female genitals, public area, or buttocks with less than a full opaque covering, the female breast with less than a fully opaque covering of any portion below the top of the nipple, or the depiction of covered male genitals in a discernibly turgid state.

"(3) The term 'sexual conduct' means acts of masturbation, homosexuality, sexual intercourse, physical contact with a person's clothed or unclothed genitals, public area, or buttocks, or, in the case of a female, physical contact with her breast.

"(4) The term 'sexual excitement' means the condition of human or female genitals in a state of sexual stimulation or arousal.

"(5) The term 'sadomasochistic abuse' means flagellation or torture by or upon a person clad in undergarments, a mask, or bizarre costume, or the condition of being fettered, bound, or otherwise physically restrained on the part of one so clothed.

"(6) The term 'harmful to minors' means that quality of any description or representation, in whatever form of nudity, sexual conduct, sexual excitement, or sadomasochistic abuse, which—

"(A) predominantly appeals to the prurient, shameful, or morbid interest of minors;

"(B) is patently offensive to prevailing standards in the adult community as a whole with respect to what is suitable material for minors; and

"(C) is utterly without redeeming social importance for minors.

"(7) The term 'knowingly' means having general knowledge of, or reason to know, or a belief or ground for belief which warrants further inspection or inquiry of—

"(A) the character and content of any material described in subsection (a) which is reasonably susceptible of examination by the defendant, and

"(B) the age of the minor."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item: "1466. Exposing minors to harmful materials."

Sec. 2. (a) The Supreme Court shall not have jurisdiction under section 1252 or 1253 of title 28, United States Code, to review any determination made under section 1466 of title 18, United States Code, that any material described in subsection (a) of that section is harmful to minors.

(b) The courts of appeal shall not have jurisdiction under section 1291 or 1292 of title 28, United States Code, to review any determination made under section 1466 of title 18, United States Code, that any material described in subsection (a) of that section is harmful to minors.

Sec. 3. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

COSPONSORS

Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. BARING, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEWINSKI, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. HOSEMER, Mr. KING, Mr. KYL, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. POAGE, Mr. RABICK, Mr. SCHNEBELI, Mr. SIKES, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. WOLFF).

PROBE OF "PUEBLO" SEIZURE NOW IN ORDER

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include two editorials which appeared in the Chicago Daily News and the Chicago Tribune regarding the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

I have personally forwarded a request to the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a complete investigation of the entire matter since there are circumstances surrounding the seizure and subsequent release of its crew, and more recently the naval court of inquiry proceedings which need to be clarified.

I am in wholehearted accord with the views expressed in both of these editorials, and I believe that the vast majority of the people of my district and the country share this position.

The two editorials follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News]

THE "PUEBLO": SITTING DUCK

The more we hear of Comdr. Lloyd M. Bucher's testimony, the greater grows the mystery of how the U.S. Navy could have put one of its own ships in the situation of the *Pueblo*. A sitting duck with a broken wing would have had a better chance.

The *Pueblo*, a merchant ship refitted for reconnaissance and surveillance purposes, had no defensive armament worth mentioning. It was once to have had 3-inch guns, but it was decided their weight would swamp the ship. Instead, it got two 50-caliber machineguns—about as useful as BB guns.

Comdr. Bucher said that he had considered the possibility of capture, and had written a letter to the Navy Department proposing that some kind of destruct system be installed in the electronics and cryptographic areas of the ship. The proposal was rejected, and when the time came he was left to do the job with axes and hammers.

At Pearl Harbor on the way to his station, Bucher said, he inquired what would happen if his virtually unarmed ship came under attack. He was told that both the Navy and Air Force had "plans to react," but that in the event of general war he could look for no air assistance. He got none.

Comdr. Bucher said that he had not told his crew they could expect no air support because he didn't want to give them additional concern. One wonders what the luckless crewmen were told when they were assigned to the *Pueblo*. In all the circumstances, there was about as hazardous duty as the Navy affords. As for Bucher, he was told the risks were considered "minimal"—and one wonders by what tortured logic that conclusion was reached.

At any rate all such calculations went out the porthole when the U.S.S. *Pueblo* suddenly found itself surrounded by North Korean vessels bristling with guns big enough to blast the *Pueblo* out of the water and fast enough to make escape impossible.

In the circumstances, Comdr. Bucher seems to have done what he could: He took evasive action as the enemy commenced firing, and directed the destruction of classified material. Bucher himself was wounded, but remained in command until he judged further resistance futile, and surrendered.

The evidence is not yet complete, of course. But Sen. Richard B. Russell of the Senate Armed Services Committee had heard enough this week to remark that the testimony indicates "a tragic mixture of errors," and to say that if the testimony holds up, "then someone higher up in the line of command has been guilty of a very grave dereliction of duty."

We trust that the subject will be pursued until the truth is known.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune]

WHO SHOULD BE TRIED BY COURT MARTIAL?

The investigation of the capture of the intelligence ship *Pueblo* by North Korean

Communists opened with testimony by Comdr. Lloyd M. Bucher, the ship's captain, who spent 11 months in captivity with 82 shipmates. His story bears some distressing parallels to the disaster at Pearl Harbor more than 27 years ago, and again we have the distinct impression that responsibility rests, not with the forces on the scene, but with higher authority in Washington.

Capt. Bucher was given an old merchant ship for conversion to an intelligence-gathering vessel. He made repeated requests to the chief of naval operations for improvements, especially a system to destroy the radar, sonar, and sophisticated electronic equipment aboard on short notice. He was denied all such requests on grounds of time and money.

His armament consisted of two mounted .50-caliber machine guns which were difficult to bring to combat readiness and were manned by less than skilled gun crews. There were 17 other hand weapons aboard.

To destroy confidential documents, he was supplied with an incinerator which was not fuel-fed. It could consume paper only after it had been shredded, and this could not be achieved rapidly under emergency conditions. There was no mechanical means of scuttling the ship. The only way to admit water to the hull was thru two water cooling pipes, and if the ship had been flooded in this manner it would have taken up to two and one-half hours to sink.

Finally, when Comdr. Bucher was assigned to intelligence scanning in international waters off a hostile coast, he was informed that no help from American aircraft could be expected in the event of attack. He agreed with the navy court that the chances of other forces coming to his aid were virtually nonexistent.

The *Pueblo* was taken with scant resistance while crew members used fire axes and sledge hammers—all that were available to them—in an attempt to destroy secret equipment. The ship has remained in communist custody ever since its seizure.

Certainly even this early in the hearing, conducted before five admirals, it is apparent that there were glaring faults of omission in preparing the *Pueblo* for a hazardous reconnaissance mission. Inasmuch as the captain had endeavored with all the force at his command to obtain remedial action before putting to sea, the fault rests in Washington with the naval command.

ALL ACTIVITIES OF MANKIND ARE DEPENDENT UPON THE MINING INDUSTRY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished men in the mining industry of California is Mr. Lee Rowland who has served for many years as a mining engineer. At the age of 84, Mr. Rowland's interest in this industry, which is truly critical to this Nation's survival, remains active and aggressive. He continues his mining operations and is also the energetic national president of the Western Mining Council, an organization of mining industry spokesmen who are promoting the mining industry.

Throughout his career, Mr. Rowland has given many speeches and written many papers in fighting to preserve the

legitimate mining activity in the Western States. Those of us who have worked with him know that this is an uphill battle but it is a battle which must be fought if this Nation is to remain free and strong. One of the major problems that we face in fighting for the mining industry is the lack of realization among the people of our Nation as to just how dependent we all are on minerals.

Mr. Rowland, who I am proud to say comes from Mariposa, Calif., a community in the heart of the mother lode mining area, which I represent here in Congress made an excellent presentation on this very issue summing it all up with the title: "All Activities of Mankind are Dependent Upon the Mining Industry."

ALL ACTIVITIES OF MANKIND ARE DEPENDENT UPON THE MINING INDUSTRY

Abraham Lincoln's message to the miners of the western states, given to Schuyler Colfax who was preparing to leave for the Pacific Coast the day Lincoln was assassinated, was: "I want you to take a message from me to the miners whom you visit. I have very large ideas of the mineral wealth of our nation. I believe it is practically inexhaustible. Tell the miners for me that I shall promote their interests to the utmost of my ability; because their prosperity is the prosperity of the nation, and we shall prove in a very few years that we are indeed the treasury of the world." Lincoln was a thinking person.

As guest speaker at a mining meeting in Sacramento, California, in the early nineteen thirties, Governor Stephens opened his address with the following statement—"There are only two basic industries; they are Mining and Agriculture. We might exist without mining but we would return to savagery almost over-night. When these two basic industries are in a healthy condition our economy is in a healthy condition."

Without mining there would not, and could not be either industrial prosperity of any kind of progress of, by or for the human race.

In order to verify the foregoing irrefutable statements it is perhaps necessary to present at least a partial analysis in considerable detail with reference to the various phases of man's activities, but first let it be thoroughly understood that it is the Mining Industry which produces the many and various types of minerals and metals used in all industrial activities of the human race.

Transportation: Transportation is one of the most important of our daily needs and activities, yet if it were not for the iron, lead, zinc, copper, aluminum and other minerals produced by mining, there would not, and could not be the hundreds of thousands of automotive vehicles, nor the highways over which they travel. It would be interesting to know the number of persons traveling the highways in an automobile who have ever realized that if it were not for the mining industry they would have neither the automobile nor the highway. There would be no iron for the construction of the body and the manufacture of springs, various gears, engine, drive shaft, wheels and other parts of automotive vehicles; no lead, zinc, copper and aluminum for batteries, wiring, trim, etc., and there would be no bulldozers, graders, compressors, drilling equipment or transportation equipment with which to build and maintain the thousands of miles of highways.

There would be no airborne equipment of any type for transportation of passengers or materials and supplies.

There would be no locomotives, railroad cars or the rails upon which trains travel;

there would not and could not be any ocean going vessels such as passenger ships, freight carrying ships, warships or any other type of ship or boat and no bridges over streams or other bodies of water because all are completely dependent upon the removal of various minerals and metals from the earth by the Mining Industry.

Communication: Communication facilities of all kinds would not and could not exist (as we know them) because there would be no printing presses or paper to use in connection with the presses; no telephone or telegraph equipment; no radio or television sending stations or receiving equipment and no transportation for the distribution of newspapers and other printed material. There would not be the thousands of Post Offices throughout the nation and no buildings, equipment, material and supplies for the processing, handling and delivery of any kind of mail. All are dependent upon the minerals and metals produced by the Mining Industry.

Farming and other agricultural industries: All agricultural products are very important and necessary in connection with the existence, activities and progress of mankind, yet those products are dependent upon the minerals and metals produced by the Mining Industry and without which there would not be the necessary tools, equipment and facilities to carry on such operations. There would be no farming and other agricultural tools and equipment such as hoes, rakes, plows, harrows, mowing machines, cultivating equipment, tractors, trucks, grain and food processing and packaging equipment; no wire or other materials used for fencing; no gardening or lawn tools or equipment and no saws, axes, sawmills, stackers and other equipment for the production and processing of lumber and other wood products, in fact there would be no lumbering industry as we know it.

Food processing: There would be no fruit or other harvesting equipment, processing, canning or bottling facilities and equipment and no refrigeration equipment for the processing of food—and no transportation or labeling equipment for distribution and labeling.

Educational institutions: There would be no educational institutions, buildings or equipment and facilities such as printed books, writing instruments or material, typewriters, adding machines and other equipment, even the desks and tables.

Household appliances and equipment: There would be no household appliances or equipment of any kind, electrical or otherwise, such as washing machines, wringers, irons, vacuum cleaners, cook stoves, heaters, motors, tableware, crockery, organs, piano, and all other types of musical instruments, television or radio equipment, furniture of any kind or type, clocks, refrigerators, wiring for bringing in electricity for lighting and appliance and equipment operation, or any and all other household items used by mankind.

Clothing: There would be no clothing garments including buttons and shoe laces, shoes, hats or other wearing apparel, articles of personal adornment including watches and jewelry of all kinds—all are either manufactured by equipment constructed from, or made of the minerals and metals produced and made available by the Mining Industry.

Sports and recreation: There would be no stadium for field or other sporting events such as baseball, football, hockey, tennis and the Olympic Games or other types of sports as we know them including hunting and fishing. No golf balls, baseballs or bats, hockey sticks and pucks or the type of protective clothing worn by the players, and no ice or roller skates. No guns of any kind for hunting or target shooting and no fishing poles, reels, lines or other equipment and again—no transportation to hunting and fishing locations or crossing the ocean or

flying to various sports festivals. There would be no equipment or facilities for extinguishing fires in the National Forests or recreational areas.

Mining: Even the Mining Industry itself could not function without the use of picks, shovels, mine cars and rails, drills, pumps and drilling equipment, hoisting equipment, underground mucking machines, ventilating pipe and fans, ore treatment plants, trucks, assaying chemicals, equipment and supplies, explosives and all other types of equipment, appliances, material and supplies used in connection with mining activities which are purchased throughout the United States—and all of which are dependent upon the Mining Industry. Some of the minerals and metals are being used faster than they are being produced. This applies to gold especially which cannot be mined at a profit at a fixed price of \$35.00 per ounce, made mandatory during 1934.

To sum up the foregoing irrefutable facts—there is not a single manufactured article that would be available for our use if it were not for the Mining Industry, therefore, the stability of our national and world economy and all the progress that has been made, or ever will be made by the human race—even the discovery of America—has been and will continue to be completely dependent upon the extraction and processing of the minerals and metals from the mineralized deposits of the earth by the Mining Industry no matter what type of governmental setup—Capitalistic, Republic, Communist, Socialist or whatever.

Has the reader thought about this matter while enjoying the luxuries, comfort, travel, recreational pursuits and the fact that it is not at all impractical so far as time is concerned—to live in San Francisco and work in Los Angeles as compared with ferry boat transportation from Oakland to San Francisco during the early nineteen hundreds?

Is it too much to hope that thinking people may lend their support to those of us who are selfishly endeavoring to protect the rights of legitimate mining claim holders and the Mining Industry from the harassment of government employees of the people and other organizations that have no concern for the importance and necessity of the Mining Industry?

In conclusion let me say that the necessities in our everyday activities made available by mining is of basic importance and the vital concern of every individual, not just to those of us engaged in or connected with mining or other extractive operations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON NIGERIA-BIAFRA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of 87 cosponsors of the concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should act to increase significantly the amount of surplus food stocks and relief moneys for the assistance of civilians affected by the Nigerian-Biafran conflict, I wish to support passage of the proposed resolution through the following remarks.

THE RELIEF PROBLEM

The area in Nigeria requiring relief includes the former eastern region, which proclaimed itself the Republic of Biafra in May 1967, and certain areas of the

midwest state. Best estimates available indicate that at least 4.5 million, and perhaps as many as 10 million people are affected by the conflict. Reports from relief experts on the scene vary, but it is clear that vast numbers of civilians have been dying daily, particularly children afflicted by malnutrition.

As a result of the worldwide relief response, a large-scale relief effort has been operating under the supervision of the International Committee of the Red Cross—ICRC—in cooperation with other international relief agencies. Observers have noted a decline in infant mortality due to the influx of protein foods, but it is now feared that local carbohydrate foods are being exhausted, which will lead to an intensification of the disaster.

THE RELIEF EFFORT

In the areas under the control of the Federal Government, food, medicine, and other relief supplies are stockpiled in and being distributed from Zagos, Enugu, Calabar and Agbor. Most of the supplies for Biafra are being stockpiled on the offshore islands of Fernando Po and Sao Tome for delivery by airlift.

As of the first of January, relief supplies reaching Biafra totaled 3,000 to 4,000 tons per month. There are approximately 260 relief personnel representing the ICRC and other relief organizations in Biafra. The ICRC estimates that it is feeding 850,000 persons in Biafra through its airlift from Fernando Po and 800,000 persons in areas under Federal Government control. Additionally, joint church aid, a group of religious organizations including Caritas and Church World Service, have delivered considerable supplies of food into Biafra from Sao Tome and estimate they are feeding approximately 400,000 people in Biafra.

The United States has thus far made about two-thirds of the global contribution for relief in Nigeria-Biafra. As of January 1, the U.S. Government has donated a total of \$22.6 million in cash and surplus food commodities. Of this total, \$5.9 million in cash has been provided to the International Red Cross. A major part of the U.S. Government contribution to the ICRC is used for the chartering of aircraft for the airlift to Biafra. On December 27 the U.S. Government announced that it was making available for the airlift to Biafra four surplus C-97B cargo aircraft to the ICRC and an additional four to the American voluntary agencies participating in joint church aid.

Of the total U.S. Government contribution, \$15.6 million in surplus food—dried milk, bulgur wheat, and high-protein blended food products totaling over 51,000 tons—have been donated to voluntary relief agencies. The Catholic Relief Services is receiving \$5.6 million of these foods; UNICEF, \$6.2 million; Church World Service, \$3.6 million; and World Food Program, \$161,000. The U.S. Government also has paid overseas transport costs of the relief supplies donated by accredited American voluntary agencies.

The private American voluntary organizations have made substantial donations of food and other supplies totaling more than \$4.1 million as of January 1 on behalf of the relief effort.

THE RELIEF IMPASSE

Despite proposed safeguards, the Biafrans have consistently opposed the surface relief corridors the Federal Military Government has offered. Most observers view surface transport as the only means of conveying adequate supplies to the needy in Biafra. The Federal Government was initially opposed to the air corridors preferred by the Biafrans because of concern that they would be used to bring in military supplies as well. In September the Federal Military Government made a temporary agreement with the ICRC for regular daylight airlifts but the Biafran authorities refused to accept last.

The most recent example is 500 tons of foods collected in the New York area and loaded aboard the Norwegian freighter *Forra* on January 12. In addition, the *Forra* will carry 347 tons of goods and medicines from Israel, Britain, and the Netherlands as well as 2,000 more tons of food donated by CARE, and the National Catholic Welfare Organization to Sao Tome. The food and medicines will then be flown to Biafra.

In early November the Federal Military Government told the ICRC that it would agree to daytime relief flights to Uli if no arms flights occur at the same time. The Biafran authorities responded that daytime flights could occur only if the relief agencies created an airstrip to receive them. If both parties continue to disagree over badly needed air and surface relief corridors, one of the most terrible famines in modern times appears inevitable.

On January 13 the International Committee of the Red Cross hinted it would have to consider ending its relief work in Nigeria should it continue to be prevented from aiding Biafra. A week before, the ICRC halted its airlift to Biafra because Equatorial Guinea banned the carrying of motor fuel on the ICRC planes. The ICRC is now negotiating with Caritas, the Roman Catholic International Aid Organization, to fly in the fuel needed for Red Cross trucks as a stopgap solution.

U.S. POLICY

Because humanitarian, political, and military factors are interwoven, it has been the policy of the U.S. Government to avoid political-military involvement by channeling support for the international relief effort through the nonpolitical ICRC and those agencies, including UNICEF, operating under its aegis. Both the Federal Government of Nigeria and the Organization for African Unity—OAU—have taken the position that all international relief efforts should be coordinated through the ICRC.

The feasibility and probable effectiveness of a possible referral of the problem to the U.N. General Assembly has been strongly influenced by the views of the Secretary General and the African states that the matter should continue to be dealt with by the OAU under chapter VIII of the U.N. Charter. If the Assembly were prepared to take up the matter, it has been U.S. policy that the United States would cooperate fully in seeking U.N. action.

No political consideration is of greater importance than the prevention of

wholesale famine in Nigeria. Former President Johnson consistently backed efforts by the OAU and the ICRC to bring about agreement on the opening of land and air relief corridors to the needy in Biafra. He has appealed to the parties to set aside the political issues of the war in the interest of reaching agreement on relief. The former President publicly backed the December 21 appeal to both sides by the Emperor of Ethiopia for a 7-day truce.

CONCLUSION

On September 10, 1968, President Nixon stated:

Until now efforts to relieve the Biafran people have been thwarted by the desire of the Central Government of Nigeria to pursue total and unconditional victory and by the fear of the Ibo people that surrender means wholesale atrocities and genocide. But genocide is what is taking place right now—And starvation is the grim reaper. This is not the time to stand on ceremony and to go through channels or to observe the diplomatic niceties. . . . The destruction of an entire people is an immoral objective, even in the most moral of wars. It can never be justified, it can never be condoned. . . . The time is long past for the wringing of hands about what is going on. While America is not the world's policeman, let us at least act as the world's conscience in this matter of life and death for millions.

With only 200 tons of food a day reaching a people whose minimum relief needs are estimated at 2,000 tons a day, it is obvious that much needs to be done. I believe that the United States must find a way to bring relief to those in need without directly involving our country in the war itself.

Thus, as a cosponsor of this concurrent resolution, I call upon the President to significantly increase U.S. relief assistance to Nigeria-Biafra.

By passing the proposed concurrent resolution, the Congress will give public support to increased Presidential efforts to meet the human needs of those caught in the Nigeria-Biafra conflict.

SAFETY FIRST CLUB'S YEAR-ROUND DRIVE TO TRIM TRAFFIC TOLL

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Safety First Club of Maryland, a citizens' organization crusading for safety on our streets and highways, has established an excellent record for itself during the past 12 years. Headquarters of the group are located in Baltimore, Md.

With the Safety First Club now preparing for its 13th anniversary, it is fitting to call attention, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the work of this fine group, as described in an article originally published in the Baltimore Beacon of January 1969:

SAFETY FIRST CLUB'S YEAR-ROUND DRIVE TO TRIM TRAFFIC TOLL

The Safety First Club of Maryland, founded February 13, 1956, by J. O. Shuger, Past President (1956-62), and Maurice E. Shochatt, Executive Vice-President, crusades for safety on our streets and highways.

The Safety First Club is now making preparations to mark its 13th anniversary on February 13, 1969, the exact date of its founding.

The prominence of the leaders from various walks of life affiliated with the organization, the traffic authorities who serve as members of the Advisory Board, the traffic safety statutes to which the organization lent its efforts prior to their adoption, the calibre of speakers who address the club meetings—all indicate that the Safety First Club of Maryland has played a leading role in Maryland's traffic safety sphere for over a dozen years.

OFFICERS

President: Bernard Potts.
Executive Vice-President: Maurice R. Shochatt.

Senior Vice-President: David Gordon.
First Vice-President: Philip Kershner.
Second Vice-President: W. A. Duffy.
Third Vice-President: Benjamin G. Caplan.
Treasurer: Samuel Matz.
Assistant Treasurer: Morris Lasover.
Counsel: Sidney B. Needle.
Chairman of Administrative Board: Maurice Cardin.

Vice-Chairman of Administrative Board: Dr. Stanley Z. Felsenberg.
Chairman of Executive Committee: J. O. Shuger.

Vice-Chairman of Executive Committee: S. Sylvan Farber.

Chairman of Board of Trustees: William J. Ryan.
Vice-Chairman of Board of Trustees: Paul Huddles.

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD

Philipp Baron.
Postmaster Warren M. Bloomberg.
Paul Caplan.
Sydney H. Cohen.
Calvin C. Eilsenberg.
Leon Finglass.
Mitchell Gould.
Jule Greenspun.
Jerome I. Gulack.
Richard G. Hunter.
Harvey C. Kasoff.
Herbert S. Kasoff.
Paul Kemper.
Dr. Leo Klein.
Herbert H. Levy.
Byron Millenson.
Bernard Morton.
Judge Joseph I. Paper.
Allen Quille.
Delegate Richard Rynd.
Milton Schwartz.
I. Marshall Seidler.
Norman R. Shor.
Judge Edgar P. Silver.
Delegate Allen B. Spector.
Milton A. Stuck.
Paul Tatelbaum.
Stanley S. Ullman.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Edward Borow.
Delegate Benjamin L. Cardin.
Jerome S. Cardin.
Delegate Isaiah Dixon, Jr.
Judge Paul A. Dorf.
Reuben Fedderman.
Robert J. Footlick.
Cong. Samuel N. Friedel.
Senator Carl Friedler.
Richard W. Goswellen.
R. Harry Harris.
Delegate Leonard S. Jacobson.
John D. Leak.
Morton Levinstein.
Dr. Louis M. London.
Daniel Needle.
Mose Ottenheimer, 2nd.
Theodore J. Phillips.
Robert A. Pinkner.
Charles W. Purcell.
Sylvan H. Sack.
Joseph E. Sallee.
David Seidman.
Rube Shofer.

Senator Melvin A. Steenberg,
U.S. Marshal Frank Udoff.
Al Weinstein.

Phillip Wilton.

Among its various activities, the Safety First Club of Maryland:

Received a National Safety Council Trophy in 1959 "for outstanding contributions to traffic safety." This was a national award limited to the Safety First Club and 10 other organizations throughout the entire country.

Received a Certificate of Appreciation from the National Safety Council and the Advertising Council "in grateful appreciation for help given in the 1960 Stop Accidents Campaign . . . A campaign designed in the public interest to save lives and thereby make America a safer place in which to live."

The Safety First Club campaigned for several years for the adoption of a statute specifying that Driver Education courses be offered in Maryland's public high schools. Bill was approved by Maryland Legislature and signed by Governor Tawes on April 24, 1961. Governor Tawes subsequently declared: "The major credit for the adoption of the Driver Education bill belongs to the Safety First Club of Maryland because of its inspired leadership and vigorous and effective campaigning for this safety education measure."

Since its inception twelve years ago, the Safety First Club of Maryland has worked diligently for the adoption of traffic safety legislation to help reduce accidents on our highways. The organization has advocated:

Employment of Meter Maids.

Point System.

Seat Belts.

Reflectorized motor vehicle tags.

Installation of devices on motor vehicles to eliminate air pollution from this source.

Adoption and enforcement of a Pedestrian Safety Program in Baltimore City.

Annual grant be made available by the State of Maryland to study, in depth, reasons for traffic accidents.

State Accident Control Records Bureau—established several years ago, and a valuable instrument in the field of traffic safety.

Compulsory chemical tests for drivers "under the influence."

Laminated photographs on drivers' registration cards.

Re-examination of drivers every four years.

Regulations for motorcycles and motor-cycle operators.

Expansion of driver education programs.

Many of these recommendations have been adopted; others have not. The Safety First Club has learned through experience that campaigning successfully for traffic safety legislation is a long and arduous task.

The Safety First Club believes that traffic supervision and control belong in the sphere of duly-constituted experts and authorities; but, nevertheless, such groups as the Safety First Club of Maryland can render services through planned and consistent safety programs, campaigns and activities aimed at helping to reduce our mounting traffic toll.

Safety First Club's major objectives are:

1. Help reduce traffic fatalities and injuries.
2. Stress the importance of traffic safety among our youth.
3. Work for the passage and enforcement of statutes aiming to reduce our tragic traffic toll.
4. Give proper recognition to the deserving for attainments in the field of traffic safety.

In an article published in the Congressional Record, Congressman Samuel N. Friedel stated:

"The Safety First Club of Maryland advocates that 'Safety Is Everybody's Problem.'" How I wish that it might be possible to instill this thought in consciousness of every man and woman, boy and girl, who lays a hand on the steering wheel of an automobile,

truck, or other automotive vehicle, releases the brake and steps on the gas, that each one of them is part of that group called everybody; and that it is highly essential for them to operate that vehicle with utmost care, that they may not snuff out either their own lives or the lives of innocent victims."

CONGRESSMAN TUCK WELCOMES WESTINGHOUSE AND COMMENDS VIRGINIA ELECTRIC & POWER CO.

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 the Commonwealth of Virginia adopted an aggressive policy of encouraging the upgrading of existing industry and of actively seeking new industry. A principal purpose for the adoption of this policy was to create additional jobs for the young people graduating from our high schools, technical colleges, and institutions of higher learning. The industrial and business leaders of America have invested millions of dollars in plants and equipment in the Commonwealth since that time.

Westinghouse broke ground for a transformer plant in Halifax County, near South Boston, Va., on November 9, 1967. The plant currently employs 213, with a projected employment of 450 within the next 12 to 18 months. We are proud to have this new corporate citizen in the district which I have the honor to represent. Through the leadership provided by Mr. Ellis Cox, plant manager, and the dedicated employees, the first transformer was delivered to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. on December 19, 1968. At the ceremonies recognizing this milestone, former Governor and then Congressman William M. Tuck delivered an address which it is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. TUCK, AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE WESTINGHOUSE TRANSFORMER PLANT IN SOUTH BOSTON, VA., DECEMBER 19, 1968

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a genuine privilege and pleasure for me to be here with you on this auspicious occasion when the first transformer produced by the Westinghouse Plant at South Boston is being turned out and delivered to the Virginia Electric and Power Company.

I appreciate the fact that my friend, Ellis Cox, could still introduce me as Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia. I am just a temporary Congressman and I am getting more temporary every day. Although I enjoyed my associations in Washington, I look forward to leaving the confusion and dissension existing there and to returning to this picturesque and tranquil Southside Virginia community where I can enjoy the pleasure of a closer association with my friends after such a long and somewhat tempestuous career as a public official. I hope that when I am relieved of the heavy burdens and responsibilities, as well as the time-consuming duties, of the office of Congressman that I will be enabled to see more of you and I trust that you will not hesitate to command me freely and fully to assist in every appropriate manner in all community projects.

We are delighted to have the great Westinghouse Corporation in Halifax County,

Virginia, and the City of South Boston. In fact, this corporation and its dexterous and skillful personnel are already a very important part of this splendid locality. We regard them as our own.

Virginia is quite fortunate in the great industrial growth and development which we have experienced in the past several years. It is due not only to the foresight and the activity of our Chambers of Commerce and our industrial committees, but is due to the exemplary government which we have provided and with which we are blessed here in this grand old Commonwealth. We have enjoyed, and will continue to enjoy, splendid labor-management relations. Although I do not have at hand the exact figures for the present year, I do know that in recent years the record will show that there is probably fewer strikes and work stoppages in Virginia than in any of our neighboring states or our sister Southern states. At the same time, our people have had full employment and are blessed with satisfactory hourly, daily or weekly wages.

We are delighted to have these industries here. We have fair management-labor relations laws in Virginia, but best of all we are blessed by the fact that those employed in industry here desire to see Virginia progress along the best lines of safe and sane betterment. We are greatly indebted to the officers and directors of the Westinghouse Corporation for the establishment of this plant in Halifax County.

We are also proud of our other industries and our public service corporations such as the two splendid railroads that serve this community; and particularly the Virginia Electric and Power Company serving approximately 2/3 of the Commonwealth of Virginia. This organization has probably done more to stimulate the growth of industry in Virginia than any other group. My public duties throughout the years have enabled me to observe closely the methods of the operations conducted by the officials of VEPCO. I know that these gentlemen who manage this company are devoted and dedicated to the highest public service and interest. The management of these organizations to which I have referred has done much to enhance the cultural, economical, and educational development of the people of our State. We are delighted to have their representatives here amongst us today. We have cooperated with them 100 per cent and I am convinced that we will continue to cooperate with them to the end that this fine Southside Virginia community may maintain in the future a desirable balance between industry and agriculture and may give full employment to the people of this region.

I thank you very much.

THE DETERIORATING SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I share the apprehensions of many of my constituents of the 22d District of California about the deteriorating situation in the Middle East, and what we feel is a failure on the part of the United Nations to examine recent events there in their total context.

We are disturbed that the United States concurred in a Security Council resolution which can only be viewed as a one-sided condemnation of Israel for recent acts on her part. The December 31 resolution, the catalyst of which was

the Beirut bombing raids by Israel, failed to take account of the very real threat to the survival of Israel caused by activities of various Arab Nations surrounding Israel and including activities originating in Lebanon.

If we are sincere in our pursuit of an honorable Arab-Israel peace, and I believe we are, then we must profit from mistakes of the past, on our part and on the part of the United Nations. In 1956 and 1957 our Government exerted great pressure on Israel to withdraw its forces from the Sinai. To the later regret of President Eisenhower, promises made at the time were not fulfilled and they were breached—to Israel's severe disadvantage.

Since that time Israel's survival has been continually threatened by constant raids into her land by Arab guerrillas, guerrillas operating from states that have maintained a state of war with Israel for 20 years and which harbor and officially encourage terrorism.

One need only look at the events which precipitated the 6-day war of 1967 to realize the injustice of the recent U.N. condemnation.

In May of 1967 Egyptian troops massed on Israel's borders with more than 100,000 reservists. Nasser imposed a blockade against Israel ships to the Red Sea through the Gulf of Aqaba; he dared Israel to go to war over the move knowing well that the gulf was an international water and the lifeblood of Israel. Harassment from Syrian raids continued on Israel's borders. Incredibly, Secretary General U Thant chose that time to withdraw U.N. security forces from the area.

Since the cease-fire after the 6-day war, there have been 1,002 incidents of guerrilla attacks against Israel with more than 259 Israelis killed and 1,005 wounded—many of them civilians. Even since the December 31 U.N. resolution condemning Israel, six more Israelis have been killed by terrorist attacks.

Throughout all this, the Arab States have maintained their boycotts and blockades. The United States, a Nation which understands well the importance of freedom of the seas, should appreciate the significance to Israel of Arab attempts to blockade international waterways. We should likewise understand the implications of the hijacking of planes. When Arab terrorists from Beirut attacked an El Al plane in Athens with machine guns and Molotov cocktails, they killed an innocent passenger, wounded another, and endangered the lives of 49 others, including American citizens.

Israel, a nation fighting for her life, made clear to the Arab governments supporting the terrorists that she was prepared to defend her skylanes to the outside world, and that she would not allow her enemies to isolate and strangle her.

It must be made clear that Israel's Beirut air response came after she had complained to the U.N. Security Council following the El Al plane attack, and after she received a silent and indifferent response from this world body.

Mr. Speaker, I share the fear of many of my colleagues in the House that the

U.N. resolution will encourage the Arabs to intensify their terrorism, secure in the knowledge that a sympathetic Security Council will protect them by threatening anyone who tries to resist them. I share the fear that the Soviet Union will exploit the censure of Israel to whip up international opinion against Israel and to intensify pressures for a Soviet-dictated settlement which would force Israel to withdraw from occupied territories without requiring the Arab States to enter into a genuine peace with her.

We owe it to ourselves and to the Arabs and the Israelis to take strong measures to curb terrorism and to bring Arabs and Jews to the peace table.

CAMPUS RIOTS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, expressing some of the thinking of the distinguished lady from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN.

It is recognized by all Members that this lady's knowledge of our educational programs is superior. I commend to you her thoughts and recommendations concerning those students who are recipients of Federal loans and at the same time are disrupting orderly campus procedures. I also commend the distinguished gentleman upon her forthrightness and I support the premise that no student who incites rebellion on our campuses should receive our taxpayers' money in the form of grants or loans.

The article follows:

CAMPUS RIOTS IRK REPRESENTATIVE GREEN
(By Ellen Hoffman)

Students who disrupt college campuses should not receive Federal aid for their education, Rep. Edith Green (D-Ore.) said yesterday.

"I'm sick and tired of a minority . . . making it impossible for the majority who want to attend classes" to do so, Mrs. Green, chairman of the House subcommittee on higher education, said.

As a result, she plans to hold hearings next month to take "a total look at higher education," focusing on campus disorders.

Mrs. Green believes that other members of Congress "feel much more strongly than they did last year" about denying aid to demonstrators because of continuing campus unrest.

Last year, Congress authorized college administrators to withdraw Federal loans and scholarships from students who disrupt campuses. Mrs. Green said she wants to find out how often funds have actually been cut off.

"We are faced with the fact that we have romantic revolutionaries, anarchists who are simply out to destroy" the colleges and universities in which they are enrolled, Mrs. Green said.

Before the rioting at Columbia University in the spring of 1967, Mrs. Green recalled, she preferred to leave decisions on Federal aid completely up to campus administrators.

But when she saw that "the same agitators who were at Columbia were in Chicago" at the Democratic National Convention last summer, Mrs. Green decided it was time for Congress to re-examine the law.

"If a person on a college campus is not there to gain a college education, he does not have a right to an education" paid for by taxpayers, Mrs. Green said in an interview.

She sees the question of supporting demonstrators with Federal aid as part of a larger issue raised by recent studies of higher education: "That every qualified student is entitled to an education."

Congress should determine who is "qualified" for support by taxpayers, she said. Special programs that encourage minority students to enter college by lowering admissions standards should also be studied, Mrs. Green said.

She said she has heard that some of these students cannot read or write.

Although no higher education laws are up for renewal this year, Mrs. Green believes "it's high time we took a look" at the Federal programs.

College students, faculty and administrators as well as sociologists and other experts will be called to appear before the subcommittee. Details of the hearings have not been worked out because new members have not been assigned to the subcommittee yet.

AMEND FEED GRAIN ACT OF 1965

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to provide the same statutory right for feed grains producers to receive prepayment for cooperation in feed grain control programs that cotton and tobacco enjoy.

The fact that these producers have had some chance of receiving this in the past was only because my colleague from Minnesota was able to amend the original Feed Grain Act of 1965, to give discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture. My bill makes it mandatory, effective with the passage of this bill.

The cost of producing corn today is in the neighborhood of \$40 to \$60 an acre.

With farm credit facilities being taxed to the hilt, and with the high interest rates that now prevail, farmers have a very definite need for receiving some prepayment at the time of signing the contract to curtail their production.

It is significant to note that the outgoing administration, in its budget that was submitted to us on January 15, specifically eliminated all prepayment for feed grains in 1970, and cutback one-half of the prepayments for this year. Thus if farmers do not receive their full one-half payment this year, it can truthfully be said that it was because of the recommendation of President Johnson.

This is a bookkeeping trick of an outgoing administration—it does not save any money—it only transfers the financial transaction from one fiscal year to another. Therefore, it becomes only a political trick to try to deceive farmers into blaming this on the newly elected President and Secretary of Agriculture.

It would seem folly to have to come up

with emergency funding programs for many of our farmers later this year—when it may be largely avoided by simply passing this bill now.

"PUEBLO": ORGANIZATIONAL FAILURE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have phoned me while home in the district or written me after reading and hearing press accounts of the naval board of inquiry's investigation of the Pueblo affair. I find there is considerable misunderstanding among the general public as to just what the issues are. It's quite natural, I think, for emotions to be aroused when one such as Commander Bucher, who has undergone such a trying experience, finds himself put on the pan, so to speak, and asked to undergo the kind of interrogation that is reported from the naval board of inquiry. I have made the point that from what disclosures have been made thus far, it would seem that Commander Bucher is headed for a court-martial, but I certainly don't mean by saying this that I believe this is what he deserves by any stretch of the imagination.

The Navy inquiry is limited in scope to matters wholly within the jurisdiction of the Navy, but it's quite possible that other branches of the Department of Defense shared in responsibility for the policies and conditions under which the ship operated. I don't think this will ever be disclosed fully unless we have an appropriate committee from the Congress conduct our own independent investigation and airing of the facts. Ultimately blame will have to be fixed, but it is quite obvious to me at this juncture that we cannot permit Commander Bucher alone to shoulder this responsibility. It is quite understandable that the Navy should want to know from a captain of one of its ships why he turned it over to a foreign power without firing a shot and what options were available to Commander Bucher, notwithstanding his being shortchanged topside so far as defensive weapons were concerned, air cover, sea support, and adequate destruct equipment aboard for disposing of the secret and sensitive equipment aboard. Over and above this concern, we as Members of Congress want to know and I think the American public is deserving of knowing just who were those responsible in varying degrees for nakedly exposing this ship and making those decisions which obviously led to this most sorry chapter in our naval history.

Mr. Chuck Dancy, editor of the Peoria Journal Star and himself a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserves, makes a good point in his editorial of January 27 entitled: "Pueblo: Organizational Failure" and I, Mr. Speaker, include the full text of that editorial at this point in the RECORD:

"PUEBLO": ORGANIZATIONAL FAILURE

(By C. L. Dancy)

The bystander focus on the court of inquiry into the Pueblo incident is naturally and instinctively on the personality, the personal trials, and the performance of Commander Bucher—but that is not the key role of the court.

The key role, and one suspects the major problem in this event, is not an individual or personal assessment, but a review of the organizational structure and over-all systems used. A system which failed, whether Commander Bucher failed in any respect or not in his place in that system.

His place in it put him in a pretty horrible situation which was hardly his sole responsibility. Nor was it his task alone to extricate himself.

As far as the Commander, himself, is concerned, the only thing that he has testified to which is professionally shocking is his comment that he never thought about or considered the possibility of being attacked.

(This is belted somewhat by his request for "destruct" equipment.)

SHOULD DESTROY AUTOMATICALLY

Nevertheless, it was a strange answer, because in military doctrine which must certainly be taught as basic to every officer the very first automatic responsibility of every unit commander is to provide for the "local security" of his unit.

One suspects that the larger question may be, however, how his security was to be protected within the over-all military setup in the areas where he operated.

And at this point it appears that nothing whatever existed of that nature.

It would begin to look as if the favorite game of the "Whiz Kids" who took charge of the admirals and generals in recent years was to bypass the regular military establishment and play with intelligence operations and special operations themselves.

If such was again the case in the operations of the Pueblo, the very people who might have and should have been responsible for both its operations and its protection were left on the outside of the whole deal, in no position to plan, to be prepared, or to accept responsibility for a prompt reaction.

SYSTEM CONFUSED

Washington is a very long way off, and unless the area people have a responsible part to play it is already too late to prepare systems when something happens. That preparation needs to have been made in advance.

It is hardly a coincidence that confusion has surrounded two ships of the Pueblo type, the Pueblo and the Liberty, at opposite ends of the world, with tragic consequences in both cases.

One cannot help but suspect that there is something basically wrong with the organization structure and systems by which these special operations are controlled—and that it arises from the recent tendency of civilian brain boys to enjoy the freedom of bypassing professional military establishment and "go it alone."

This is a dangerous practice indeed and unfair to its victims. It should have been abandoned after the Bay of Pigs—where it began. It seems to be a continuing disaster.

LAW AND ORDER AND THE SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, former Commissioner of Education Harold Howe has never been noted for his

reluctance to speak out on major issues. The consistency with which he insisted on "telling it like it is" was, in my judgment, a very refreshing quality during the years he headed the Office of Education.

I was pleased to read in the New York Times recently that Dr. Howe's departure from Federal service has not prevented him from continuing to speak his mind on the issues with which he is familiar. I refer to a letter to the editor of the Times of January 19 in which Dr. Howe gives the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare some good advice on the subject of law and order as it relates to school desegregation.

For the benefit of my colleagues who may not have read Dr. Howe's letter, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1969]

FINCH'S ALTERNATIVES

ASHLAND, N.H.

January 11, 1969.

To the Editor:

Your Jan. 11 issue reports that Secretary-designate Robert H. Finch of Health, Education and Welfare is considering alternatives to the withholding of Federal funds in school districts where desegregation is an issue.

Certainly every effort should be made by Federal officials to work with local school authorities to desegregate the schools without depriving children of the benefit of Federal programs. The outgoing Administration has made much effort and has achieved some progress in bringing about voluntary compliance with the law.

But the record clearly shows that voluntary compliance is not likely to be successful unless backed up by the willingness to use the legal procedure to withhold funds in places where racial discrimination continues. Indeed, the mere suggestion by Mr. Finch that he is considering using other methods will almost certainly encourage those currently practicing discrimination in the schools to continue it until he clarifies his views.

Mr. Finch needs to remember some facts as he makes up his mind about these matters:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act requires the withholding of Federal funds from any grantee practicing discrimination on the basis of race; even if Federal funds are withheld, school districts have a constitutional obligation enforceable in the courts to cease discriminatory practice; the courts have firmly upheld the principles embodied in the H.E.W. guidelines for school desegregation.

The incoming Secretary of H.E.W. can do the new Administration and the cause of law and order a service by making it clear that he intends to enforce the law, even if it is not very popular in some quarters. If the law is not enforced by those whose duty it is to do so, what can we say to those who choose to disobey laws which are not agreeable to them?

HAROLD HOWE 2d.

"HOOSIER," A WORD WITH A HISTORY ALL AROUND IT

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the term "Hoosier" is one of the most distinctive of all State nicknames. As a native of the Hoosier State, I am well aware of the

continuing discussion about the possible origins of the nickname. Because of the many inquiries, I believe the following explanation is especially worthy of reproduction:

"HOOSIER," A WORD WITH A HISTORY ALL AROUND IT

Since the Indiana centennial of 1916, historians, teachers, and research scholars have been delving into pioneer archives seeking the origin of the distinctive nickname: "Hoosier." It is a term of dignity and character, they conclude, and applies to anyone native to Indiana or who is a resident within the State's borders.

Specifically, the scholars have concluded the word Hoosier means: An important caller, and a dignified, self-reliant person.

But reports in the files of the Indiana Historical Society disclose there are three schools of thought concerning the manner in which the word might have been born, perhaps between 1810 to 1830, and got into common usage.

AN IMPORTANT CALLER

There are many claimants for "who's hyer?" said to have been hallooed by a cabin settler to a wayfarer on horseback, or vice versa, during territorial times. The traveler, according to a poem written in 1830 by John Finley, titled "The Hoosier Nest," proved to be an important caller and a fine gentleman. Novelists of Indiana's later golden age of literature, including Lew Wallace, of Ben Hur fame, and Booth Tarkington, liked the idea of "who's hyer?" becoming in time "Hoosier," and meaning important caller or friendly traveler.

The second school gives the word military dignity—from hussar.

It is said Colonel Lehmanowski, a Polish hussar of the Napoleonic wars, appeared so resplendent in his uniform of military braid and decoration during a sojourn across the new State of Indiana that he inspired coonskin-capped riflemen of the frontier militia to glorify themselves as hussars, which they pronounced "Hoosier." The scholars declare that in the war with Mexico and long after the Civil War all parade soldiers in Indiana were called Hoosiers.

The poet, James Whitcomb Riley, believed either of these legends could have been the true source of Indiana's nickname, but in his lyric recitals he pointed out that much of Indiana's speech, quality talk, and slang stemmed from a southern immigration.

THE THIRD SCHOOL

The third school suspects this southern group of immigrants gave the word "Hoosier" to Indiana, and remarks that it was popularized by riverman Mike Fink from Pittsburgh. He was a man of invincible strength, who picked up the word "husher" and used it often while traveling up and down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

"There is not another like myself in all this country. I'm a hoosier"; the keelboatman is said to have remarked with gusto.

"Hoosier" was Mike's pronunciation for "husher" meaning mighty man. Researchers found husher is out of the particular dialect of settlers in the Carolinas and Georgia, who hailed from Cumberland, England. "Husher" means big, important, large, able.

Tracing the word back to England the scholars found it was written "hooser," and that Mike Fink, the skull cracker and braggart, used the word "hoosier" to proclaim he was the best man in a crowd. When challenged he promptly staged an eye-gouging hand knuckle fist fight. For years his strength, vocabulary, and use of firearms provided fabulous tales for rivermen and settlers throughout southern Indiana.

His skill and gusto gave the word "hoosier" real meaning as it became hoosier and denoted a unique individual of exceptional abilities, the historians declare.

FEW CHALLENGERS

Few dared to say that Mike wasn't a very remarkable fellow, nor did they argue about the prowess of his 100 boatmen. Most rivermen agreed that Mike was something they didn't want to get tangled up with, yet were his friends. Mike roared, boasted, fought, and raced up and down the length of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers from the close of the American Revolution to 1821. "Then," says an idolatrous historian, "to use the words of Mark Twain, he moved westward with the jug of em'pire."

Wandering ahead of the tide of settlers, Mike accompanied a fur-trading expedition up the Missouri River, and met his death at a lonely post near the Yellowstone in the winter of 1822-23.

COMPROMISE ON CENSUS

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable JACKSON E. BETTS, has labored long and hard for the passage of a bill to limit the questions of the decennial census to six and to remove the criminal penalties for failure to answer the questions. A good indication of the support this bill has within the House is evidenced by the fact that 86 Members have already sponsored this bill in this Congress. Recently the Dallas Morning News published an editorial that indicates the kind of support the bill has across the country and I include it in the RECORD at this time:

COMPROMISE ON CENSUS

The Census Bureau's long questionnaire, backed by the power of compulsion to force a proportion of respondents to answer, is again the subject of legislative battle.

In this session of Congress, the attack on the compulsory feature of this long form is being led by Rep. Jackson Betts. In the past, similar attempts have been made to eliminate this feature by Rep. George Bush of Texas and others who feel that the threat of fine or jail should not be used to elicit what many believe to be personal information.

The question is one of benefits and disadvantages, complicated by such sensitive issues as the right of individual privacy and the traditional American suspicion of governmental power. Basically, the controversy centers not on the form itself, but on the existence of a provision to fine or jail the citizen who refuses to answer.

In the past, we have disagreed with such attempts, on the basis of a belief that the usefulness of the data to society outweighed the objections of the few. However, in light of the steady loss of individual privacy and the increasing bitterness against government compulsion, The News believes there is merit in seeking an alternative to the government's power to punish those who prefer not to give such information.

The information that is gained by this portion of the Census survey is undoubtedly of great benefit to government planners and statisticians, as well as to the many businesses and other private users of the demographic and economic data compiled by the Census Bureau.

The Bureau's officials maintain that there is no intention to snoop into private affairs of citizens, and that the compulsory feature is, in fact, rarely brought to bear. There is little cause to doubt these assertions.

It is probable that a large proportion of the Census respondents answer the long form questions such as those dealing with sources of income, employment record and bathroom facilities without considering them unduly personal.

But on the other hand, there are also Americans who object bitterly to giving this information, particularly under threat of punishment. In recent years as the growth of government and the urbanization of society have increasingly infringed on the individual citizen's privacy and the area in which he can freely make his own decisions, this objection has gained increasing weight.

Americans have become painfully aware of the steady loss of privacy, and this awareness has stimulated a determination among many citizens to protest vigorously against further encroachment. This determination is reflected in laws and rulings against electronic surveillance and wiretapping as well as the measure to remove the compulsory provision from the long Census form.

The question then becomes a matter of weighing the undoubted benefits to government and business that are furnished by the form against the growing opposition by citizens and lawmakers who feel the use of compulsion is unwarranted in gaining these benefits. Can the benefit be gained without the compulsion?

Rep. Betts and the supporters of his bill say that it can. By the provisions of the Betts bill, answering the long form would be voluntary, not compulsory. He contends that, since the long form is used only for one fourth of the Census interviews, census takers should be able to gather the necessary data from those respondents who do not object to giving it. The compulsory feature would apply only to the few basic questions.

This approach would appear to be a compromise that could give the benefits to government and business without producing the backlash from those who bitterly object to answering these questions against their will.

The area in which the individual is free to mind his own affairs and make his own decisions is shrinking, and to an extent this cannot be avoided in our modern interdependent society. But as personal autonomy becomes more limited, that which remains becomes more precious to the individual and is therefore more vigorously defended.

The Betts bill may be able to preserve one small fraction of that autonomy. It is worth a try.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE PATSY T. MINK RELATING TO THE 91ST CONGRESS, JANUARY 1969

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter, which was sent to my constituents:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE PATSY T. MINK RELATING TO THE 91ST CONGRESS, JANUARY 1969

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 14.—Representative Patsy T. Mink was re-elected today as Vice President of the Democratic Study Group for the 91st Congress.

The Democratic Study Group (DSG) is made up of approximately 120 liberal members of the House and has been responsible for many reforms in House operations, including modification of the rules and, most recently, in gaining approval of monthly meetings of the Democratic Caucus.

Mrs. Mink says she expects the DSG to play an even more vital role in the 91st Congress than it has in the past.

I begin my third term in the U.S. House of Representatives with great pride in having served in the 89th and 90th Congresses and in what we have been able to accomplish. I sincerely hope that the 91st Congress can be as productive of social legislation as the two preceding congresses were.

But I must confess to certain misgivings when I consider the Democratic loss of the White House, President Johnson, in his State of the Union Message, carefully reminded the Congress of its commitment to the Democratic programs of progress which must be upheld.

It may be expected that the new administration will attempt to stem the tide of social progress generated by the Democratic administrations of the last eight years, and this danger will require renewed vigilance and diligence by the Congress to keep the tide moving in the right direction. I pledge all my energies during the next two years to that task.

THE 91ST CONGRESS

The first session of the 91st Congress got under way on January 3rd with two major battles, both of them dealing, on the surface, with personalities, but with important underlying principles involved.

The battle over the speakership

The first of these two battles concerned the leadership of the new House of Representatives. John McCormack of Massachusetts was making a bid for another term as the Speaker, and Morris K. Udall of Arizona was trying to unseat him in favor of someone younger, more vigorous and progressive. I aligned myself with Mr. Udall and the young liberals.

The national Democratic campaigns for the presidency in 1968 cannot be lightly dismissed. The message was clear: the old Democratic leadership, too long entrenched, had lost touch with the country, and there were those who would no longer tolerate that kind of leadership.

As Time magazine put it, the challenge to the McCormack leadership "established beyond dispute that the lessons of 1968 have not been lost on substantial numbers of younger, activist members of the Democratic Party."

But in the end, older and grayer heads prevailed and the old leadership was returned to its seat of power despite those painful lessons of 1968, but only temporarily.

The election of Senator Kennedy in the Senate as Majority Whip was a parallel movement; and its success will have a very great bearing upon continued efforts in the House to bring our procedures and actions in line with those which will undoubtedly take place in the Senate under Senator Kennedy's leadership.

The Honolulu Star Bulletin said later that I had gotten myself in the dog house by siding with the Udall forces. Again I quote from Time: "Udall and his hardy backers—only 58 of 435 House Members—did their careers no damage, and may well have assured a more responsive leadership for the future."

If that is true, and we are eventually able to invigorate the House leadership—and I believe we will—I shall be proud of my part in bringing about such progress.

But aside from what we may accomplish in the future, we were able to make some immediate gains.

In order to defeat Mr. Udall, Speaker McCormack was forced to make some meaningful concessions: all Party Members will henceforth sit in on our monthly policy meetings, thus assuring that the voice of the young activists will be heard. Another concession by the old guard was that committee

appointments will now be subject to approval by a caucus of all House Democrats; in the past, these were arbitrarily dictated by a tight-knit circle of congressional elders.

So we lost the Speakership, but we made some gains, and we will make more so long as we don't give up and so long as we don't take the easy way out through acceptance of an outmoded system.

I do not intend to do that, and I don't think you would want me to.

The battle over Adam Clayton Powell

The other opening day battle was over the seating of Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of the 18th District in New York City. Many Republicans and the Southern Democrats sought to bar Mr. Powell, but I voted to seat him for the reason that to do otherwise would be unconstitutional. The Constitution sets forth only three qualifications for a Member of the House. Mr. Powell meets those qualifications. He is over the minimum age, he has been a citizen of the United States for seven years, and he is a resident of the state in which he was elected. Those are the only constitutional requirements and the rest is left to the voters. Mr. Powell's constituents have made it clear that he is their Congressman and he is entitled to their seat in the U.S. House.

The House barred Mr. Powell two years ago, and the Supreme Court has agreed to hear his arguments on the constitutionality of that action. I suspect that the Court will find it unconstitutional, as I believe it was.

In any case, the House did finally seat Mr. Powell and I believe that to be the only right thing we could have done. If the voters of the 18th District want him, it is their right to have him. It is not the duty of Congress knowingly to thwart the will of the people.

The troublesome Electoral College

Three days later, on January 6, the Congress met to count and ascertain the electoral votes for President and Vice President, and again we ran headlong into a constitutional problem. One member of the Electoral College from the state of North Carolina—Dr. Elroy Bailey—cast his vote for George Wallace and Curtis LeMay despite the fact that a plurality of the votes in his state had been cast for Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew. The North Carolina votes were therefore challenged and a resolution offered to nullify Dr. Bailey's improper votes.

I voted against the resolution because no member of the Electoral College is constitutionally required to vote in accordance with the popular vote of his state and there is no law that says he must. The Congress is not empowered to change the vote of any member of the Electoral College.

The fact that Dr. Bailey could do this only highlights another defect in the constitutional device of the Electoral College which so long has been severely and justifiably criticized. We in Congress should correct this flaw in the Constitution by abolishing the Electoral College and having the chief registrars of elections in each state cast that state's vote according to the plurality of the voters.

THE DITCHLEY CONFERENCE

On January 30, I will fly to London as the guest of the British Government to attend the Ditchley Anglo-American Conference sponsored by the Ditchley Foundation. Ditchley is a non-profit, British Foundation dedicated to furthering knowledge and understanding between the leaders of the English-speaking nations of the world.

It is a great honor for me to have been invited to participate in this year's conference with Members of the British Parliament and other government leaders. I am further honored to be the first woman ever invited to participate in a Ditchley Conference.

The subject of this year's conference will be: new political ideas and movements in

the U.S.A., Britain and other western democratic countries, with particular reference to student unrest, Negro movements and other minority expressions.

The conference will be conducted during the week end of January 31 to February 3.

THE DRAFT AND OUR TEACHERS

I have been working for many months on the problem of the drafting of teachers. Young, male teachers are in demand in nearly every school system in the country, and we in Hawaii have a general teacher shortage. Despite this shortage, our teachers continue to be called away from their classrooms and inducted into the service.

I have corresponded with Selective Service Director General Lewis Hershey on this matter, and he has said that teachers should be given occupational deferments when they are teaching in areas which have a teacher shortage. He has also explained how this must be done; that when a teacher is qualified for the draft, the local draft board must give weighty consideration to the testimony of local school officials. If the school officials say there is a teacher shortage, and if they say that the teacher in question cannot be replaced, then, according to General Hershey, that teacher should be given an occupational deferment.

The problem in Hawaii is that our teachers are given only postponements until the end of the current school year and then drafted during the summer vacation. The effect is the same: we end up losing another qualified teacher.

I have tried to impress upon our local school officials that this can be avoided by requesting an occupational deferment for each individual teacher who is classified as 1-A, and if such request is rejected by the local draft board, an appeal to higher authorities should be made. This course of action should be made a matter of policy by our school officials.

I receive numerous letters from Hawaii teachers who ask me to help them get deferments so they can stay in their important work. But there is not much I can do unless the school officials do their part.

So I have informed all members of Hawaii's Board of Education and also the School Advisory Councils that they are responsible for action to save our badly needed teachers from the draft, and they must take action to show the draft boards that our teachers ought to be given occupational deferments.

I see no reason why they should not do this, and I sincerely hope they will make it a policy in the very near future.

DR. DELLQUADRI

For the first time in 56 years, an incoming Administration is seeking to fire the Chief of the Children's Bureau at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The man presently holding that post is Dr. P. Frederick Dellquadi, a former Dean at Columbia University and the University of Hawaii, who was appointed last April by President Johnson.

The job has traditionally been above partisan politics, but Mr. Nixon's Administration has asked for Dr. Dellquadi's resignation.

I have wired the new President urging his reconsideration of this action. The job of administering the Children's Bureau should continue to be safe from the vagaries of partisan politics.

OIL IMPORT, AGAIN

In the last weeks of the Johnson Administration, I was working toward the establishment of a second oil refinery for Hawaii to be located in a Foreign Trade Sub-Zone at Barber's Point. On January 8, I appeared in Washington before the Trade Zone Examining Committee to testify in favor of the Barber's Point Sub-Zone. But honesty compels me to say that the outlook has never been very good.

Mr. C. R. Smith, Secretary of Commerce under President Johnson, had decided to

make no decision on the application and let it for the Nixon Administration.

In his final days in office, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall signed new Oil Import Regulations which permit Hawaii to import low-sulphur, foreign crude oil into a trade zone, and that is a big step in the right direction; but without the trade zone approval, there is still nothing we can do.

No one knows what the Nixon administration will do about this, but the whole oil import problem is expected to come in for intensive review. That may take years, and our sub zone application may be shelved during that time. However, I intend to keep working for its approval.

THE MATTER OF WALLY HICKEL

I look with great disfavor on the appointment of Governor Walter Hickel as the Secretary of the Interior. In a letter to Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine, I strongly urged the Senator to insist on an intensive investigation of Governor Hickel when his appointment was before the Senate, and Senator Muskie, who shares my concern, did so.

Governor Hickel's appointment had rough sledding in the Senate, but in the end, he was confirmed; and so the natural resources of our country, our mineral reserves, our mountains, streams and rivers, our parks and scenic areas and our wildlife resources have been given into the keeping of a man who, by his own statements, has little regard for the concept of conservation and is annoyed by the growing demands in the country for pollution control.

Aside from his alarming statements on matters of national policy, Governor Hickel also intervened directly against Hawaii's application for a trade zone oil refinery, after he had been appointed Secretary of Interior. His connections with the oil industry are vague. He once said that he had no interest in the industry, then later said he had about a million dollars invested in the gas industry. The distinction between the oil industry and the gas industry is a bit hard to find.

In any case, Mr. Hickel has now been confirmed, but the roll of Senators voting against him is impressive: James Allen, Alan Cranston, Fred Harris, Vance Hartke, Edward Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy, George McGovern, Thomas McIntyre, Frank Moss, Edmund Muskie, Gaylord Nelson, John Pastore, Claiborne Pell, William Proxmire, Joseph Tydings, and Stephen Young.

There will be many Members of the Congress who will keep Secretary Hickel under close scrutiny in his new position, and I shall be among them.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

We are now in a new enrollment period for medical insurance under Medicare. This is a period in which those over 65 may sign up for insurance to help pay for doctors' and surgeons' bills and other expenses not covered by the basic Medicare program. For many eligible people, this is the last chance to enroll for these added benefits. This enrollment period closes at the end of March.

If you are eligible, or if you know someone who is, check into it at your nearest Social Security Office.

Do it now.

THE BELLOWS FIELD DECISION

The Department of Defense notified me on December 26 that it is agreeable to releasing a part of Bellows Field for Civil aviation, and so we came to the brink of settling this ancient problem.

The only thing that now remains to be done is for our State officials to negotiate a lease agreement with the Department of Defense. The Pentagon has recommended some rather harsh lease conditions which our State officials are not pleased with, but if negotiations are opened promptly and diligently pursued, we should be able to achieve an acceptable lease.

I was most gratified to receive the Pen-

tagon's decision, and I hope that a final settlement of this matter can be achieved in the near future.

FISH AND WILDLIFE PRESERVATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, mankind is disturbing its environment in mighty ways and, more often than not, little or no thought is given to the impact of these changes on fish and wildlife, or in fact upon man himself.

It seems inevitable that we must accept an expanding population in most areas of the world. This expanding population, when coupled with rapid economic growth and technological development, will unquestionably bring changes in our environment. However, there is no reason for us to compound our problems by allowing the destruction of fish and wildlife through insensate slaughter, particularly when it is based on ignorance, avarice, or plain brutality.

The truth is, though, that this is exactly what is happening throughout the so-called civilized world today. Many species of fish and wildlife are becoming endangered and others are rapidly disappearing from the face of the earth.

In the United States and Puerto Rico alone, some 24 species of birds and 12 species of mammals have become extinct. In 1968, the Congress expressed its concern on a national level over the disappearance of these species by enactment of Public Law 89-669, which provides for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction. However, much more needs to be done, particularly on an international level, to assist in protecting rare and endangered species.

It was because of my concern over the disappearance of these species that I was prompted in the 90th Congress to introduce legislation which would assist on a worldwide basis in protecting species that are threatened with extinction. H.R. 11618, which was identical to my bill, was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and passed by the House, but the Senate failed to act. The legislation would prohibit the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife or parts thereof into the United States, except by special permit from the Secretary of the Interior for zoological, educational, scientific, and breeding purposes. Under this legislation, no lengthy negotiations or international treaties would be required before the Secretary could make a determination as to species that are threatened with extinction. The Secretary would only be required to consult with the affected foreign countries or with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources before making such a determination. The world's rare and endangered wildlife lists now include about 250

mammals and more than 300 birds. Among the species listed are such well-known animals as the mountain gorilla, the orangutan, the chinchilla, and many species of the cat family, such as the leopard, ocelot, and jaguar.

Equally important, H.R. 11618 would extend protection to mammals, birds, reptiles—alligators—amphibians, mollusks, and crustaceans by prohibiting the interstate shipment of these species which are taken contrary to Federal, State, or foreign laws.

Mr. Speaker, I have just recently joined as a cosponsor in introducing legislation in the 91st Congress which is identical to the House-passed bill of the last Congress. It is H.R. 248, introduced by Congressmen LENNON, PELLY, KARTH, and myself.

This legislation is admittedly only a partial answer to man's rapacious destruction of the world's natural resources. But it would serve as an important step toward the preservation of a portion of nature's endowment.

The legislation is designed to protect those many species of animals which are endangered because they are in demand for novelty uses or because their skins provide specialty or decorative wearing apparel promoted as being very chic. The hides of spotted cats and zebras are in demand as luxury apparel and status symbols—better than these symbols should be a dead alley cat or common rat, species which are all too abundant.

Poaching to supply the market for these status symbol hides is a lucrative enterprise in Asia and Africa. The slaughter is well beyond the ability of the species to reproduce themselves, particularly since man is taking over so much of the land where these animals used to flourish. As the animals become rarer and rarer, their value as status symbols apparently increases in direct, or perhaps greater, proportion. Therefore, the prices that so-called luxury consumers are willing to pay for a hide gets higher and higher and the poachers become more and more avid in their efforts at destruction. The final result, of course, would be the extinction of the species of wildlife in question and, incidentally, the end of any job or industry which is based on the utilization of such species.

The developing countries of Asia and Africa, with their limited economic and governmental resources, are for the most part incapable of halting the activities of poachers as long as the demand for status symbol hides and skins remains high and the traffic in them unencumbered.

Since the market for these status symbols is heavily concentrated in the United States and other prosperous countries, there is a heavy obligation for these countries to halt the traffic in these items.

The endangered species legislation now before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries would do much to accomplish this objective. Its adoption would also provide the Department of State with a strong argument to be used in an effort to secure cooperative international agreements to halt the traffic in endangered species of fish and wildlife.

The legislation also is aimed at a major domestic problem. Here in the United States poachers can and do invade the marsh areas of such States as Florida, Texas, and Louisiana at night and illegally take alligators. For these illegal activities, the poachers often make \$500 a week and more. If a poacher is caught, the penalty imposed upon him is usually only a small fine. Poaching is profitable, the danger of being caught is small, and when caught the penalty is nominal. Thus, poaching flourishes. The real solution to the problem is to remove the market. This is the objective of H.R. 248.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is the leading market for birds, monkeys, furs, hides, and other animals and animal products which have been taken illegally or in violation of the tenets of good natural resource conservation practice.

If threatened species of fish and wildlife are to be protected, it is imperative that the United States take the lead with effective legislation to halt the traffic in such species, whether they come from the United States or other parts of the world.

The Congress must approve legislation to protect endangered species of fish and wildlife at the earliest possible moment. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I shall hold hearings on this legislation in February or March.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House and in the Senate to give their wholehearted support so that the bill can become law during the first session of the 91st Congress.

INTEREST RATES SET BY FEDERAL RESERVE, NOT BY THE FREE MARKET

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there is still a great deal of misunderstanding about how interest rates are set in the economy. Some people still cling to the outmoded notion that high interest rates are the result of actions of a free and open money market.

This is simply not true. Interest rates are set by the Federal Reserve System and its Open Market Committee through the purchase and sale of Government securities. The Federal Reserve has the full power to peg these interest rates at any level that it desires.

This morning's Wall Street Journal once again repeated the old theory that high interest rates are the result of free market action. I have written the Wall Street Journal in an effort to set the record straight on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of the Wall Street Journal editorial in the RECORD along with my letter:

THE INTEREST IN HOUSING

When the Administration raised the maximum interest rate on Government-underwritten home loans, it was no more than a

belated recognition of market reality. There are those, however, who see it as something else.

"It is significant," declared House Banking Committee Chairman Wright Patman, "that the first major decision of the Nixon Administration is to raise interest rates for home owners." Interest rates, in the Texas Democrat's view, are whatever the Government declares them to be.

Actually, lenders for some time have been interested in Government-underwritten mortgages only when homesellers have come up with "discounts"—lump sum payments—that bring their yield close to the going market rate. The red tape involved is great enough that, even with discounts, the loans sometimes have found no takers.

If Mr. Patman and his Congressional colleagues really want to do something for home owners and buyers, as well as other Americans, they can cooperate with current efforts to curb the inflation brought on by Federal financial excesses. As long as lenders are so unsure what their dollars will be worth in the future they're sure to go on demanding higher interest rates to try to offset the erosion of their funds.

In our relatively free economy, in sum, the Government cannot order interest rates to fall. It can, however, promote that objective by getting its fiscal and monetary affairs in order—and keeping them that way.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1969.

THE EDITOR,
The Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial, "The Interest in Housing," (Wednesday, January 29) renews the old and discredited claim that interest rates are set in a free and open market place.

Interest rates, of course, are not set by a free market, but are pegged by the Federal Reserve Board and its Open Market Committee through the purchase and the sale of massive amounts of Government securities. In addition, of course, the Federal Reserve has the power to set the so-called discount rate which, in effect, becomes the floor for all interest rates.

Few economists, either in or outside of the banking industry, cling any longer to the theory that there is a "free market" in interest rates.

Years ago, leading officials of the Federal Reserve conceded that there is no free market in interest rates and that these rates are indeed established by the Federal Reserve. For example, the *American Banker* of May 7, 1954, quotes Mr. Allan Sproul, who was then president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and for years a leading influence in the Federal Reserve System:

"So far as 'free markets' are concerned, I think we are all attracted by the phrase. It suits our habit of mind. But we haven't had a free market in money and credit, at least since the Federal Reserve System was established, and we haven't had a free market in Government securities, and therefore a wholly free securities market, since the Government debt climbed to the high magnitudes, and open market operations by the Federal Reserve System came to be used as a principal instrument of credit policy."

The Federal Reserve System has full power to lower interest rates and to bring the nation out of the chaos of the current high interest rate policies. It has the power to allocate credit to the sorely-pressed housing market.

The question now is whether the President and the Congress will require the Federal Reserve System to do this in the public interest.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

EQUALITY: BUT NOT IN NEWS COVERAGE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, what the people do not read about they do not know about—and a public opinion gap results.

People seem to be dying all over the world today but only certain deaths, detentions, enslavement ever seem to get equal treatment in the communications media.

Zanzibar, the government in exile, reports great atrocities against their people.

Why the news gap on the plight of these people who suffer injustice and brutality?

Mr. Speaker, I include the following press releases from the Zanzibar Organization, 68 Hudson Road, Southsea Hampshire:

ZANZIBAR'S PLIGHT

(1) Do you know that 12,000 people were murdered in Zanzibar when the elected Government was overthrown in 1964?

(2) Do you know that today there are hundreds of political prisoners, among them former Ministers, still imprisoned without trial since 1964?

(3) Do you know that there are to be no free elections for fifty years?

(4) Do you know that as recently as last October about 50 Zanzibaris were rounded up in Dar-es-Salaam (capital of Tanzania) and flown to Zanzibar, and since then nobody knows of their fate?

(5) Do you know that three of the nine detained Zanzibar Ministers who had been released from the mainland Tanzania's prisons last November were flown to Zanzibar a month later where they are languishing in the torture cells?

(6) Do you know that many of the population are deprived of enough food, clothing and medical care?

(7) Forced labour has been introduced.

(8) The islands are becoming major bases for the training of foreign Guerrilla forces and for Soviet and Chinese subversion on the mainland of Africa.

(9) Do you know that death sentences are being carried out without trial?

We the Zanzibaris need your help—like the Czechs we had had to accept a rule of tyranny.

How you can help us: By writing immediately to the United Nations the conditions under which the people of Zanzibar are living are a gross violation of the declaration of Human Rights; and by bringing the matter to the attention of your member of Parliament.

NYERERE AND ZANZIBAR MISERIES

(By Ahmed Seif Kharusi)

In 1964 Zanzibar witnessed a rape of her democracy when her legal Government was violently overthrown. Ever since the people of Zanzibar have suffered untold misery under the tyrannical regime. Innocent people have been arrested, flogged, tortured, indefinitely imprisoned without trial and even murdered; and yet the whole world has been oblivious to their sufferings.

In April of the same year a union between Zanzibar and Tanganyika was proclaimed without the consent of the people on either side. It was then believed that through this union Nyerere would be able to curb the strong arm of the gangsters in Zanzibar. However the people of Zanzibar knew then

that the marriage of convenience between Zanzibar and Tanganyika would never be consummated; and the union is still the legal fiction that it ever was. Nyerere may be referred as the President of Tanzania, but his authority in Zanzibar is not at all clear.

It is a common belief amongst the Western Powers that Nyerere does not condone the atrocities perpetrated by the tyrannical regime of Zanzibar, but a quick glance at his own actions would show that he not only condones them but also connives in their happenings.

In 1965 the Zanzibar ruling tyrants arrested Mr. Othman Sharif, who was then their Ambassador in Washington, on the pretext that he was engaged in a plot to overthrow First Vice-President Karume. The regime in Zanzibar was all set to execute him, but he was released on the intervention of Nyerere and he is now living in Tanzania mainland. On the other hand only as late as October 1968 President Nyerere ordered a down swoop in Darassalaam, where forty-seven Zanzibaris, mostly who had left Zanzibar and sought refuge in the capital of Tanzania, were arrested and handed over to the tyrants of Zanzibar. No charges have been preferred against these innocent people—nor indeed, any reason given for their arrest—and yet they are now being tortured in Zanzibar. It is even rumored that some of them have died through torture.

On 26th November 1968 "a great show of mercy" was enacted by President Nyerere probably in his endeavour to fool the world. He released three of the nine detained former Zanzibar Ministers who have been languishing in mainland prisons without trial since 1964. They were: Dr. A. A. Idarus Baalawy, Mr. Abadhar Juma and Mr. Salim Kombo. A week later they were flown to Zanzibar to pay homage to Karume, and returned to Darassalaam after two hours in the islands. However, when they asked for passports so that they could leave Tanzania for some other Commonwealth country where they might find more security, they were flown to Zanzibar on false pretences allegedly to bid farewell to Karume, whereupon their arrival were immediately arrested and sent to the torture cells of the dreaded security force. To this day nobody knows of their fate.

The people of Zanzibar have made repeated appeals to the world outside to put pressure to bear on the current regime so that law and order may once more be restored. Appeals have been lodged with the United Nations, Amnesty International, International Commission of Jurists, Commission on Human Rights, etc., yet atrocities still continue to be committed against the helpless people of Zanzibar. Thus the once beautiful happy islands of Zanzibar and Pemba are now a Police State and a centre of political intrigues and subversion. Military training centres for saboteurs and foreign guerrilla forces have sprung up like toadstools all over the islands.

GREAT EVENTS

The three Zanzibar Ministers (out of nine imprisoned since 1964) were released on 26th November, 1968. A week later they were flown to Zanzibar by government plane "to pay homage" to the present puppet tyrannical rulers, and returned to Darassalaam after two hours in the Islands. On 27th December they were again flown to Zanzibar where they have been thrown into torture cells since then. They are Dr. A. A. Idarus Baalawy, Mr. Abadhar Juma and Mr. Salim Kombo.

We have accordingly informed all the organizations concerned.

On 7th January, 1969, about one hundred and twenty Zanzibaris staged a demonstration outside the Marlborough House, London, when the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference opened. Some of the demonstrators had been already at the spot by 2 a.m. regardless of a bitterly cold night. A photograph of all the Zanzibar demonstrators with their banners bearing such mes-

sages as "Release All Political Prisoners", "Zanzibar Demands Elections Now", "Stop Reign of Terror in Zanzibar", "Democracy Must Prevail in Zanzibar", etc. appeared in the Times of January 8, 1969. There was a distribution of various leaflets and hand-outs.

On 11th January the Anglo/Zanzibar Society convened a meeting on Zanzibar at the Church House (Bishop Partridge Hall), Westminster, London. About one hundred members of the Society, Zanzibaris and distinguished sympathisers attended. Lady Marion Bennet was on the Chair; speakers were Mr. John Biggs-Davison, M.P. and A. S. Kharusi. Mrs. Fatma Tayabali (daughter of the former Zanzibar Prime Minister) read a poem (published elsewhere in this issue). After the meeting a letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth was read and signed by Lady Bennet, Mr. Biggs-Davison and A. S. Kharusi. (The letter is inserted elsewhere in this issue.) Leaflets were distributed.

The Daily Telegraph, January 14, 1969: "Mr. Duncan Sandys, Conservative M.P. for Streatham, commenting on the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, said on 13th January: 'The Commonwealth Prime Ministers have talked much about democratic rights in Rhodesia.' It was time someone spoke up about the reign of terror in Zanzibar.

"There, the last vestige of political freedom had disappeared, and the former political leaders have been illegally imprisoned for five years, and in some cases brutally tortured.

"Mr. Sandys said: 'President Nyerere should restore basic rights in his own country before lecturing Britain about democracy and justice.'"

Extracts from Sheikh Abdulla Churembo's letter, Darassalaam: "May I reply to Mr. Karume's recent anti-Islamic speeches?

"At the Darassalaam Saba Saba rally, he translated a number of Quranic verses which to put it briefly, were completely self-composed. In Islam, this is a great sin. Mr. Karume went on to attack the composer of Moulid Barazanji (Prophets way of life) and argued that this man could not have written accurately about a man who lived at a different time to himself. He went on to claim that the Prophet Muhammaed was a great socialist. Now how did Mr. Karume know this? . . .

"In another recent speech in Zanzibar, he declared that fasting in Islam was not obligatory . . .

"A few years ago a non-citizen Muslim was expelled from the country for mixing politics with religion. Yet recently Mr. Karume declared that politics cannot be kept out of religion. I fear that as a result there will be a religious crisis in Tanzania if these things are not properly explained, particularly to the Muslim." (Reporter, published in Nairobi January 10.)

EXTRACTS FROM OUR SYMPATHISERS' LETTERS

December 12, 1968: "We pray to God that He will deliver us all, both black and white from those evil creatures who are setting brother against brother, religion against religion, race against race, for the benefit of the Red Beast of Biblical prophecy. . . .

"Today I was handed a leaflet from your Organisation . . . so great is it that I am sure it will do so much to wake up both Black peoples and White as to the Vileness and devility of this murderous creed of International Communism. If it is possible I would esteem it a great Christian favour if you could forward me as many of the above leaflets as possible to distribute amongst my Christian Organisations.

"Believe me, you . . . who have escaped into this free country of Britain, by your persecution and your endeavours, will wake up some of our stupid blind Church leaders as to the truth about the plight of the menaced millions of Africa. . . . Believe me I have

many friends, not only in Britain but in the Commonwealth and the U.S.A."

December 12, 1968: "Alas, unfortunately nowadays people don't seem to care very much what happens to anyone else, especially in foreign parts, so the cause of justice has never been weaker. I only hope . . . that things will improve.

"So it is in that spirit that I wish you a very happy New Year and many more of them."

January 11, 1969: "I believe that if you put your trust in . . . and the great and good things they stand for, and work with them to free your beloved people, you will be successful. A great friend of mine—one of the finest men I have ever met—would like to meet you as quickly as possible. . . . Please believe that I will do everything in my power to help free your people."

FROM THE PRESS

The Daily Telegraph, January 3, 1969: "Many Westminster onlookers will be amused to learn that Mr. Humphry Berkeley, a Conservative of the far Left, and Mr. John Biggs-Davison, MP for Chigwell and one of the staunchest of the Right, have joined forces in the same cause.

"Mr. Biggs-Davison, who is vice-chairman of the Anglo-Zanzibar Society, has persuaded Mr. Berkeley to interest the United Nations Association, of which he is chairman, in the fate of political prisoners in Zanzibar. For five years members of the Sultan's government have been held prisoner in the island without trial.

"Mr. Berkeley has forwarded a resolution to Mr. Michael Stewart on this case, and promised to raise the matter with his friend President Nyerere. But even Mr. Nyerere's influence is not decisive in what has become a Chinese island off Africa."

The Daily Telegraph, January 15, 1969: "Three former Zanzibar Ministers, in whose release from prison Mr. Stewart, Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, was asked to assist, have been re-arrested in Darassalaam and sent back to what are described as 'torture cells.' It is learned.

"A spokesman from the Zanzibar Organisation said in London yesterday: 'Their crime was simply to have asked for passports so that they could leave Tanzania for some other Commonwealth country, where they might feel more secure.'"

Daily Nation, Nairobi, January 14, 1969: "Aberl Amani Karume, First Vice-President of Tanzania, had a cordial talk in Zanzibar yesterday with two Communist Chinese representatives, the New China (Hsinhua) News Agency (NCNA) reported today.

"NCNA said the two Chinese—Chou Po-Ching, temporary charge d'affaires of the Chinese Embassy in Tanzania, and Chao Hsin-Jan, a representative of the Chinese Army—had been invited to celebrations of the fifth anniversary of the Zanzibar Revolution."

Daily Telegraph, January 14, 1969: "An Indian and a Goan, employed by the British High Commission office in Zanzibar were detained at the weekend, it was learned in Darassalaam yesterday."

Daily Telegraph, January 11, 1968: "Sir: I invite the attention of the visiting leaders of the so-called union of Tanzania on behalf of the people of Zanzibar and Pemba, who are being deprived by the existing regime of all that which makes life worth living.

"Urgently they demand, without undue delay, fair elections to elect their own leaders, on whom they would have faith and trust. Similarly they wish to make it abundantly clear that the majority of the inhabitants do not support this imposed union, which has not served any useful purpose for them. Each and every one of us will not rest or tire till there has been a change for better in our own country.

"MURHAMED BIN ABDULLA."
Daily Telegraph, January 16, 1969: "Sir: I have been shocked to note that President

Nyerere, of Tanzania, said at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference on the question of Rhodesia that the British Government has handed power to a minority Government in Zambia.

"The former legitimate Government of Zanzibar was formed on the basis of one man one vote. The ZNP/ZPPP Alliance won 18 seats out of 31; hence it came to power.

"If President Nyerere tries to justify the atrocities and genocide that are the lot of the Zanzibar people since the violent overthrow of the freely elected Government then he had better find some other excuse.

"AHMED SEIF KHARUSI."
By Terrence Clarke in the Portsmouth Evening News: "Mr. Frank Judd (M.P., for Portsmouth West) is reported (E.N. Jan. 4) as having said at Lusaka airport 'Britain has a responsibility to bring home to Portugal that Zambian territorial integrity must be preserved.'

"Why Mr. Judd should think we have any responsibility vis-a-vis Zambia and Portugal is difficult to understand.

"Would it not have been better if he had pointed out that Zambia must respect the integrity of Rhodesia, instead of recommending Britain to use force against Rhodesia, and encourage Zambian guerrillas to do the same?"

"While he was in Tanzania did he ask his friend President Julius Nyerere why he had annexed Zanzibar? Doesn't Zanzibar have some rights to freedom too?"

"Did he do anything to help the African refugee ruler who lives in Southern? Did he do anything to help King Freddie who is a refugee over here or ask why his daughter Princess Victoria is under arrest?"

"Does Mr. Judd not think that Asians who have lived for 20 or more years in Kenya and Zambia have some moral rights to stay there?"

RAMSEY CLARK SPEAKS OUT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to former Attorney General Ramsey Clark who, in my opinion, has been an outstanding chief executive of the Justice Department.

Ramsey Clark's understanding of contemporary issues has been especially noteworthy. The emphasis he has given to the enforcement of civil rights legislation and the alleviation of strained relations between police and large portions of the black community has provided an important balance to the simplistic call for law and order which has been so much in vogue in recent months.

At this point in the Record I include an interview with Ramsey Clark, which appeared in the January 3, 1969, issue of Congressional Quarterly, and which I commend to my colleagues:

[From the Congressional Quarterly, Jan. 3, 1969]

RAMSEY CLARK SUMS UP IN WIDE-RANGING CQ INTERVIEW

Attorney General Ramsey Clark Dec. 10, 1968, summed up his views on major national issues in a wide-ranging interview by Congressional Quarterly. (For excerpts from the transcript of the interview, see below.)

The Attorney General emphasized two areas which he considered of primary importance: civil rights and the conduct of police.

He said that it was necessary for the Fed-

eral Government to enforce vigorously the major civil rights legislation which Congress had enacted. In particular, he said that enforcement of the open housing provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 and the voting provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 should be enforced. In regard to the latter Act, he said that its automatic sanctions, due to expire Sept. 5, 1970, should be continued by Congress.

Clark also said that federal laws regarding the desegregation of public schools and prohibiting racial discrimination in employment and union membership should continue to be enforced vigorously.

Concerning the school desegregation provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Attorney General said that the use of lawsuits by the Justice Department to accomplish the legislative goals was "too slow, too cumbersome." He said that the threat of a cut-off in federal funds, provided for in Title VI of that Act, was much more effective as a method.

In regard to police conduct, Clark said that the issue of police-community relations was the "most important and the most difficult law enforcement problem of today and the next several decades." Without improved relations between police and the community served by the police, he suggested, the opportunity to reduce crime would be jeopardized. Failure to improve police-community relations, he said, could "divide the country."

Clark said the Johnson Administration had laid the groundwork for a major federal attack on crime through the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. He said he hoped that the Nixon Administration would ask for the full funding of \$300 million for the Safe Streets Act, which was intended to assist State and local governments in upgrading their law enforcement operations. The Juvenile Delinquency Act was intended to do the same thing through federal financial aid for programs involving juveniles.

Turning to organized crime, the Attorney General said that it was a problem which could be eradicated. He said, however, that a key factor in the existence of organized crime was its dependence in corruption of certain local officials, including police.

The Attorney General said that the whole problem of crime was a complex one, not conducive to simple solutions. The deeper causes of crime, he said, stemmed from mass living and long-range dynamics of the society.

Excerpts from the interview follow:

Q. What are some important areas to watch to see that major legislative purposes of the last decade are implemented, such as school desegregation?

A. When the school year started in September 1963, the percentage of Negro children in the 11 states that comprised the Confederacy who were in schools classified as desegregated was one percent. That's nine years after *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Under the powers that were granted with Title VI of the 1964 (Civil Rights) Act, very significant progress has been made. Our estimate is that the percentage will be above 20 when we get the final statistics for January 1968. When you consider just the few short years that you've had to work there with the new techniques, you see that this is real progress. It's important that this be carried forward in the Northern school districts as well.

Q. Which has been more effective, the lawsuit route or the Title VI cut-off (of federal funds) route?

A. Unquestionably the administrative technique is the only one that really meaningfully works. There are 6,000 school districts in the south alone; 2,000 with very substantial desegregation problems. So the litigious route is too slow, too cumbersome.

You need something much more effective and efficient.

The whole history of the development of the administrative process tells you that's what is needed in a mass society. It's got to be moved very effectively to the Northern school districts as well, where there are many, many manifestations of state action that require careful investigation and careful development of cases.

OPEN HOUSING

The HEW has to move in this area. Housing clearly provides a most important responsibility. With a lot of fanfare, we promulgated in 1968 the right of American citizens to own, rent, buy, sell, lease, advertise a home, a place to live and raise a family regardless of their race.

But it would be very unfortunate if we did not enforce that law. Better to have never put it on the books than to tell the American people we stand for a principle and then not enforce it. People who've been deprived of rights for a long time won't understand that, and it certainly won't increase faith in our institutions. It's imperative that we move effectively in that area.

In employment, there is vast discrimination on account of race. It's quite discouraging to see it in major corporations and in major labor unions, but it's a fact of life. Title VII of the '64 Act provides a major obligation and opportunity to give people in this country, regardless of race, an opportunity to fare for themselves, to get a job, to make some money, to be somebody and to do something. And enforcement of this statute to many is, perhaps, the most important responsibility that we'll have.

VOTING RIGHTS

Q. What other areas are important?

A. There'll be the issue of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and whether its automatic sanctions should be continued beyond Sept. 5, 1970. . . . This is one of the really remarkable experiments in democracy in voting that you'll find in history. I imagine, because there were hundreds of thousands of people historically disenfranchised and for very strongly felt reasons in the community. And here all of a sudden with one Act you achieve in a couple of years a doubling of registrations and a doubling of voting and a lot of elected (Negro) officials.

Q. Don't you think the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is part of the historical trend on opening the right to vote, and really if properly implemented is the last step toward a completely universal constituency in this country, for everyone except those in mental hospitals or jails?

A. There may be another step. That may be compulsory or obligatory voting. They have this in a sense in Australia and some other places. You don't like to think about it until you see a 40-percent vote in an important election. We've just got to involve people in our political processes if we're going to make our institutions really effective and responsive.

Q. If we do more things like making a Social Security card equivalent to a voting registration card, we can push quite a ways before we go compulsory.

A. We'd all hope you wouldn't go to the compulsory, but we've got to do something to concern people with their political destinies and to make them believe what must in fact be true—that they make a difference.

Q. Can former convicts be constitutionally disfranchised?

A. Well, I don't know, I guess the one thing I know is you have to keep pretty tentative in your judgments about these things because we're learning and changing awfully quickly. . . . It would seem quite clear to me that the state has the power to deprive people who have offended it very seriously, who have done serious injury to persons or property. To deprive them of participation in the democratic process? I would be very cautious

about that. I would feel somewhat as I feel in the field of citizenship. It's a rare situation where you deprive either a naturalized or a natural born citizen of his citizenship. You've got to learn to deal more meaningfully than that. Because this world just can't take much of that, really.

Q. Do you think it is imperative that the 1965 Act be renewed and perhaps strengthened? Do you think we'd retrogress if its automatic sanctions expire?

A. I would be concerned about it. We're still studying the results of this election, and we haven't really decided here. But I know this. You should err on the side of implementation of the policy, because it's such a terribly important policy and we just can't stand backsliding. And if as we examine the evidence we see risks there, then we'll just have to be very careful.

POLICE MISCONDUCT

Another area that has to be looked to that's very delicate and very difficult is police misconduct. We've had to get into this area. It's not anything anyone likes to do, but you have a duty. And above all, the police themselves must not violate the law or the rights of citizens. This is an area that, if the Federal Government doesn't stand up to its responsibility, can divide the country, really divide the country.

It's some things that typically almost by definition, in many instances, local governments and even state governments are unable to work effectively with. They are in the very community of all the emotion that gave rise to a particular series of acts. Just as historically in the South we've had to move where white sheriffs had beaten Negro prisoners, because all history and experience told us that local authority could not and would not move, we have to be ready to meet this responsibility, anywhere in the nation. As a result we've looked at a lot of cases. We've had to bring quite a few in the last couple of years and there may be more.

We have a new statute, a very important statute in this area, in the 1968 Civil Rights Act, that is designed to protect federal rights from violation by law enforcement and it's imperative that it be enforced, as difficult and uncomfortable and unpopular as it may seem at the time.

Because if your rights have any meaning at all, it's in connection with their protection when there's trouble. You don't have to worry about rights when times are calm and when nobody is going to bother you. This must be an important priority area.

NEW CRIME LAW

Q. This is related to civil rights and to the general area of criminal law?

A. Oh yes, it goes far beyond the rights of minorities or Negroes. It's a question of deprivation of constitutional rights or federal rights by law enforcement.

The Congress enacted the Omnibus Crime Control bill. It provides the best opportunity the Federal Government will have to really help local law enforcement. It's funds, but more than funds, it's guidance, because so frequently and in so many places more of the same is exactly what you don't want.

Q. What kind of funding levels would you like to see in Title I (of the Crime Control law) in the coming two or three or four years? You got \$63 million for this year, and you asked for \$94 million.

A. We asked for \$100 million, really, but there was an adjustment at the end because of some FBI problems.

Q. You asked for full funding.

A. Right. Next year we will ask for \$300 million. I would hope that the Nixon Administration would ask for the full \$300 million, too. I would hope that the Congress would grant it, and that it would be very wisely distributed to local law enforcement, to state administration of prisons, to reform of court systems at state and local levels.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Q. Do you see the Crime Control law and the Juvenile Delinquency law, both of this year, as providing a framework for very significant national action?

A. Absolutely. That's the plan. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act is the happier side of the docket, you might say. It can work creatively, and it really can with kids in pre-delinquency and even delinquency situations.

We know where these kids are. We don't have to kid ourselves. They're not the rich suburban kids, not that we don't have some problems there, but if you want to put crime on a map, you will see that it's concentrated in the slums in every city in the United States. It's where all your other deprivations are, and it will be 10, 20 and 100 times more frequent per capita down there, and there's just no use fooling ourselves about it.

So what we need to do is to work with the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act massively and effectively in these areas, and we can prevent crime at the very happiest time, before it happens, before the guy's got a stick or a gun in his hand or even the intent in his mind, or capability in his heart.

It starts at the very beginning. The youngest person who lives in an environment where there's street gangs, where there's dope peddling, and 11 other kinds of illicit activities right in the street—where there's poor health, inadequate housing, it's substandard, it's not safe—there're rats running around.

Q. And the police are scarcely looked upon as protectors.

A. And the police are looked upon as the enemy, the occupying force. The Act will work with a youth and give him an opportunity to really do something with his time and himself, that won't mean trouble for other people.

LAW AND ORDER

Q. The Nixon campaign emphasized law and order. Can the Nixon Administration, using the tools open to it now, move effectively to have an impact nationally in terms of reducing the crime rate between now and, let's say, the next presidential election? Is this a deliverable promise? Can there be appreciable and visible progress?

A. Well, we undoubtedly have the techniques available. We haven't made the commitment to them yet. Many we've just really authorized. If they are fully pursued, unquestionably a very major difference can be made.

A real difference won't be made quickly. I don't think we should fool ourselves. This is a much deeper problem than that. You can't blow a whistle and have everyone start behaving differently.

But we really don't know, in terms of measurement, where we've been or where we are or where we're going. Most crime has never been reported. A very clear obligation of anyone concerned with the control of crime is to see that as much crime—ideally all crime—is reported.

I'll be very concerned to see that we work effectively to that end, because you don't know the universe that you're working with until you have its dimensions finally and fully described. You can make some rough estimates, but you won't know. We don't know today if there's more crime than there was in 1900 or 1908.

Q. But that's a preparatory step for working on the problem.

A. Well, ideally, but you've got to do everything at once. You don't wait. You just go forward at once.

But the only way that there can be shown any dramatic reduction in crime in a few short years is through manipulation of statistics, when you go right down to it, because crime is a much vaster and more difficult problem than that.

It stems from all the problems of mass oc-

city and all the turbulence of our time. It comes from long-range dynamics with population growth, urbanization and science and technology. And we have barely begun to understand the individual.

NEW LEADERSHIP

Q. Aren't some cities doing quite a good job?

A. I think we do have new and imaginative leadership in law enforcement—men who are very sensitive to police-community relations, which from any measurement that I can make, is the most important and the most difficult law enforcement problem of today and the next several decades.

The police must serve communities, and the communities must recognize their service. And until that happens, crime control is a contest. The mere fact that most crime is not reported shows the dimensions of the police-community relation problem. Why isn't it reported? How can you hope to do anything about it until it is reported? Is it fear of the police that causes the failure to report? Is it the feeling that they are hopelessly incompetent? What are all these reasons?

If your community won't report crime to you, you won't control crime. And to have the community report crime to you, it not only has to be in close contact and constant communication with you, you have to have its full confidence. They have to think you really serve them, you serve their people, and then this by definition eliminates organized crime. By definition it brings you right in quickly when crime occurs for control purposes, and by definition it gives you the opportunity to chart your preventive techniques. Of course, in terms of race relations, in terms of student situations, you can see that we will have some very strenuous contests until we get a lot closer relation between police and people they serve.

ORGANIZED CRIME

Q. The President's Crime Commission found a connection between organized crime and local politics. Could you address yourself to that?

A. There is no question that organized crime cannot flourish without at least the neutralization, if not the corruption, of segments of local government.

Now it doesn't mean the entire police department, it doesn't mean even 10 percent of the police department, but it means this lieutenant or this captain and these three sergeants or these five patrolmen, something like that. And they don't all have to be in one part of town, even. It may mean this assistant district attorney or this court administrator or judge, even.

But the reason is perfectly clear. It was recognized by the Wickersham Commission report in 1931 and by anybody else that has ever studied it. Organized crime is dealing in goods and services on a daily basis that the public wants to buy. They want to gamble—that's about 70 percent of the illegal income right there. They want to borrow money—at excessive rates of interest. Shylocks and loansharks will provide these monies and they'll provide strongarm tactics of collection, and the rates of interest will be exorbitant. They'll provide prostitution, narcotics and other things that the public wants to deal in.

That can't happen in a city without local law enforcement knowing about it. Any of us could go in any town in the United States and if we had 50 bucks, just roll them up in tens or fives and crinkle them like that and say: "Where can a fellow gamble around here?" or "Where can he find a prostitute?" Well, if they're around they may circle you for a little while, for a couple of hours, depending on what's going on at the time, or they may just walk right in and shake you by the hand and say: "Come on back in here. We've been looking for you." Because they've

been looking for you just like you're looking for them.

If you and I could do it, can't the police, who live there, who know the people and know the streets and the places? Of course they can. So the professionalization of law enforcement is the key in the long run.

CORRUPTION AND CRIME

Q. In the more sophisticated organized crime operations, doesn't the corruption go farther up the line?

A. Yes, that's right. It tends to and it can involve a good part of a precinct, a good part of the manpower of a precinct.

We've seen situations where it has, but it doesn't have to involve everybody in the precinct, and common sense would tell you it wouldn't. Why bother? Why cut him in? He's making his \$325 a month. Just let him walk the streets out there, and don't worry about these three girls who answer the telephone—they don't need to be involved in it.

But we've got to have Sergeant Jones and Lt. Smith because this is their area and if they close that place down, why we're going to lose income for 10 days until we get re-located and all our customers find out where we are.

Q. Is there great variation among cities in the United States in terms of how pervasive this influence is?

A. Sure. The Crime Commission report (President Johnson's) surveyed roughly 72 cities in the organized crime task force area. By the broadest combination of counts—admission by local authorities, intelligence from federal investigative agencies or state investigations—or just a rough estimate, only 25 had organized crime existing at all. That doesn't mean there wasn't a little burglary ring. That doesn't mean there weren't guys working in the stolen car racket. It just means there wasn't regular ongoing organized crime.

That tells you a number of things. As you know from just being alive, you don't have to have organized crime. That's the happy thing about it. That's a ball game you can win altogether—72-0. You can win that one. There have been whole societies and whole countries today that have been free of organized crime. It's a very peculiar phenomenon, and you can control it, you can eliminate it.

Q. What are some of the more critical areas in which the organized crime connection with the political structure is substantial and important? Is the President's Crime Commission report the place to get the leads?

A. It will give you some information. Some of the people who worked on the thing can give you some assistance on it, and then you can just look where our strike forces go, and you can assume that those tend to be our estimates of the more critical areas. You've got seven or eight on the way now and we hope to have a couple of more.

Q. Where are they working, these strike forces?

A. Detroit, Buffalo, Chicago, Philadelphia, Miami and Brooklyn.

PRESIDENT NIXON VISITS WITH AND GRET'S MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1969

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to commend President Nixon, our 37th President of the United States, for coming here to the House of Representatives this morning and for giving us the opportunity to greet

him and wish him well. I am sure it was a pleasure for all of us here in the House of Representatives. In my opinion it augurs well for America that the President has taken time to come up to the Hill to greet the Members of this House of Representatives.

NIXON'S FIRST NEWS CONFERENCE IS SKILLFUL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call an excellent column by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Evening Star for January 28, 1969, to the attention of the Congress and the American people. President Nixon is certainly off to a fine start.

The Lawrence column follows:

NIXON'S FIRST NEWS CONFERENCE IS SKILLFUL

President Nixon, at the first news conference of his administration, handled himself with a skill and forthrightness rather unusual and unexpected from a chief executive who has been in office only a week. He obviously could not have done it if he had not been studying public questions carefully. His televised meeting with the press indicates that he has chosen a clear-cut rather than an ambiguous approach.

Nixon, for instance, in a simple manner disposed of a question on a highly controversial subject—the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. He said his policy would be to continue to oppose Red China's entry—first, because Peking has not indicated any interest in becoming a member and, second, because it has not shown any intent "to abide by the principles of the U.N. Charter."

He added that Communist China also continues to call for the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations even though the Formosan government "has met its responsibilities without any question over these past few years." Nixon suggested, too, that the resumption of talks at Warsaw soon by American and Red Chinese representatives may disclose "whether new changes of attitude on major, substantive issues may have occurred."

The President made it clear that he does not think policies—particularly foreign policy—should be made "by off-the-cuff responses in press conferences, or any other kind of conferences." He stated that he believes decisions should be reached in an orderly way, and that this is why he has established the Urban Affairs Council and a Cabinet committee on economic policy, and has revitalized the National Security Council for foreign affairs.

Nixon referred to two very long meetings of the National Security Council at which foreign policy was discussed. He declared that he regards the Middle East "a powder keg, very explosive" and that it is very important to "cool it off" so as to avoid "a confrontation between the nuclear powers."

Perhaps the most interesting explanation that the President gave was related to the possibility of a "cease-fire" in Vietnam. He said the word applies more to a conventional war than to a guerrilla war. He pointed out that, in the latter, "one side may not even be able to control many of those who are responsible for the violence in the area," and that a cease-fire could then be "meaningless." He feels that an agreement on mutual

withdrawal of military forces and other factors should have priority in the peace talks at Paris.

As for the armament strength of the United States, Nixon declared that "sufficiency" is a better term than either "superiority" or "parity." He said that the important objective is to get "sufficient military power to defend our interests and to maintain the commitments which this administration determines are in the interest of the United States around the world."

With respect to the problem of inflation, Nixon gave assurances that he is considering what actions can be taken which will not bring "an unacceptable rise in unemployment." He said that, without "too much managing of the economy," it is going to be necessary to "have some fine tuning of our fiscal monetary affairs in order to control inflation."

The President revealed that he does not go along with the suggestion that inflation can be effectively controlled merely "by exhorting labor and management and industry to follow certain guidelines." He commented that, much as the leaders on both sides "might personally want to do what is in the best interest of the Nation," they have to be guided by the interests of their own organizations. He added:

"So the primary responsibility for controlling inflation rests with the national administration, and its handling of fiscal and monetary affairs. That is why we will have some new approaches in this area. We assume that responsibility. We think we can meet it, that we can control inflation without an increase in unemployment."

These were some of the various issues which the President discussed in a candid way with the members of the press, many of whom said afterwards it had been one of the most interesting and satisfactory news conferences in years.

MERITS OF THE BLOCK GRANT SYSTEM

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, in light of the continuing discussion over the relative merits of adopting a system of "block" grants, in place of the present system of grants for specific, federally approved projects, I would like to insert an excellent editorial on the subject which appeared in the Torrington Register.

The editorial follows:

CASE AGAINST BLOCK GRANTS

It seems to be generally agreed that when the new Congress assembles in January, one of the first orders of business will be setting the wheels in motion for a general overhaul of the present system of distributing federal funds to state and local government.

Specifically, what has been proposed—and endorsed by both parties in the late presidential campaign—is a major shift toward a system of "block" grants, in place of grants made for specific, federally approved purposes. Under the new arrangement Uncle Sam would dole out the funds with no strings attached, letting the states and the communities decide for themselves how they wish to spend them.

Superficially this is an appealing idea. The federal tax base is much broader than that of the state and local government, and the federal tax collection system is much more efficient. What's more, the present system of

earmarked grants has created an extremely complicated and cumbersome bureaucratic jungle in which 21 federal agencies are trying to administer more than 150 separate aid programs through hundreds of regional offices. Too often the gravy goes not to the localities that need it most but to the ones which are most adept at the fine arts of grantmanship.

But there is another side of the coin—and it's a side that ought to be considered very carefully before we blithely proceed to junk the whole concept of earmarked funding. For all its bureaucratic shortcomings the strings-attached approach has scored important social gains that couldn't possibly have been scored otherwise.

Consider, as one of many examples, the stream pollution program. The only reason that real progress is at last being made in the fight against pollution is that the federal government is now offering liberal quantities of earmarked aid to communities that undertake programs meeting certain federally prescribed standards.

Or take the case of regional planning, an obviously desirable concept which was getting nowhere until the federal government initiated the policy of specifically subsidizing it by making the availability of federal funds for various local purposes contingent upon the existence of regional planning commissions.

Countless other examples could be cited. Most crucial of all, perhaps, is the case of federal aid to education, where earmarked funds provide by far the most practical method of imposing certain minimal standards, particularly in regard to school integration. If federal aid is to be dispensed without any control over its use, this means among other things that it will be used to fatten the budgets of countless Southern school districts which are segregated in patent violation of the law of the land.

The fact is that federal aid is an enormously powerful weapon for persuading state and local government to pursue more progressive policies—but it is a weapon which can only be effective if it is granted with strings attached. The system needs to be made less cumbersome, of course. But the basic idea of earmarked aid is sound, and to picture its abandonment as a "reform" is plainly nonsense.

FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA ANNIVERSARY

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was highly privileged last October to be able to participate in impressive exercises at the Cathedral of the Pines in Rindge, N.H., to commemorate the 50th anniversary of free Czechoslovakia.

Under unanimous consent I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the inspiring remarks of George F. Pavlik, of Medway, Mass., the dedicated president of the American Czechoslovakian Society of Massachusetts, at these moving exercises.

The material follows:

We Americans, of Czechoslovakian origin, meet here today at "the Cathedral of the Pines", to present the Czechoslovakian flag and in a sense to rededicate this symbol of the land of our forefathers. Let this flag join the flags of so many other nations in this

beautiful spot of America, representative to people everywhere of freedom and courage.

Freedom . . . experienced for so short a time in Czechoslovakia, but the fires of which burn in the hearts of the Czechoslovakian people, and inspires the courage to defy the forces of oppression, and to keep alive that dream of freedom for Czechoslovakia again . . . someday.

Let the Czechoslovakian flag float here in majestic silence, and yet, though silent, it speaks to us of the glorious past . . . the dark present . . . and the hopeful future of Czechoslovakia to rise and shine again. It speaks to us of the men and women, who have gone before us and of the inspiring record they wrote upon it.

We Americans, of Czechoslovakian descent, commemorate the day of this flag's birth, which until now has witnessed a great history . . . which has floated on high countless times through great events, and great plans, in the life of the Czechoslovakian people, who, though small in number, have nevertheless been great in deeds.

The proud country of Czechoslovakia, will never follow the pattern of the Baltic States or of Hungary. Czechoslovakia will never become the 16th Republic of the Soviet Union. The Czechoslovakian people have ably demonstrated that they do not live under communism by choice, but only by oppression which is maintained today by the presence and constant threats of the Soviet Union and her allies.

We present this flag today, in the memory of our forefathers, and for the oppressed Czechoslovakians who do not now have what we so enjoy in America . . . freedom . . . but they have known it . . . and will someday again enjoy it.

It is with pride and with love that we see the flag of Czechoslovakia raised here today in this noble setting . . . in this great country . . . we have now adopted for our own.

MOTHER ALBERTA STANGO

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the following front page story from the Italian Tribune, about a truly great and remarkable lady with tremendous faith and courage. Mother Alberta received her education at St. John's Villa in Staten Island and her higher education at Fordham University. The entire world benefits from and needs more people like Mother Alberta Stango.

The story follows:

MOTHER ALBERTA STANGO

Mother Alberta was born in Newark, New Jersey, where she attended St. Lucy's Grammar School. During her early school days she was known to be a fun-loving tomboy—who put aside her baseball bat and gloves to enter a convent at the age of 14. She graduated from St. John's Villa in Staten Island and furthered her education at Fordham University. She is the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Albert Stango. Her parents left Italy during their childhood and resided in Newark, N.J.

Mother Alberta was called to the Religious Life in the Congregation of the Sisters of St. John the Baptist and spent four years in New York doing Parish work. From her early youth, Mother Alberta demonstrated a great human quality—a sincere dedication to the welfare of others. She is now one of the many outstanding missionaries who went to

Africa (Zambia) over 21 years ago as a stranger to the land. She and a group of five Nuns sought to know the people, to understand their customs, and by this attitude to convince them of their sincerity. After winning their confidence, they sought to bring the truths of Christianity within the circle of their own traditions rather than starting them with mysteries and admonitions they could not accept. Her second principle of missionary work was always to bring religion to the children first. If children would hear her and believe, the adults would soon follow. Since love of neighbor is the distinguishing feature of the Christian, she and other Nuns spent countless hours ministering to the sick and poor, particularly to the lepers.

Today, with self-sacrifice and endurance she is working deep in the bush with the St. Francis Mission Hospital and leprosy colony. Her day begins at 5 o'clock in the morning when she rises and together with the other Nuns on her staff, ends the day's work at 10 o'clock at night. The leprosy colony has many problems. There is no cure for this disease but it can be treated to lessen the pain with medicine and general hygiene. With this disease a finger may drop off or a nose or a foot. Some are unrecognizable with sick mothers still feeding their children. Children, too, are lepers.

Mother Alberta is the only Missionary Nun (while visiting every five years in Newark) known to spearhead a committee to raise funds so she may continue with her missionary work to ease her desperate plight in Africa. Because Mother Alberta was able to return to the dark reaches of Africa with the financial aid she so urgently needed much progress was realized. Today in Zambia there is an excellent clinic that was not there five years ago. Because of funds raised at a Newark cocktail party "running water" is now available for lepers. The many lepers families who lived primitively in small overcrowded huts now live in homes with beds. Although medical capability is limited, the hospital facilities with modern equipment has greatly improved. There is also a bus—purchased only because of the funds raised. With deep appreciation and humility Mother tells us "God bless our contributors in the U.S.A. who are 95 percent (wonderful) Newarkers who made this all possible.

Tropical disease, jungle rot, leprosy, diseases transmitted by insects, snakes and vicious animals; a place where poverty, ignorance, superstition and depravity are rampant . . . these are the conditions that Mother Alberta and her staff encountered day after day, year after year for the past 21 years in Zambia, Africa. The staff of Nuns that began with six (21 years ago) has now grown to 32 with an additional nine African sisters. Yes, progress has been made but there is much to be done. For the clinic sulfone drugs, quinine, aspirin, antibiotics and other medicines are needed. To crown a remarkable career of unselfish accomplishment, Mother Alberta hopes to build a girls' orphanage. Their mothers died in childbirth. Many orphans are now living with the Nuns. Besides spiritual help these young girls need nourishing food, clean clothes and loving care by the Nuns.

For her work among the English children, Queen Elizabeth has made her an honorary member of the British Empire. She was the recipient of a "Humanitarian" award by an outstanding organization called the Amity. Mother Alberta Stango—You will love her magnetism and strength stemming from her humility, compassion and respect for the dignity of the human spirit. Then, too, you will love her happy way. This good work must go on. With your help it will continue. Help them provide food and medicine as they bring Christ to those who do not know Him! Remember: "As long as you did it to one of these, my least brethren, you have done it unto me."

SEPARATING PLANES FROM CITIES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I wrote this week to Acting FAA Administrator David Thomas, to request raising the minimum altitude of planes flying over a congested area which means over our cities.

This change could be made without serious inconvenience to any pilot. It would increase the margin of safety for the innocent city dweller who may be jeopardized by the present 1,000-foot altitude limitation.

I frankly can see no reason why planes should be that close to a city under any circumstances, even in 1926 when the regulation went into effect. Certainly in 1969, with the great growth of our urban areas, we must provide the urban residents with every possible reasonable protection from aircraft.

I also suggested to Mr. Thomas that this same rule be clarified in relating its self-evident exception for planes taking off and landing to those approaching and leaving approved airports only. This has always been FAA's view of its rule but recently the National Transportation Safety Board overruled FAA by saying that the rule, as presently written, allows pilots to land or take off wherever they want, including public highways, golf courses, or anyplace else.

The text of my letter follows:

JANUARY 28, 1969.

MR. DAVID THOMAS,
Acting Administrator,
Federal Aviation Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: I am convinced that the minimum safe altitude regulation for flying over congested areas (FAA Regulations, Section 91.79) is outdated and potentially dangerous to both aircraft occupants, but particularly to completely innocent city residents.

The fundamental altitude restriction has remained the same since it first went into effect in 1926. In the last forty-three years, however, the size and complexity of our urban areas have increased dramatically. One thousand feet of altitude, while sufficient in 1926 to insure a safe glide to open areas, is no longer safe. I believe I can see no justification for any plane to fly within 1000 feet of city buildings except during take-offs and landings.

I also strongly believe that present regulations must be amended to include a requirement that landing or take-off be restricted to an approved field, except in an emergency.

In *FAA v. Pendleton* (NTSB, Docket SC-949, February 25, 1968) FAA argued that Section 91.79 of FAA Regulations—stating that an aircraft in a take-off or landing pattern was legally exempt from adhering to the minimum safe altitudes—contained an assumption that this exception would only apply to aircraft in the process of take-off and landing at areas recognized for these purposes. The NTSB examiner disagreed, refusing to interpret the exemption as pertaining solely to aircraft using areas allocated for landing-take-off purposes.

Therefore, I urge you to include in Section 91.79 a provision specifically prohibiting the right to take-off or land at areas which are not airports, except under emergency cir-

cumstances. This would enforce what I believe was FAA's correct assessment of 91.79 in the *Pendleton* case.

These changes I advocate are basic to the safety of those who do not fly, but whose interests in air safety is, nonetheless, considerable. It is imperative that their interests—and lives—be protected.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member of Congress.

THE CONSUMER VOICE WILL CONTINUE TO GROW IN VOLUME

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, all over the Nation there is a rising tide of protest from the forgotten American—the consumer. This is the citizen who is tired of warranties that are not worth the paper they are printed on. Sick of unsafe automobiles. Disgusted with automobile insurance that discriminates and overcharges. Agghast at what happens to him when he ventures into an automobile repair shop. Appalled at rising costs for items that should not rise in price.

This is the person who is asking uncomfortable questions about phony games used as come-ons in the marketplace. He questions the worth of trading stamps, demanding a cut in price, instead.

He and his wife are finished with unsafe tires, fixed drug prices, and unsafe drugs that have not been fully tested. They have no patience left for poor-quality food and worse quality appliances.

These are the citizens among us who have put all their support behind the recently enacted truth-in-lending and truth-in-packaging acts that are in the process of being implemented.

This is an aroused and growing consumer protection movement, and it will be heard. It cannot be put off with flimsy excuses and political placebo.

If industry and business do not listen to their legitimate grievances, then they will make an impact in another manner. At first their voices were few and weak. Now they grow in strength each day.

One of these groups, The Consumer Assembly of Greater New York, is meeting here in this city as part of the national gathering of the Consumer Federation of America.

I welcome them here, hoping that they will make a greater impact this year than ever before in advancing the consumer cause. I heartily espouse their goals and methods, and it is my intention to see that their positions are espoused and advanced on the floor of the U.S. Congress.

Every major interest, be it national or corporate, has its champions here. I believe that the consumer movement must gain strength here if America is to give its citizens a square deal when they enter the marketplace.

CREDIT INDUSTRY RESPONDS TO GALLAGHER SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, consumer installment credit is now over \$100 billion and 60 percent of the average individual's income is used to pay off credit obligations. The focal point of the information necessary to grant credit and thereby continue America's unprecedented prosperity is the local credit bureau. While credit bureau reports do not themselves recommend the granting of credit—this decision is in the hands of the merchant—this data on the consumer is crucial, not only to the credit granter, not only to the American economy, but most importantly to the individual consumer himself.

For, without the ability to obtain the privilege of credit, the consumer is excluded from enjoying much that is good in American society.

Over a year ago, my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy became aware of a startling number of complaints about the procedures and practices of credit bureaus. Individuals were unjustly denied credit by errors or by negligence, credit reports were filled with irrelevant or outdated information, and the citizen was unable to correct or even be informed of the content of the report which so vitally affected the life of himself and his family.

GALLAGHER STEPS IN

Acting upon this information, the Special Subcommittee convened hearings in March of 1968. For 3 days the credit bureau system was analyzed and discussed and, for the first time, the public had a clear view of a segment of the economy which many regarded as a "closed society." Prof. Alan Westin of Columbia University provided a broad overview of the industry which confirmed, in general terms, the research about specific individuals we had assembled. The ease with which organizations unrelated to credit granting could obtain supposedly confidential credit reports was demonstrated. The range and tone of the letters received from individuals all over America was described. It seemed that everybody could have access to credit reports except the individual himself. Parents check the references of a prospective son-in-law; neighbors could find out just why they were having difficulty keeping up with the Joneses; and Federal and State agencies could casually conduct "fishing expeditions" through credit bureau files with no adherence to due process of law.

The entire credit bureau industry had developed free from any legal restraint or public scrutiny. One hundred and ten million Americans were on file and information about them was widely exchanged and yet they had no legal recourse and little knowledge about how to correct mistakes. I described the situation this way at the hearings:

In every State and every township in the country there are regulations concerning the transfer of ownership of dogs . . . yet there are really no regulations whatsoever pertaining to the transfer of this kind of information affecting a man's standing in the community, his dignity, his economic transactions, his private life, his very name itself . . .

THE CREDIT BUREAUS RESPOND

Stung by the criticism, credit bureau spokesmen at the hearings agreed to formulate new procedures for their industry. The Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., the major trade association comprising some 2,200 bureaus around the country, promised to accelerate its efforts to modernize and reform the practices of its members. A series of industrywide meetings were sponsored by the ACB after the March 1968 hearings and a blue ribbon panel was formed.

Because of the close relationship between credit granters and credit bureaus, this privacy protection panel consisted of representatives from the American Bankers Association, the American Retail Federation, the National Retail Merchants Association, the American Petroleum Credit Association, the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., and other influential groups. As wholly new guidelines were under discussion, the meetings were full of vigorous debate. Spokesmen for some organizations represented on the panel were reluctant to change practices which they had not altered since the turn of the century.

Yet, the necessity to respond to changed social attitudes, coupled with the validity of the criticism disclosed at the hearings, compelled the industry to reform itself. By spearheading the movement for change, the leadership of the ACB showed social responsibility and a willingness to cooperate with my urgent call for self-regulation.

GALLAGHER ANNOUNCES GUIDELINES

On January 13, 1969, I was pleased to release the results: The credit industry has reached a consensus and issued its "Credit Bureau Guidelines To Protect Consumer Privacy." These guidelines contain a number of significant departures from former procedures:

For the first time, a consumer can now demand to be informed of the total range of information in his file at a local credit bureau. The industry has pledged to have trained personnel on hand to explain the credit report and to counsel the consumer on his credit difficulties. If the individual has not been refused credit but is merely curious, a "modest fee—not exceeding the cost of a revised report—may be charged" if reinvestigation of certain items in a report seem called for. Otherwise, this service is free.

Second. Service to Government agencies will be strictly limited and due process of law will be followed in all cases except those involving investigations for "security purposes."

Third. Member bureaus of the ACB will refuse reports to credit granters and their employees if a business transaction is not involved. Thus the privacy destroying gossiping uncovered at our March hearings will be controlled or at least diminished.

Fourth. The content of credit bureau files will attempt to reflect the individual's current state of credit-worthiness

and every effort will be made to record the outcome of any legal action involving the individual. Time limits on the retention of information are established; thus, meeting my often expressed charge that one derogatory item could damn a man for his entire life.

A PROMISING FIRST STEP

I would like to praise the ACB and its lenders for formulating this extremely promising first step.

I have a great deal of faith in American industry and in our free enterprise system and I fully recognize the vital part credit plays in our economic success. Before I initiated congressional concern with credit bureaus, I was worried that their procedures were frequently so outmoded that they represented a threat to the continuation of the free flow of credit and, thus, to the health of our economy. At the same time, I felt that if the Congress were to rush in with legislation severely restricting the exchange of credit information, we might do more harm than good. Self-regulation and self-policing, whenever feasible, is wise national policy in an economy which emphasizes self-reliance and personal responsibility.

These new guidelines are a vital beginning. Their effectiveness is now in the hands of over 2,200 ACB member bureaus, credit granting firms, and their employees. Their mere existence has two salutary effects: The individual credit bureau is now widely known as a focal point for consumer activity and the content of the guidelines provide a useful basis for further evaluation of credit bureaus.

It may be shown that legislative assistance is needed to translate the guidelines' generally adequate provisions into legally enforceable practice. However, such a sincere response to my special subcommittee hearings shows that the credit bureau industry is not afraid of sound and practical change.

REAL PROBLEMS REMAIN

Mr. Speaker, none of this is meant to imply that serious problems do not remain, to be faced by the credit industry and the American people. Perhaps the major problem is the one of accurately identifying the various segments of the credit industry. When I expanded the special subcommittee's concern and on May 16, 1968, heard testimony from Mr. W. Lee Burge, president of Retail Credit Co. of Atlanta, Ga., my opening statement contained the following two paragraphs:

When Mr. John Spafford, Vice President of the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., testified before this Subcommittee on March 14, 1968, he was quite careful to draw the distinction between credit bureaus and credit reporting organizations. Credit bureaus report to retail firms information they already have in their files and they confine themselves, in large part, specifically to individual credit transactions. Credit reporting firms, on the other hand, generate information at the request of clients on specific individuals, customarily for employment or insurance reasons.

If these hearings accomplish nothing else, it is my fervent hope that the distinction between credit bureaus and credit reporting organizations may be clarified.

The guidelines under discussion now refer to credit bureaus and not to credit

reporting organizations. I would hope that their content can be expanded to cover the activities of firms like Retail Credit Co.; but it must be emphasized at this time, that these guidelines are only applicable to credit bureaus and the credit granting firms they service.

Mr. Speaker, the Newark Star-Ledger of Sunday, January 26, 1969, carried a brief description of the ACB sponsored guidelines. I am pleased to insert it into the RECORD at this point:

CREDIT BUREAUS NOW ON YOUR SIDE

America's \$100 billion-a-year credit industry says its new set of self-regulatory guidelines will protect consumer privacy.

The Associated Credit Bureaus Inc., representing 2,000 credit bureaus in the U.S., claimed the rules would wipe out unauthorized snooping into confidential records and would guarantee fairer reports on borrowers.

In the past, the ACB admitted, there were few restraints to prevent individuals, state and federal agencies from conducting "fishing expeditions" through credit bureau files.

In addition, a survey of the industry showed that many installment buyers were denied credit because of errors or negligence and that credit reports often contained irrelevant and outdated information.

SHOW ME

Under the new guidelines, a consumer can demand to see what information is in his personal credit file at a local credit bureau.

The credit industry has promised to have trained personnel on hand to explain credit reports and to counsel a consumer on difficulties.

Service to government agencies will be strictly limited and due process of law will be followed in all cases. ACB member bureaus will refuse reports to credit granters and their employees if a business transaction is not involved.

Finally the industry will attempt to assure that its files reflect an individual's current state of credit-worthiness.

DAMNATION QUALIFIED

Time limits on retention of information have been established to meet a charge by a congressional committee that "one derogatory item may damn a man for his entire life."

The committee, which studied invasion of privacy, was headed by Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher (D-13th).

Gallagher was instrumental in pressing the credit industry to clean its house. He expressed confidence that the new guidelines will protect consumer privacy as well as insure more accurate and faster credit transactions.

BASIC ROLE OF SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVASION OF PRIVACY

Mr. Speaker, underlying this specific affect on the credit industry are the motivating principles of all the activities of my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy. America has become a data-rich society; yet, we are in great danger of becoming privacy poor. Spontaneity and creative risk-taking are largely responsible for our success as a society and this certainly implies the ability of the individual to control, at least to some extent, the spread of information about himself. The new technology has given society the tools with which to inhibit and demean our essential individuality and I am convinced that human values must be made the vital part of any system of record-keeping or research.

Perhaps the key to the new technology is the computer. The computer has now made it possible to pull together all the facts and all the hearsay about a man. In

the very near future, a single reel of plastic tape will be able to store a five-page dossier on every man, woman, and child in the United States. The individual's whole history, idle speculation as well as confirmable fact, can tumble out of the computerized information system within 10 minutes. Computer technology is permitting records surveillance to advance at such an incredible pace—for example, one credit firm plans to have data on every American in its computerized system within 5 years—that we may lose control of our own destiny and human nature itself may be radically altered by the machines we have created.

Mr. Speaker, let me relate a relevant example of the new technology at work. Farmers in California built a machine to pick tomatoes. The only difficulty was that it bruised the thin skins; instead of redesigning the machine, they developed a strain of thicker skinned tomatoes. I do not believe that humans should surrender their rights or their lives to the demands of the new technology; Americans should not have to develop thicker skins just to make our machines work better.

NORTHERN NEW YORK REMEMBERS
AND SALUTES A NATIVE SON:
HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the 31st Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, is proud to claim as its native son, the new Secretary of State of the United States, the Honorable William P. Rogers. Leading newspapers in the 31st District have made fine editorial comment on his appointment and reflect this local pride.

Mr. Rogers was born on June 23, 1913, in Norfolk, a son of Harrison A. and Myra Beswick Rogers. Later Mr. Rogers moved to Canton where he was graduated from high school. He went on to receive his bachelor of arts degree from Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y., in 1934 and his bachelor of law degree from Cornell Law School, Ithaca, N.Y., in 1937.

Mr. Rogers becomes the fifth Secretary of State having direct ties with the northern section of New York State. The first was Gen. John W. Foster, of Evansville, Ind., who served under President Benjamin Harrison in 1892, filling out the unexpired term of James G. Blaine. Secretary Foster owned property at Henderson Harbor on Lake Ontario where he spent his summers. One of Secretary Foster's daughters, Eleanor, married Robert Lansing, of Watertown, who was Secretary of State under President Woodrow Wilson. The third connection between a Secretary of State and the north country was when another daughter of Secretary Foster, Edith, married the Reverend Dr. Allen Macy Dulles, father of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Dr. Dulles was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Watertown from 1887 to 1904.

The fourth was Secretary Frank Billings Kellogg who was born in Potsdam in 1856.

Mr. Speaker, the following are editorials and comments from newspapers in the 31st Congressional District where the new Secretary of State, the Honorable William P. Rogers, was born and raised, which I would like to share with my colleagues:

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times]

THE NEW SECRETARY OF STATE

The appointment of William P. Rogers as secretary of state in the new cabinet showed the deftness and the shrewdness of the real professional that President-elect Nixon is. Perhaps the surprise element has created some of the excitement. However, Mr. Rogers has been a man on the go during his whole career and deserved an elevation beyond the cabinet role of attorney general which he held the last three years of the Eisenhower administration. Reappointment as the nation's chief lawyer would have been routine. Designation as secretary of state demonstrates a perceptiveness that Nixon backers are always hopeful that they will see.

Mr. Rogers on the one hand knows the nation from experience, yet is as fresh as though he had been drafted because of brilliance from a successful but non-public career. How could there have been combined such attributes in such a person? The question may be unanswerable, but it may be the much used word "charisma" offers the explanation.

Most of us in northern New York know his career because we watched him from his days of high school graduation at Canton, his years in Colgate as an undergraduate, his editorship of the Cornell Law quarterly more than 30 years ago. He became a part of Thomas E. Dewey's staff as an assistant district attorney. He had a naval career during World War II, and came out as a lieutenant commander.

After the war he was a special counsel of the senate war frauds investigating committee. This led to an assistantship under Attorney General Herbert Brownell during the fore part of the Eisenhower administration. During the latter part he took over as attorney general.

What does all this have to do with becoming secretary of state? In the first place, he is physically and mentally attractive; he has had success for which he alone has worked to achieve. Energetic, he should be able to impart some of his personal drive on the State department which has been for too long a time a one-man show, both during the days of John Foster Dulles and more recently with Dean Rusk as the head man. Mr. Rogers is not necessarily a team player, but on the other hand, he can be expected to insist upon a team performance from the many echelons below him in the State department.

Of great importance also is the close association between Mr. Rogers and President-elect Nixon. There always has been an intimacy between the two, perhaps because of the similarity in their careers as investigative types in the 40's and the testing under political fire which goes back to the 1952 campaign. He must well remember, as do many of us, those hours when he was sitting in the Pullman car in Oregon during the campaign, out of touch with the charge that Nixon had been the beneficiary of a private fund. Mr. Rogers was the campaign director for Mr. Nixon in those days and as late as 1952 communications were rudimentary at best in moments of political crisis.

When he was with the Department of Justice as assistant attorney general and later as attorney general, he assembled a youthful team that may have suggested to the successor administration of President Kennedy where to reach for the talent necessary in this modern governmental system.

He put in his hours at work not before the television cameras or on the speaking circuit. He was not seeking higher office but rather directed his efforts wholly to attorney assignment.

In a sense, therefore, he kept himself under wraps which made him all the more attractive on those few occasions when he emerged.

So after eight years out of public office during which he continued to show a measure of restraint when others were raising their own political flags, he takes over as secretary of state.

We congratulate him and President-elect Nixon for naming him.

[From the Ogdensburg (N.Y.) Journal]

BILL ROGERS OF NORFOLK AND CANTON IS
NAMED THE NEW SECRETARY OF STATE

The appointment of a native of Norfolk and graduate of Canton High School to be Secretary of State was a surprise to Northern New York as well as to the rest of the world. There had been general speculation on who Mr. Nixon would name to that most important of Cabinet posts, but William P. Rogers had not been even mentioned until the news got out Tuesday. The names of C. Douglas Dillon, former Secretary of the Treasury and Ambassador to France; Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Henry A. Kissinger were frequently mentioned while Mr. Rogers was not.

Mr. Nixon and Bill Rogers, as his friends in St. Lawrence County have always called him and always will, have had a long and close political and personal association.

He first became associated publicly with Nixon in 1948 when Nixon, then a first-term congressman, was looking for an outsider to evaluate Whitaker Chambers' charges against Alger Hiss, a high State Department official who was accused of passing secrets to the Russians. It was Rogers' opinion that Chambers was telling the truth that helped Nixon make up his mind to pursue the Hiss case.

Rogers and Nixon became close friends. The attorney helped the politician in his 1952 campaign for the Vice Presidency. Then he worked with Nixon in trying to stifle the Red-hunting Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin during the early years of the Eisenhower administration.

In 1955, when President Eisenhower suffered a serious heart attack, Nixon relied on Rogers, then Deputy Attorney General, for advice and even took refuge against the press in Rogers' suburban home.

Rogers served as Attorney General during General Eisenhower's second term as President. He traveled with Nixon during the 1960 presidential campaign.

In Sept. 1958 then Attorney General Rogers was given a testimonial dinner at Massena, when he was honored as the first native son of St. Lawrence County to have attained Cabinet rank. We were on the committee which arranged the dinner and met Bill Rogers for the first time. We thought he was a most attractive and impressive person. He is handsome, witty, warm and friendly. He invited us to call on him in Washington which we did one time and later saw him again after he had resigned as Attorney General when John Kennedy was elected President and was practicing in New York. We always found him a stimulating and extremely gracious person completely without any pretense or sense of his own importance. He was unassuming and modest despite his great success while still a young man. We always found him deeply interested in St. Lawrence County and his boyhood friends here.

Mrs. Merli Doren of our staff wrote one of her typically excellent stories about Bill Rogers in yesterday's Journal. She talked to Mr. Hugh C. Williams who was principal of Canton High School when Bill Rogers was a student there during his last two years of

high school. She also talked to Mrs. Williams who was then Miss Claire Gage and speech instructor at the school at the time. Mrs. Doren told us: "I thought both Mr. and Mrs. Williams might remember Bill Rogers as a young 'hell raiser' or possibly some kind of a major problem. To my disappointment they didn't. They remembered him as a very good student, very bright, well behaved and no problem at all. I was disappointed. So often a great success like Bill Rogers has skeletons in his youthful closet and youthful escapades which make a good story. He was so well behaved that no one suspected he would ever become Secretary of State."

Bill Rogers joins three other Northern New Yorkers who reached the exalted position of Secretary of State: Secretary Kellogg who was born in Potsdam, moved to Minnesota with his family when a small boy, served as Secretary of State under President Coolidge; Robert Lansing, Secretary of State under President Woodrow Wilson; John Foster Dulles who served as Secretary of State in the Eisenhower Administration.

St. Lawrence County and Northern New York are proud of Bill Rogers and sincerely wish him a highly successful career in the high position to which he has been named. Those who know Bill Rogers have no doubt that he will be a great Secretary of State.

—F. R. L.

[From the Pulaski (N.Y.) Democrat]

WILLIAM PIERCE ROGERS

The State of New York has provided many political leaders of national prominence over the years. Every resident can easily compile a long list of men from this state who have held high posts in the United States Government in addition to those men elected to Congress.

William Pierce Rogers, who will be Secretary of State in the administration of Richard Nixon, is a New York State man, and of even greater interest to Pulaski residents, he is a North Country man.

Rogers was born in Norfolk, St. Lawrence County, on June 23, 1913, lived in Canton, where he was first in his high school graduating class; received his Bachelor of Arts Degree from Colgate and his Bachelor of Law Degree from Cornell Law School in 1937. He served as a Lt. Commander in the U.S. Navy.

William Rogers became part of Governor Thomas E. Dewey's staff and later achieved prominence as Special Counsel to the Senate War Frauds Investigating Committee. He was Assistant Attorney General under Herbert Brownell and became Attorney General during the last three years of the Eisenhower administration.

Four other Secretaries of State have had North Country ties. John W. Foster, who owned property at Henderson Harbor, served under President Benjamin Harrison. His daughter, Eleanor, married Robert Lansing of Watertown, who became Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State. Another daughter of Foster's, Edith, married Reverend Doctor Allen Dulles whose son, John Foster Dulles served under Eisenhower. Frank Billings Kellogg, who was born in Potsdam in 1856 was Secretary of State in the administration of Calvin Coolidge.

The rural and recreational land areas on the banks of the St. Lawrence River and the shores of Lake Ontario have brought forth many men of strong character and of high caliber.

The people of the North Country are proud that President-elect Nixon has selected William Pierce Rogers to become Secretary of State of the United States of America and our prayers and best wishes go with him as he assumes his high office.

[From the Massena (N.Y.) Observer]

WILLIAM P. ROGERS AS SECRETARY OF STATE
Selection of William P. Rogers, native of

OCX—142—Part 2

Norfolk, by President-elect Nixon as secretary of state in the new administration pleases everybody throughout the area.

But this appointment is more than the recognition of the ability of a man who was born in Norfolk, graduated from Canton High School, Cornell University Law School and has since held responsible positions in government and in private enterprise.

It is more than just recognition of the splendid job Mr. Rogers did as attorney general in the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

This appointment is assurance that the office of secretary of state will be conducted in the best possible manner.

President-elect Nixon wants a successful administration; he wants to solve the problems of the world, or at least to alleviate them as much as possible.

And he is selecting top men on his team. William P. Rogers, our man from Norfolk, is a top man for this job.

[From the Oswego County (Mexico, N.Y.) Weeklies]

U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE FROM NORTHERN NEW YORK

Secretary of State, William P. Rogers of Canton, New York is the fifth United States Secretary of State in history to have upstate New York ties.

Secretary Rogers was born in Norfolk, New York on June 23, 1913. He graduated from Canton High School and received his BA degree from Colgate University in Hamilton, New York. He graduated from Cornell University Law School in 1937.

Upstate New Yorkers should be proud that these important men in history were from our area.

[From the Jefferson County (Adams, N.Y.) Journal]

THE NEW SECRETARY OF STATE

William Pierce Rogers, born in Norfolk, Northern New York on June 23, 1913, will become the third secretary of state from this area when he takes office in the administration of Richard M. Nixon on Monday, Jan. 20.

It is noteworthy that leaders in the federal government have three times chosen their secretary of state from this section of the country. The first named was Robert Lansing in the World War I Woodrow Wilson administration, and then John Foster Dulles in the Eisenhower era. Both were from Watertown, New York, and both served with distinction through some of the most trying times the Republic has ever known.

William P. Rogers, a lawyer who has had wide experience before the bar and in government office, will also serve during some of the most critical times of the nation as did his predecessors from Northern New York. We have every confidence that when his chapter in history is written he will rank with Lansing and Dulles as among the greatest Secretaries of State; all three men born within 70 miles of Adams.

Mr. Speaker, two other northern New York newspapers recalled Secretary Rogers' boyhood, calling upon the memories of old-time friends and neighbors.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PLAINDEALER, CANTON, N.Y.

The St. Lawrence Plaindealer which is published in Canton, N.Y., the community where Mr. Rogers spent part of his boyhood, reflected the pride felt by the long-time friends of the new Secretary of State.

Mr. Rogers, in letters to Canton residents, said "I will never forget what wonderful people there are in Canton," the newspaper reported.

The Plaindealer noted Mr. Rogers was graduated first in his class from Canton

High School where he played varsity basketball and managed the school football team. A close friend of Dr. Eugene Bewkes, under whom he had studied at Colgate University, Mr. Rogers returned to Canton in 1959 to receive an honorary doctorate in law degree from St. Lawrence University during the Bewkes presidency there.

Canton residents recalled Mr. Rogers' pleasing personality as a boy. Among them cited by the Plaindealer is Atwood Manley who recalled:

I remember him as a handsome, polite boy who used to walk past our home on his way to High School every day, often eating an apple as he walked.

Dr. Bewkes, now retired, recalled:

Mr. Rogers was an extremely able lawyer, with a very broad legal base. As a student he was quick, bright, and later, in the government of General Eisenhower, he proved to be a very able, tough negotiator, tied to no man.

Another Canton friend, Roy H. Bassett, remembers Bill Rogers' early days in northern New York and recalled "He always was a leader when he was a boy here," recalled the Plaindealer.

THE ADIRONDACK DAILY ENTERPRISE, SARANAC LAKE, N.Y.

The Adirondack Daily Enterprise of Saranac Lake, N.Y., reported a glimpse back into Mr. Rogers' early days as a businessman. Danny Sheehan, a Saranac Lake friend, remembers Bill Rogers with a fondness that time fails to diminish.

"Young Bill," as Mr. Sheehan refers to him, was a 15-year-old junior high school student when he asked if he could join the mobile summer photography unit operated by Mr. Sheehan and a partner who specialized in taking pictures of business houses and personnel and selling the finished photos back to the owners in lots of a dozen or more.

Bill Rogers got reluctant permission from his parents to take the summer job and traveled through towns from Massena, N.Y., to Burlington, Vt., taking picture orders and setting up appointments for the camera specialists who followed.

Some days, the Enterprise commented, Mr. Rogers was picked to hold the explosive flash powder tray and once or twice scorched a ceiling causing the crew to move on faster than usual.

Mr. Sheehan recalls the new Secretary of State was quick to learn. The Enterprise said:

Tell him something once and that was it. He must have developed a photographic mind from taking pictures with our company.

LET US SAVE THE LIVING; IRAQI GOVERNMENT, PLEASE NOTE

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, 14 men are dead because the revolutionary court of the Government of Iraq so decreed. These deaths, against the canons of law, reason, and humanity, are irreversible. Nine of these men were of the Jewish faith. What of the remaining Jews in Iraq?

The Jewish community once numbered 150,000 in Iraq. Now there are approximately 2,500. We have been able to learn that of the 2,500, hundreds are in jail. Others are under house arrest. All of them are subject to curfews and economic and social deprivation. The Iraqi Government will not let them leave. They are imprisoned within a land that they neither permit them to live a normal life nor permit them to seek other lands where they can begin anew their shattered lives.

In short, the Jews of Iraq are being held as hostages in a conflict not of their making, only because they are Jews. Certainly the world is not so bereft of conscience that it cannot, through the medium of international agencies, devise ways and means of persuading and influencing the Iraqi Government to permit the remaining fragment of Iraq's Jews to depart.

We have every reason to fear that these will not be the only hangings. In fact, we know that another trial behind closed doors is already in process and that the suspects are accused of working with the CIA. Who these accused are, we do not know, but the pattern has already been set. There are willing hands throughout the world ready to give asylum. It is at least conceivable that the government of Iraq would not be completely deaf to concerted world opinion. At the very minimum, we must try.

The condemnation by our State Department was forthright. The people of the United States were quick to applaud the vigorous statement of Secretary Rogers. We have set an example which others will surely follow. Let the nations of the world now join together in the rescue of the living Jews. All governments who have engaged in persecution of the Jews have claimed this to be an internal matter. Is it, or is it a matter of the collective humanity of mankind?

ECOLOGY AND THE INTERRELATION OF THE SCIENCES

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, more and more, public attention is being directed toward the field of human ecology and the interrelation of the sciences, the advancement of technology and the forces of change on man and his environment.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that rather than being independent, our society and our economy is interdependent. No longer can areas of our national life be considered wholly detached and isolated from other parts of our society because, invariably, there are substantial side and filter-down effects that go far beyond areas of immediate concern.

One of the first conferences on human ecology was conducted at Airlie House near Warrenton, Va. I think it significant that this landmark step should occur in the Commonwealth of Virginia, which traditionally has placed great emphasis on history and conser-

vation of natural and human resources. I believe the remarks of Charles O. Johnson, Jr., Administrator, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, Public Health Service of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, are most significant, and place in perspective the question of human ecology in a modern technological society. For this reason, I wanted to bring it to the attention of the membership.

REMARKS BY CHARLES C. JOHNSON, JR.

First, let me again say how pleased and grateful I am to have you here at this Symposium. My staff and I look forward to our discussions with you. I hope that in the years to come you will be able to look back on these few days as a gathering of minds that truly marked a turning point in our national approach to the problems of human ecology.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has established the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service to provide a new and broader kind of national leadership in dealing with these problems and specifically to provide that focus on man without which all ecological considerations become purely academic.

We approach our new task, not with optimism—for no one who looks at what we have done to ourselves and our planet in a comparatively few years can be guilty of optimism—but with determination. Secretary Cohen has charged the new Service with making this "a cleaner, safer, more healthful land for all." And we do feel sure that it can be done. Man, as a rational being, did not set out deliberately to destroy or contaminate the earth that gives him life, and surely he cannot, once the consequences are made clear, persist in a course which clearly leads to environmental chaos or even self-destruction. We are therefore moving ahead as quickly as possible to create a program whose impact will be felt throughout our society.

As we set about creating such a program, we need the best advice, the best guidance, possible. That is why I have asked this outstanding group to come together and consult with us. I am confident you will be able to give us a deeper insight into the man-environment relationship, assist us in defining the constants and the variables of human ecology, and help us avoid the pitfalls which surely lie ahead.

We live in troubled times, and they show all too clearly the terrible interplay of forces between man and the whole biocommunity of which he is a part. We find ourselves today catapulted into a new kind of world which we approach as strangers in a strange land. At times, the very structure of society seems in danger of being overwhelmed by a torrent of technological change which man has set in motion but sometimes seems incapable of controlling. Urbanization, a soaring population, and inequities nurtured in the darkness of the past and long ignored have released a slumbering discontent which jars the very foundations of the American dream. In our cities, this discontent has shown itself in attempts to destroy what no longer seems tolerable. Among our young people, there is a kindred frustration—and they would turn their backs on a society which they find "irrelevant."

In the year 1968, the greatest nation in the world must face a harsh and frightening fact: In spite of our tremendous advances in medicine, in science, engineering, and technology; in spite of a lengthening span of human life through improved health services and victories over communicable disease; in spite of affluence and high standards of living; in spite of all these things—perhaps even because of these very things—we have not succeeded in creating a physical, social, and cultural environment

in which we can find that satisfaction for the "whole man" which was surely the purpose of all our strivings.

With regard to the physical environment, we have reached, or at the very least are rapidly approaching, a critical point. Every year, pollution gets worse, rather than better; the threat from unsafe food, drugs, water, and a variety of consumer products is increasing; the quality of American life, particularly urban life, is deteriorating in a maelstrom of environmental problems so complex as to appear almost beyond remedy.

In the image of our adventurous ancestors, we are always drawn to the distant frontier and find it easy to close our eyes to the unplowed field that lies in front of us.

We are challenged by the potential miracles of organ transplants—while we drop steadily backward in such measures of medical progress as infant mortality. (We ranked sixth among the nations of the world in 1950 and by 1961 had moved down to about fifteenth place.)

We are about to land a man on the moon—and have not yet figured out what to do with the growing mountains of trash that litter our countryside.

Believe me, I do not question the value of these explorations whether they be in space or in medicine—but I am reminded, and I think our generation needs to be reminded, of that old proverb: "A man gazing at the stars is at the mercy of the puddles on the road."

Certainly our progress in meeting human needs has been great, but it has been uneven and our failure to come to grips with our consumer and environmental problems has—as the saying goes—been worse than a crime; it has been a blunder.

Let me, very briefly, review for you just a few more of the problems that demand our attention:

Toxic matter is being released into the air over the United States at the rate of more than 142 million tons a year, or three-quarters of a ton for every American. It comes from 90 million motor vehicles, from factories, power plants, municipal dumps and backyard incinerators.

The use of food additives to impart flavor, color, or other qualities has increased 50 percent in the past ten years, and each of us now consumes an average of three pounds of these chemicals yearly. Pesticides leave residues on food crops, and traces of veterinary drugs occur in milk and eggs—all this in addition to the chemical barrage that reaches us from other parts of the environment.

Over two million Americans are stricken with illness each year from microbiological contamination of food; increased use of "convenience" foods requiring little or no heating in the home complicates this problem.

Not counting industrial and agricultural wastes, we discard more than 165 million tons of solid wastes every year. Auto graveyards mar our landscapes; smoking, foul-smelling dumps pollute the air; no-return bottles, cans, and other packaging that cannot be recycled create mountains of trash. In low-income urban areas, garbage breeds rats, disease, and filth.

Every year, more than 500 new chemicals and chemical compounds are introduced into industry, along with countless operational innovations; thousands of workers suffer from cancer, lung disease, hearing loss, dermatitis, or other preventable diseases because industry, unions, and government at all levels have failed to give really adequate attention to occupational hazards.

Much of the drinking water available in our Nation's communities is of unknown quality. There are over 19 thousand communities whose public water supplies serve about 53 million people which are not covered by U.S. Public Health standards. About 750 community water supplies serving about 92 million people are covered, but the stand-

ards themselves need updating, particularly with regard to chemical contaminants.

Accidents—many of them involving hazardous products—take the lives of 100,000 Americans every year and injure 52 million more. Some 3,000 deaths occur every year from accidental ingestion of poisons—most of these among children.

Radiation as an environmental hazard is a growing threat to ours and future generations which we have barely begun to understand. Radiation sources are now to be found throughout the environment. They range from the large-scale applications of nuclear energy, particularly in electric power generation, through laser and microwave technology in industry, to the use of radionuclides and X-rays in the healing arts and the use of microwave ovens and other electronic equipment in the home. And our scientific protection against radiation is at a beginning stage of development.

The world clamors for the thousands of new miracle drugs which our pharmaceutical research produces to treat specific disease problems. Yet in spite of our best efforts at testing, labeling, and other controls, they often produce unforeseen side effects and may even offer sinister genetic threats. What these new chemical formulations mean in terms of the total chemical barrage to which modern man is exposed is an area we have not even begun to explore.

Scientist-philosophers like Dr. Dubos and others in this distinguished company have pointed out for years the hazards of our heedless and random manipulation of the ecological system. As a Nation, we have been slow to understand, and even slower to act—and yet we have not remained completely idle.

For some years, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has been engaged in programs to assure safe food, drugs, and drinking water; to control air pollution, occupational disease, radiation hazards, and other environmental threats. In the last few years, we have attempted to adopt a broader, more comprehensive approach to these problems. We have established a national laboratory for environmental health research. We have tried several organizational alignments in an effort to create more effective action. We have recognized that several of our diverse activities—in food protection, sanitation, safe drugs, clean air, and the like—all relate to the same overwhelming problem, the problem of man's ability or inability to adapt to an environment which he himself is subjecting to constant change.

But although our perception of the man-environment relationship matured and clarified and although our sense of urgency grew, we in Health, Education and Welfare, no less than the rest of the Nation—seemed unable to translate this new understanding and urgency into meaningful action, with man the whole man—as the focus of our efforts.

Even as the holistic nature of the man-environment relationship became an article of faith with us, we somehow still remained too often locked into narrow, categorical approaches to our environmental problems. And in spite of broader concepts of human health and a growing understanding of the whole man, we have unquestionably limited ourselves to too narrow and rigid a definition of environmental health. We have thought that before we could prove health hazards in the environment we had to be able to count the corpses—and furthermore to establish a direct, incontrovertible causal relationship, based on immutable scientific data in strict accordance with Koch's Postulates. Unfortunately, in an environment of multiple impacts, direct, incontrovertible causal relationships between health and individual insults are difficult to define even when the evidence is abundantly clear. Furthermore, science is never immutable; what we know

today is always modified by what we learn tomorrow.

Unless our Nation learns and learns quickly to apply the scientific knowledge we have—and it will always be incomplete—to the problems of the environment, we are courting inevitable disaster.

We in Health, Education, and Welfare have at last in our organizational structure, taken into account the interdependence and interrelatedness of all environmental factors in their effect on man. We have brought together in a situation in which they can be mutually supportive the Food and Drug Administration, the National Air Pollution Control Administration, and the Environmental Control Administration. We intend to provide coordination to our total effort. We want to assure that no important line of research is neglected. And, most importantly, we want to consolidate all that we know today—and all the knowledge that we can develop in the future—into a sensible, revealing picture of what is happening to man in the contemporary environment.

It is our purpose to define as well as possible, and to enunciate as clearly as possible, the effect on man—the combined and total effect wherever this can be determined with some degree of validity—of the various environmental impacts to which he is subjected. We intend to give first priority to the development of broad environmental criteria based on our current understanding of human health and well being; we hope such criteria can become the baseline for the thousands of daily decisions, in both the public and private sector, which determine the kind of world we live in.

We suffer no illusion, either as to our own limitations or the difficulty of the task. We cannot manage the environment, and no single agency of government can do so. For just as every human activity has contributed to our environmental problems, every human activity—probably without exception—is going to have to be involved in their solution.

No agency of government can single-handedly design and build transportation systems, and cities, and industrial plants; it cannot remove pollution from the air, and assure pure drinking water, and uncontaminated food. Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service cannot single-handedly rebuild our ghettos, or update our sewage systems, or eliminate the noise and stress and crowding that mar the quality of our lives. It cannot construct a safe and healthful environment for every American.

But we in the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service can provide the focus on human health and welfare which is so essential to the attainment of these vitally important goals. And all Americans, working together, can transform the face of the nation, if we are determined to put science and technology to work to solve the very problems which science and technology have created.

We intend to use those regulatory authorities vested in us fully and fairly, and to seek new authorities where we find they are needed. We intend to work closely with industry and government of all levels to achieve prevention or control of environmental hazards. We intend to work with State and local jurisdictions to help them develop broad, effective environmental and consumer protection programs. And, as I emphasized earlier, we intend to develop criteria which can guide their action.

We intend to become the spokesman, not just for conservation or pollution abatement or food and drug protection or sanitation, but for man the citizen and consumer. We intend to become the advocate and spokesman for human ecological wisdom applied throughout our society.

We intend to make common cause with all the other organizations and movements that are concerned with any aspect of the envi-

ronmental problem. And we hope that by providing a more meaningful focus on man, we can weld all these separate approaches into a coherent and effective design for national action.

Never before has there been such general public concern about the quality of the environment. Increasingly, as environmental deterioration has more and more affected the lives of all, uneasiness on the part of all has created a demand for more sensible use of the environment. Universities and other private organizations have turned their attention to the problem. State and local governments have established programs to cope with various aspects of it. Industry has shown increasing awareness of its responsibilities. Throughout the Federal structure, agencies charged with such matters as transportation, natural resources, city planning, and agriculture, are thinking in terms of environmental impact and striving to reconcile their actions with some elusive principle of ecological wisdom.

And yet, our national efforts have not been effective in holding back the tide of environmental ills. The Nation as a whole has failed, I think, to grasp the complete meaning of what Dr. Dubos and others have tried to tell us—that the object of our concern is, or certainly ought to be, man. I search for neat, single solutions to neat, single problems, we have tended to classify them as though they were parts of an exercise in planetary property management. We have looked too long through the wrong end of a telescope, and have lost sight of the principal figure which should demand our attention—man himself. As Action is the child of Thought, obsolete thinking has produced—in accordance with the immutable laws of Nature—obsolete actions.

If we are going to replace customary attitudes with new ones, all of the disciplines and institutions who in the past have been concerned with man's environment must re-examine their traditional positions. In the field of public health, only a few pioneers have shown real concern for the important role of environmental factors in the causation of disease and disability. We set up clinics in rural and city slums where we patiently treat and re-treat the same child for recurring bouts of diarrhea, for instance—without ever concerning ourselves with the environmental source of the infection. We set up mental health clinics which try to mitigate the terrible effects of poverty and ignorance and degradation, but regard an attack on the causes as beyond our province. Too many public health workers in short, are still capable of showing genuine compassion for the person who is already ill or injured, coupled with genuine indifference to the environmental causes.

For years, our conservationists have been "voices crying in the wilderness" maintaining the ecological truth that man cannot be totally estranged from the natural world and remain whole. They have helped stem the tide of devastation. But their efforts, too, must be attuned to a broader ecological view—that relates the "Natural environment" to the "Man-Made" urban environment in truly meaningful ways. Pesticides do threaten the balance of Nature, and water pollution is indeed destroying aquatic life, and the effect of sonic booms will assuredly be felt by wildlife in our wilderness areas. But all of these things, it must be made clear, are important fundamentally because they have sooner or later an adverse effect on man himself.

Those who are concerned primarily with preserving and enhancing the beauty of the world about us are in possession of a higher order of ecological grace than most of the rest of us, for they never forget that "man does not live by bread alone." But their efforts, too, must be taken in awareness of the complex interrelatedness of all en-

vironmental problems; otherwise their best efforts could do no more than erect visible barriers between man and the ugliness he has created.

Those who are concerned with the consumer must recognize that he is also a citizen, and the hazards to which he is subjected go beyond those of contaminated milk and food, hazardous products, etc. They include the air he breathes, the water he drinks and the many hazards which he encounters as he moves through the environments of home, job and neighborhood. With regard to their effects on him, the environmental hazards he encounters as a citizen cannot be differentiated from the hazards to which he is subjected as a consumer.

I hope that we can provide for all of these various groups a common view on the problem of human ecology and give new impetus and definition to all their efforts. And I hope that we can establish some new priorities for saving the environment.

As for the future, the population of the United States now numbers 200 million and is expected to reach at least 230 million by 1980; urban areas will absorb the increase, and their environmental problems will be intensified. Technology may be expected to increase the risk of food-borne disease and chemical contamination. Unless we apply the lessons of human ecology the future can only bring more physiological, biological, and psychological hazards for man.

We in the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service hope that we can help America apply these lessons. We will certainly need help in doing so. Your charge, then, during these three days of discussions, is to distill the varied and vast body of knowledge which you represent into a series of recommendations which we can consider as we strive to carry out the mission with which we have been charged.

RHODESIA: TO UNDERSTAND A SERIOUS CRISIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Claudius G. Pendill, 44 Broad Street, Newburyport, Mass., has prepared a factual and informative handbook on Rhodesia which may be of interest to our colleagues and under unanimous consent I submit the handbook for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

RHODESIA: AN EFFORT TO UNDERSTAND A SERIOUS CRISIS

(By Claudius G. Pendill, November 1968)

It is more difficult each year for a private citizen, as it is for a member of Congress, to keep accurately informed on the ever increasing number of important events in this country and in the world, where our interests are directly involved. Conflicting statements are published. Propaganda is poured out. There is often an absence of hard facts or of an objective point of view.

One situation much in the limelight today is Southern Rhodesia, or just Rhodesia as it is now called.

The main events in the news have been the refusal of Great Britain to grant independence to Rhodesia, even after doing so to more than 20 other countries including Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland in 1964; the Unilateral Declaration of Independence by Rhodesia after the final breakdown of negotiations in October 1965; the application of voluntary sanctions by the United Nations on Nov. 20, 1965; the further UN action on April 9, 1966 directing the U.K. to

prevent oil tankers with oil for Rhodesia from reaching Beira, a Mozambique port, "by force if necessary"; the UN imposition of selective mandatory sanctions on Dec. 16, 1966 and increased mandatory sanctions on May 29, 1968, all of this supported and implemented with devastating detail by the United States. And the vote on Nov. 7, 1968, by the UN General Assembly, bringing this closer to a serious crisis and another war, as reported in the New York Times of Nov. 8th, "to strengthen sanctions against Rhodesia, extend them to include Portugal and South Africa and demand that Britain use force to bring down the regime of Prime Minister Ian D. Smith." Only 9 nations opposed—Australia, Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Britain and the United States.

What is this all about? What are the issues? Why did it build up to this international danger point? It is important to know so that we can either back the U.S. position or get it changed.

The details have been studied in thousands of pages of information gathered in books, reports, pamphlets, letters, speeches and documents of all sorts, including several hundred pages recently received from the Department of State.

This paper will review, in summary form, these matters:

- I. The settling and economic development of Rhodesia;
- II. The characteristics and tribal nature of the Africans;
- III. Several different developments of political organization in Rhodesia;
- IV. The Rhodesian way (the principle of merit) its constitution, education and voting franchise requirements;
- V. A 17 point chronological summary of developments in Rhodesia and with the British, United Nations and United States;
- VI. The new proposed constitution for Rhodesia, the internal situation, the Communist aspect;
- VII. A critical look at the main arguments advanced to justify actions taken;
- VIII. A concluding statement by Dean Acheson.

I. THE SETTLING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF RHODESIA

Africa as a whole is 3 times the size of the United States. The part generally referred to as Southern Africa is nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ of it and lies below the Congo and Tanzania. It runs 2000 miles from about 7° south down to the tip at 35°. It includes Portuguese Angola and Mozambique, Zambia (formerly Northern Rhodesia), Malawi (Nyasaland), South Africa and its mandate South West Africa. Rhodesia is about 500 miles each way, as big as New England, New York and Pennsylvania together; the size of California.

It is mostly high plateau country, 3000-5000 feet altitude, the climate like Southern California. There is also a fertile lower part, the "lowveld". Rainfall is generally good, there are few droughts, floods or cyclones. The Zambezi River on the north is the boundary with Zambia, the Limpopo River the border with South Africa.

The site of Zimbabwe is evidence of an early indigenous Rhodesian civilization between the 9th and 13th centuries A.D. They were driven out by waves of Bantu from the north who are the main foundations of the Africans of Rhodesia. They are of two tribal groups, the Mashona in the center and north, the older and larger tribe, and the Matabele in the southwest around Bulawayo. The latter came from the South African warrior Zulu tribe. A large portion of the Africans are Christians.

In 1888 Cecil Rhodes got a concession for mineral rights and all of Southern and Northern Rhodesia were proclaimed a British sphere of influence. In 1890 there were about 400,000 Africans. The British settlers ran the

country until 1923 when it was formally annexed by Great Britain and granted self government. Today there are 4,400,000 Africans, 235,000 Europeans (whites), 23,000 other ethnic groups. About 500,000 of the Africans come from nearby countries to work for a few months and then return to their own tribes.

Rhodesia is a country of private enterprise. It has had more exports than imports.

In mining, it has the world's largest metallurgical deposit of chrome. It has the world's greatest deposit and is the principal world producer of lithium. It has the world's biggest single deposit of coal with one vein about 30 feet thick. It is the third largest world producer of asbestos. With sanctions, the U.S. no longer bought high grade chrome from Rhodesia but turned to the USSR, the only other major producer, for lower grade ore. In 1968 the latter raised the price some 20%.

In agriculture, ownership of farming land is of three kinds: European areas restricted to ownership by Europeans; Tribal Trust Lands restricted to African use in accordance with tribal customs and usages; and African purchase areas which can be purchased only by Africans. European owners may apply to have their lands converted into lands available for African purchase but Tribal Trust lands cannot be transferred to European ownership. There is extensive help for African farmers, including that given by white farmers to their nearby African neighbors in such ways as use of machinery and instruction in modern methods.

Tobacco was more than half of all agricultural earnings. It was hard hit by sanctions, since most was sold to Great Britain. The government had to buy and store it. A crash program of diversification was begun. Other crops are sugar, cotton, maize, groundnuts, tea, vegetables and citrus fruits, with wheat and coffee now started.

Cattle in 1965 amounted to 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ million head, more than half of them owned by Africans. There is enough production of pigs, milk and cheese for home use and export. There is large scale forestry and growing paper manufacturing.

II. THE CHARACTERISTICS AND TRIBAL NATURE OF THE AFRICANS

After the whites came in 1890 the warlike Matabele continued to fight the more numerous but more peaceful Mashona as they had for years. Then a small white force helped the Mashona defeat the Matabele. However, the latter rose again in much the way that the American Indians attacked our early settlers here, and in 1896 killed 103 unsuspecting white men and their families. A force of 2000 whites and 600 black troops put down that uprising. Then the Mashona surprised everyone by rising. Both African groups thought the white man was weak and the Mashona did not want to pay the price if the Matabele should win and again be able to beat up the Mashona. The same methods were used as more recently in Kenya. Servants thought to be faithful suddenly killed women and children, prospectors and farmers.

At this point Cecil Rhodes took a small unprotected party including two women, to meet the Matabele chiefs. In some amazing way he induced them to lay down their arms. The Mashona and the settlers were no longer attacked. Thus began 70 years of peaceful living together between the tribes themselves and with the whites. Yet people who live there say that the tribal feuds still simmer, that if there were "instant Democracy", the Mashona could impose their majority rule by vote which the Matabele would never accept. Tribal war could come again, as in Nigeria today. Both groups have had the white man's protection and want it to continue. The whites also kept out other tribes who raided both these tribes for slaves. The two rebellions cost the whites about one-tenth of

their numbers, a percentage loss not equalled in our wars.

Practices of the Africans are laden with superstition and traditional ways of doing things. A handful of bones, cast by night upon the floor of a native hut, still will evoke an unimaginable terror. In a drought one tribe sacrifices a child to the spirit of the Rain God. Another kills bulls as a sacrifice to their ancestors. Parents universally sold and still sell daughters for marriage. The price of one girl is 5 cows. We saw superstition when we visited in Kenya in 1960. An African worker came to our post saying he must move from the district. Pay and everything were alright but a certain kind of hawk had landed on his hut. That was a bad omen and meant that he must burn down the hut and leave the area.

Another instance shows the depth of their beliefs. The Mau Mau sent fire arrows into the thatched roofs of the huts and burned them down, and they also easily entered the huts to kill with knives in the dark. Our host Bill offered all his Africans cinder block homes. These could not be burned. Their doors and windows could be barred. He offered to provide all the material free and as each man built his house he would pay him the same as though working in the fields. The offer was unanimously turned down. The reason, when a person died in a hut it was necessary to burn it down. They could not burn down cinder block homes so they could not accept them to live in even though it would save them from the Mau Mau.

People who have lived long with the black African community make it clear that individual Africans have no tradition whatever for "voting" as we know it. The tribal enclaves are organized like a pyramid, from the villagers, to the elders, to the district head men, to the chiefs who are either hereditary or chosen in tribal fashion. There is no thought that "the children" at the lowest level could ever challenge the tribal authority. They believe "that the ancestors, consulted through the medium of the chiefs, ultimately decide the tribe's weal or woe". Again "the educated and well-to-do African townsman with a business remains subject to his tribe's communal custom of sharing possessions. If a man has 6 wives and 61 children, (a case known to one author), he will not wish to declare even the modest amount of property he has which would qualify him for a vote."

III. SEVERAL DIFFERENT DEVELOPMENTS OF POLITICAL ORGANIZATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Many countries in Central and Northern Africa are ruled by dictatorships with totalitarian methods and much bloodshed. In many of them Africans rule and exclude whites from positions of responsibility. There have been different and more peaceful developments in that third of the continent which is Southern Africa. In *Malawi*, African rule depends to a great extent on the Europeans for administration of government and for operations of services and the economy. In *Botswana*, Africans rule and depend on Africans for support in the administration while leaning on Europeans for assistance. In general, the question posed is, what is the best political organization and method of operation for a state in which the inhabitants range from primitive, superstitious, tribal people living in huts and kraals, to highly sophisticated and educated people, when they are diversified so widely by tribes, languages, interests, race, color, religion and education or lack of it? What is the best method for each country at this particular stage of its development, now?

As we consider what is happening, it is a good idea to remind ourselves that when the first settlers came to America it was already inhabited by Indian tribes estimated to number some 800,000 individuals. It was the practice of our ancestors here in settling this

land to exploit, kill and to nearly exterminate the native Indians. In 1865, after 2½ centuries of settling, there were only 248,000 Indians left, instead of their making a normal growth to some two million population. As one American student of Africa put it, "this was our solution for the only real colonial problem we ever faced". In 1876 when we made our Declaration of Independence, after 150 years of establishing colonies, the white population was fractional as compared to the Indians and the Negroes then inhabiting this land. I wonder how we would have responded then. If a United Nations had supported England with sanctions to strangle us because we did not have "majority rule" or "one-man one vote!" It took centuries here to free the slaves. Women only got the vote in 1920.

One solution for the African problem is that being worked on in South Africa. When the Dutch and English first came there some 300 years ago there were only a few scattered tribes such as the Hottentots. The great area lay empty. As they moved north hundreds of miles they encountered black Bantus pushing down into south central Africa. The racial problem began that way. But the whites did not kill off these other races as we did. Even today thousands of blacks in Northern Africa come into South Africa for better living and economic development. The whites are now about 3,800,000. Coloreds, a combination of whites and Hottentots, are nearly 2,000,000. People from India total about 500,000. There are 12,500,000 blacks or Bantus of many different tribes with 7 different languages and many more dialects.

It is South African policy that no good can come now of trying to mix this great diversity of racial groups. So blacks and whites live in close contact with each other in city and on farm. They work together by day but must occupy separate living areas. Movement is restricted and a "passbook" is used for movement within the country. One reason is that the experiment was tried of letting the Bantu immigrate to the city as we let our Negroes move anywhere. This bred some of the worst slums in the world. Their solution was not to have a Harlem or a Watts but to control the influx, have them live in their own areas near the cities, and make it possible for the Bantus to develop their own culture. 80% of all Bantu children of school age are in school. New homes for more than 100,000 non-whites are being built each year. There is today strong pressure from within to solve one problem after another. This is one way which is evolving to reach ultimately the most workable solution to the problem. Only 6% of the population of the African continent is in the Republic of South Africa. Yet it produces 40% of the continent's industrial output. The blacks share well in this economic development. Of the dozens of countries in the world which have received U.S. aid, loans and lend lease, only South Africa has repaid in full all principal and interest.

A second way of organizing a political state is the way that Southwest Africa is run by South Africa under mandate. This uses home rule, a kind of federalism. It recognizes and develops each major tribe and then ties them together as parts of a state. In South Africa itself this is being tried with the Bantus in the Transkei. It is also about what has developed in the former British Protectorate of Basutoland, now independent Lesotho, and in the British protectorate of Swaziland.

Southwest Africa is twice the size of Rhodesia, population 75,000 whites, 450,000 blacks, very sparsely settled. The tribe of Ovambos in the far north is 45% of the black population. If majority rule were granted, this one tribe would overwhelm the others leading to the same violence as in the Congo and Nigeria. This area is being developed in peace and with great economic gains as a separate entity within the larger whole. Be-

tween 1940 and 1965 the per capita income went from \$42 to \$380 a year, an enormous advance, far faster than in most of Africa.

IV. THE RHODESIAN WAY (THE PRINCIPLE OF MERIT), ITS CONSTITUTION, EDUCATION AND VOTING FRANCHISE REQUIREMENTS

From the founding by Cecil Rhodes and his British South African Company and the coming of the first white settlers in 1890, the Company ran the colony until 1922. Then Rhodesia began a third way of political development in Southern Africa. The 400,000 Africans there in 1890 were not killed off but increased to the 4,400,000 who are there today. The Rhodesian idea recognizes that if European restraints were removed the powerful and warlike Matebeles could again war against the larger and peaceful Mashonas. It recognizes that many Africans have moved to the cities and are detribalized, and that many are fully integrated into the Rhodesian social and political system. The constitutional approach of Mr. Ian Smith has taken into account all these factors and assumes that Europeans, Matabeles and Mashonas will exist in any future Rhodesian political system and that all have a part to play in it.

(a) The Constitution

The 1923 constitution made it a self governing colony with a British-appointed governor. All matters were in his own hands except international. The British government reserved certain powers to prevent legislation which discriminated against Africans or amended the Constitution. It could also disallow any active legislation if it deemed that necessary. It never exercised those powers. That constitution also laid down the principle of merit as the criterion for participating in government. It provided for a single House of Parliament with 30 members. Voting was open to all adult British subjects regardless of race, with annual income over \$960.

In 1953 the British got Southern and Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland to form a Federation. It succeeded economically but after several years of rioting it broke up and was dissolved in 1963. Nyasaland became the independent state of Malawi in July 1964. Northern Rhodesia the independent state of Zambia in October 1964.

In 1961 during the break up, a new constitution for Southern Rhodesia was worked out, to be the basis for Rhodesian independence. It was approved by both the British and Rhodesians in December 1961. It increased African representation markedly. British powers were further limited but the Crown could still prevent discrimination against Africans.

(b) Education

The educational situation in Rhodesia is summarized in a report by Representative Ashbrook, Ohio, after his visit there. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 4, page 5342.) The facts given are also reported in other sources. "African education is the single largest expenditure of the Rhodesian government. 98% of all direct taxation is paid by whites. The government has subscribed to the western idea of providing as much education as possible, rather than to the practice prevalent in most former British and French Colonies of training only a small elite group and ignoring the rest of the African population. In 1966 Rhodesia's ratio of children in school to total population was comparable to Britain's. In Britain it is 1 in 5, in Rhodesia 1 in 6, in Tanzania 1 in 18, in Malawi 1 in 43, in Ethiopia 1 in 80."

"In 1968 there are about 700,000 African school children. The primary school is now a 5 year course. More than 40% complete that and receive further 3 year schooling in the upper primary. The new plan, however, now in effect provides that every African child able to reach a school by 1969 will get a full primary education of 7 years as in European schools. . . . Half of those completing the primary course will receive fur-

their education in four year academic secondary schools or two year courses qualifying for apprenticeships. The other 50% are not barred from further study but those who want it will get assistance from teachers, in available class rooms and by correspondence courses. As a matter of fact, the demand of Africans for the few but steadily increasing places in secondary schools is not as yet equal to the supply. All who want to go further can do so today."

(c) Voting franchise requirements

The franchise is for voters of all races, registered on one of two rolls. It extends to all citizens aged 21 years or over, resident in the country for more than two years, subject to property, income or educational qualifications as stated below.

Parliament went from 30 to 65 members. Of these 50 are selected by "A" roll voters to represent constituencies. The 15 selected by the "B" roll voters represent the much larger

electoral districts which overlap the constituencies. Each voter casts two votes, one for constituency, one for district. By this system of cross-voting the "A" voters can influence the result of a "B" roll contest, and vice versa. This is designed to broaden the appeal of candidates to voters on both rolls. A married woman is deemed to have the same means of qualifications as her husband if she does not qualify in her own right. This applies to one wife only. She has also to fulfill the other appropriate qualifications herself.

There are now 14 Africans in the Parliament. In 1966 "A" roll voters numbered 101,000—95,700 whites, 2,400 Africans, 3,000 others. The "B" roll numbered 11,700—10,780 Africans, 589 whites. Qualifications required for both rolls as to ownership, income and education are on the next page. They were made much lower for the "B" roll. Nothing prevents any African from gaining access to the "A" roll.

	Annual income and value of property owned	Education	
		Primary	Secondary
"A" roll:			
(a).....	\$2,220 or \$4,620.....		
or			
(b).....	\$1,480 or \$3,080.....	Complete 5 years.....	
(c).....	\$924 or \$1,540.....	do.....	4 years.
or			
(d).....	Appointment to office of chief or headman.....		
"B" roll:			
(a).....	\$739 or \$1,386.....		
or			
(b).....	\$370 or \$770.....	2 years.....	
(c).....	Over 30 years of age and \$370 or \$770.....	Complete 5 years.....	
(d).....	Over 30 years of age and \$524 or \$1,078.....		
(e).....	Kral heads with a following of 20 or more heads of families.....		
(f).....	Ministers of religion.....		

V. CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY (17 POINTS) OF DEVELOPMENTS IN RHODESIA WITH THE BRITISH, UNITED NATIONS AND UNITED STATES

1. Rhodesia was self governing throughout its history. Its premier sat on an equal basis with all other premiers in the British Empire and Commonwealth.

2. Rhodesia developed with voting based on certain modest property and educational requirements as we have seen, with adult male and female suffrage. Voter qualifications are nothing new. They were in effect in the United States and in other countries during early stages of representative government, when education was not common and when cultural and economic development was unequal.

3. In 1963, as the Federation broke up, and in 1964 as independence was being granted to Malawi and Zambia, Rhodesia began to press for it. Two years of conferences were held. In 1964 British Prime Minister Sir Alex Douglas-Home indicated that progress might be made if Rhodesia's Prime Minister Ian Smith could show that the majority of all the population of Rhodesia favored independence under the basic provisions of the 1961 Constitution. The tribal chiefs, acknowledged leaders of more than 60% of the African population, held a four day "Indaba." At it's conclusion, October 26, 1964, they voted unanimously in favor of the independence plan. So did the registered voters 10-1. This was unsatisfactory to Britain. Nothing would suffice short of a new constitution assuring prompt transition to African majority rule.

4. In later conferences with Premier Harold Wilson he took a new position. No Independence Before Majority African rule, referred to as NIBMAR. On their part, the Rhodesians demanded the right of continued evolution, not revolution, and the right to determine and control the pace of transition to majority rule, as is stated on Page 3 of the Department of State Bulletin March 6, 1967. The two years of negotiations broke down in October 1965.

5. On Nov. 5, 1965—the General Assembly

of the U.N. adopted a resolution calling on Great Britain to suspend the 1961 constitution and convene a new constitutional convention, to arrange independence based on universal suffrage. (State Dept. Bulletin 3-6-67)

6. On Nov. 11, 1965 the government of Ian Smith Unilaterally Declared Independence for Rhodesia, referred to as UDI.

7. Great Britain at once invoked economic war against Rhodesia, embargoed shipments to and from, and froze Rhodesian assets in British Banks.

8. On Nov. 11, 1965, after UDI, the U.N. General Assembly condemned the UDI. The Security Council did so on Nov. 12th.

9. On Nov. 20, 1965, by Resolution 217, the Security Council of the United Nations voted unanimously (France alone abstained) "that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constitutes a threat to international peace and security" and called for voluntary sanctions by all members, including arms, equipment, military material and oil. U.S. Ambassador Goldberg supported this. His first reason was "we are irrevocably dedicated to the principle of self-determination and independence for and by all people of South Rhodesia."

10. On Apr. 9, 1966 the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 221, noting that oil tankers were arriving at the Mozambique port of Beira, Portuguese, and called on the U.K. "to prevent by the use of force if necessary the arrival at Beira of vessels reasonably believed to be carrying oil destined for Rhodesia." This was done by British warships.

11. On Friday, Dec. 2, 1966 Prime Ministers Wilson and Smith met aboard HMS Tiger at sea off Gibraltar on a new Constitution. After two days of strenuous meetings both sides compromised in what seemed to be fair, reasonable and responsible constitutional changes as to parts I and II. They included a further development of African voting power. But Mr. Wilson then did three things:

(1) He adopted a peremptory tone amounting to an ultimatum. (2) He demanded that Mr. Smith at once commit his government to the whole agreement. The latter questioned

part III and steadfastly insisted upon consulting his associates at home. (3) Wilson demanded, at 1 o'clock Sunday morning, Dec. 4, that Rhodesia give a final answer at 10 o'clock Monday morning December 5th. Ian Smith made the long flight back home after a gruelling 3 days aboard the British vessel.

12. The meeting failed when the Rhodesian cabinet found Part III of the working document utterly unacceptable. In this part Britain proposed to change completely from the independent relationship with Rhodesia that had lasted 70 years and in which they had never had a single occasion to exercise any vote. Instead, they would dissolve the legislature, give most power to the Royal Governor, hold new elections, the government would be appointed by the Governor at his discretion, the Royal Governor would be responsible "for the maintenance of law and order and the protection of human rights and would exercise these powers as Commander-in-Chief of the defense forces." There was no commitment as to how long these conditions would prevail. There was no guarantee that if conditions were met, independence could be achieved. When advised that Rhodesia could not accept the proposal the British Government thereupon withdrew the proposals it had previously advanced and accepted. It restated its position that no solution would be acceptable which would grant independence prior to majority rule.

13. On Dec. 16, 1966, as the voluntary sanctions in force for a year had not proved effective enough to topple its government, the Security Council of the U.N. at the request of Great Britain, passed resolution No. 232 which imposed selective mandatory economic sanctions for the first time in U.N. history. The United States supported this. By Article 25 of the Charter all U.N. members are obligated to accept and carry out such a decision of the Council. The use of force was urged by Jordan, India, Bulgaria, Nigeria, Mali and Senegal.

14. On Jan. 5, 1967 President Johnson signed executive order 11832 implementing the above resolution. He acted under the United Nations Participation Act of 1945. No action by congress is called for as the law stands today.

15. On May 29, 1968 the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution extending mandatory economic sanctions from a selected list of products to all trade with Rhodesia. This was agreed to and implemented by the U.S.

16. On Nov. 7, 1968 (New York Times of Nov. 8) the General Assembly of the U.N. voted to strengthen sanctions against Rhodesia, extend them to include Portugal and South Africa, and demand that Britain use force to bring down the regime of Prime Minister Ian D. Smith. The vote was 86 to 9 with 19 abstentions. The 9 nations opposing were Australia, Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Britain and the United States.

17. The U.S. has taken extraordinary measures to enforce the mandatory sanctions. There are many pages of detailed orders and restrictions imposed by the Departments of State, Commerce and the Treasury. It is stated by those who should know, that the oil embargo on Rhodesia is only effective because President Johnson put the pressure on major U.S. oil companies. This is our blockade.

A new measure by the Treasury just hit the little Rhodesian Information Office at 2824 McGill Terrace, Washington, D.C. 20008. A letter went to Washington's Riggs National Bank on Sat. Sept. 28, 1968. It informed the bank that the bank accounts of Kenneth Towsey, Director of RIO, and his associate John Hooper were suspended. This freeze covered their personal household accounts as well as the RIO. As this became known such protests poured in that they recovered their personal funds, though the office accounts remain frozen. Strange thing in a country supposedly for freedom of speech and free-

dom of the press, to prevent the dissemination of information in such a way.

VI. (A) THE NEW PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR RHODESIA, (B) THE INTERNAL SITUATION, (C) THE COMMUNIST ASPECT

(a) *The new proposed constitution for Rhodesia*

(a) In Feb. 1967 three observers went to Rhodesia and made a study of the increasingly serious situation. It was published in the "National Review" of May 16, 1967 entitled "Rhodesia: a Case History. How the U.S. is Helping to Bring Down Rhodesia's George Washington." Members of the reporting team were Rene A. Wormser, a distinguished member of the New York State Bar; Walter Darnell Jacobs, professor of political science at the University of Maryland, and James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader and writer of a well known syndicated column. The report states "at least 60,000 Africans are thought to be qualified by education or property ownership for "A" registration now. It is only apathy or disinterest in politics that keeps them from the polls". It is evident that with the accelerated rate of education and economic development, in only a few years there will be many more Africans qualified for the "A" roll and hence voting for all 65 members of the Parliament, than there are whites.

The dangerous developments of the last year and a half caused a recent updating of that study. Just available in October 1968, it was made by the same professor Walter Jacobs in an analysis and report entitled "A Constitution for Rhodesia". In it he states "Rhodesians argue that the standard of merit is the fairest one and that it is certainly far fairer than any standard of immediate African rule without consideration of merit. In any case, however, a merit standard for participation must be seasoned with serious attempts to improve the merits of all citizens. The government contends that it is doing exactly this by its expenditures on education, by its high tax rate on Europeans to pay for them and by its assistance to those who create new job opportunities for Africans."

He continues "Rhodesia is presently not a society based on apartheid. The new proposed 1968 constitution does not create a society based on apartheid. The franchise provisions are based on economic considerations, the theory being that those who contribute to the system should make its decisions. There are provisions providing for the broadening of the franchise without reference to race."

Professor Jacobs concludes his study on the present status of the proposed new constitution for Rhodesia, "The first principle of the proposed constitution, to be submitted for vote by December 1968, is that it does permit and provide a guide to western-type democracy in both Stage I and Stage II."

"The second principle is complete and final independence from Britain."

"The third principle, that of advancement and selection on the basis of merit, accords with the practical reality in Rhodesia. Preferred treatment for Africans is excluded and so is legal discrimination by excluding Africans."

"Mr. Smith insists that the control of Rhodesia will be retained in civilized hands for all time. To Mr. Smith that means that Africans and Europeans have an equal right to power; that merit is the only qualification."

"The proposed Rhodesian constitution is not perfect. It is an attempt to provide a solution for present problems and to avoid the creation of new problems. The plan seems to have been designed by men of authentic good will. It would appear to meet the needs of Rhodesia and provide a reasonable guide for future actions."

In all of this work toward a new constitution Premier Ian Smith represents a middle course. He has been too liberal for the extreme right which would move more toward

an apartheid solution. He is too conservative for the liberals. After 80 amendments had been proposed, the final vote on this constitution was very close but he won. Some indication of his status and of the standing of his Rhodesian Front in the country was shown in a 1968 by-election when a Smith supporter won 870 to 65 for an opposition candidate.

Jacobs further states "Mr. Smith re-defines the basic political nature of his party and of his government as a little right of center because it insists on the principle of merit, and because it insists on present and future African representation in Parliament as well as maintaining the possibility of extended African suffrage. It rejects immediate implementation of a one-man, one-vote formula which has so signally failed to bring stability to Africans north of the Zambezi."

The new Smith Constitution proposes a Stage I to last for 5 years or until the next general election, whichever comes first. The legislature would continue as at present. But it would have opportunities for the extension of the franchise to African voters and continued African representation in Parliament.

It would be supplemented by a Senate in place of the existing Constitutional Council. This would also be open to African and European membership. In it various elements of the population would be represented on a sort of ex officio basis. To quote Professor Jacobs "tribal chiefs will be present, cultural and economic groups will be represented. The Senate will have fewer legislative powers than the other body but it will serve to assist in political matters somewhat as the House of Lords in Britain." He further notes that Stage I serves to encourage the growth of political parties in Rhodesia.

In Stage II which would follow at the end of Stage I the legislature would be changed. There would be a National Parliament sitting in Salisbury, with powers of legislation on affairs of national concern. In addition, 3 Provincial Legislatures will deal with local matters, one representing the Matabele, one the Mashonas and one the Europeans. These would be more like our U.S. state legislatures. Professor Jacobs notes that the qualification system for the "A" roll may with some reason be used as an incentive for Africans to improve their economic situation and thereby to participate more fully in the political life of the country.

This new Constitution is being decided by Rhodesia alone. The question of the legality of the Smith government was raised in connection with the conviction of 32 terrorists, three of whom were convicted of murder under aggravated circumstances and were hanged by the Rhodesian authorities. The three judges of the Appellate Division of the High Court of Rhodesia, after citing numerous British decisions, the law of Pakistan, Justice Story of the U.S. Supreme Court and Grotius, decided, as Chief Justice Beadle put it (Sept. 13, 1968), "that the 1961 Constitution has been annulled, that the present government is now the *de jure* government and the 1965 Constitution is the only valid constitution."

(b) *The internal situation*

Looking at Rhodesia as a whole, it is a peaceful, quiet, tranquil place. More than 2½ million Africans, 60% of the total, live in tribal arrangements as they have for a long, long time. They conduct their affairs in the normal way through their elders and some 600 chiefs who hold that office as hereditary or by tribal selection. The chiefs are paid a small amount by the government for the performance of judicial and administrative duties. But the government does not appoint them and cannot remove them. Africans are about half of the armed forces and of the police. The police are unarmed. There has been no uprising.

There are in Rhodesia, as in every society,

people who dissent and who want to overthrow the present organized government. Such groups usually want to replace it with themselves. Rhodesia has two organizations of Africans which are small but dedicated to extremism and terror. The government has taken the position that most countries would take when someone is trying by terror to overthrow it. They have put in camps or prisons the heads of the two organizations and other leaders. They have not done this when peaceful means of dissent were used. They have felt that they are in a terroristic war and an economic war, and under great and unjustified pressure by the outside world.

They felt they had to impose a censorship. Trade figures must not be released to let anyone know the extent to which sanctions are successful or not. The newspapers cannot publish certain information. Yet many of them freely oppose the administration. The report of May 16, 1967 by the committee of Kilpatrick, Wormser and Jacobs quotes one African minister of Home Affairs in a statement Oct. 1966 "any government worth its salt must put the preservation of public security above the convenience of a handful of persons who are doing their best to undermine it." Rhodesia has not acted against any person for wholly political reasons. Those who have been arrested are thugs, assassins, arsonists, saboteurs and terrorists, many of them Communist trained and financed. Almost all of them have been black Africans preying upon other black Africans. The victims and those endangered by terrorist activities seek government protection, yet are often too terrified of reprisals to be willing to testify in court. There were 35 petrol bomb raids a month before the Rhodesian Government clamped down. (Congressional Record, volume 112, part 4, page 5342.) Thus, for the protection of the black Africans themselves, it has been necessary for the government to take drastic action. A Law and Maintenance Act was passed in 1962 and a more strict Emergency Powers Act in 1965, permitting renewable 3 month detention of persons found to be terrorists or collaborators. In 1966 the number of persons restricted under these acts averaged from 358 to 603 at any one time.

It is true that western ways with rules of due process of law are not applied. No writs of habeas corpus are available to persons held because of terrorist actions—no jury trials, rights of counsel or other protections as used by Americans and Britons. Reports state frankly that it is regrettable that this should be true. Prof. Jacobs goes on to say,—"When public safety permits we were told that this system will be suspended. Meanwhile, the two Acts have served so effectively that terrorism, a serious problem late in 1965 and part of 1966, had almost ceased in early 1967. Crop slashing, maiming and the poisoning of stock and the burning of villages decreased in 1967. Under the existing conditions in Africa only the misguided idealist would expect a perfect adherence to rules of due process of law. The number of persons affected by these laws is relatively small. The principal African extremists are under restriction. Others are free to foment trouble from Lusaka and Zambia. Another was last heard from in Princeton, N.J."

Other criminal activity in Rhodesia is remarkably low. In 1966 there were only 156 murders, 195 house breakings and 143 thefts in a nation of over 4 million.

(c) *The Communist aspect*

As to Communist efforts against Rhodesia, Prof. Jacobs reports on page 7 "the Communists, led by the Soviet Union, used Rhodesia as a weak spot in the West, a spot which can be attacked with benefit to world Communism. There is every reason why Moscow should view Rhodesia as a base from which to launch the 'final solution' for all Africa—the elimination of the Republic of South Africa and the raising of a Communist sys-

tem dependent on Moscow. Moscow supports terrorists in Zambia, and other African locations."

The Chinese presence in Africa complicates the picture. China is especially active in Tanzania. Chinese trained terrorists have frequently been apprehended inside the borders of Rhodesia with Chinese arms and supplies. Communist China has agreed to build a major rail line from Zambia to Tanzania. Many "technicians" and "specialists" from China are involved. Communist China also has an advantage in African politics which is not available to Soviet activist or other Communist agents. It derives from the fact that many Africans still hold to old beliefs from mythology and primitive religion. In some areas of Africa, the Chinese is said to be the personification of Ukhanyana, a character from Zulu folklore. He is described as crafty and deceitful and of a physical nature which makes him look like a Chinese. This analysis may seem far fetched but many persons who have encountered Africans after the latter have had dealings with the Chinese, say that the influence of folklore and mythology among Africans has indeed been exploited by the Chinese Communists.

The newspaper South African Communist reported the attendance at a Cairo seminar, in October 1966, of representatives of Communist Parties from many African countries. The list included "the Zimbabwe African Union (Rhodesia)," one of the extremist terrorist groups. Its leader refused to oppose Ian Smith's government by constitutional and legal means so he was held in detention.

The importance of Rhodesia, as an integral part of all anti-communist Southern Africa, must always be kept in mind in appraising the Communist danger in the total world situation. Freedom of the seas is vital to survival of the free world. About 98% of intercontinental shipments go by ship—oil, grain, coffee, farm and industry products of all kinds. These include dozens of scarce strategic minerals, absolutely vital to our industries and our defense. They can only come when there is freedom of the seas, secured for all the world only by the British fleet for more than a century and by our fleet with them for the last half century.

Note, however, the threat in the rapidly changing situation. The British fleet is gone from east of Suez, is a minor world factor today. The Soviet fleet is now a clear challenge to control of the Mediterranean. Its nuclear submarines with missiles cruise off our coast, shadow our surface fleet and Polar subs thruout the world, intrude in NATO war exercises. Soviet growth and aggressiveness leave no doubt that the ultimate intent is to control the seas, deny their free use in area after area.

The Suez Canal is blocked. Shipping must go via South Africa. Control of those ports means bases to control all shipping which would pass. Each year 16,000 ships pass the Cape of Good Hope. Yet our Alice in Blunderland attitude already compels 8,000 of them to make no stops. It includes denial of use for U.S. Navy ships even for normal liberty. With dismay and disbelief one sees a combination of power seeking black Africans and Soviet and Chinese Communists bent on world domination using ruthless, terrorist methods with the approval of a U.N. which silently watched India invade little Goa, Nigerian tribes needlessly starve millions and the USSR itself conduct a full scale invasion of Czechoslovakia. And to cap it all, our own country unaccountably collaborates to ruin friends of freedom and assist its declared world enemies.

What a crazy situation the U.S. has got itself into here. We have fought Communism in many places for many years—Berlin, Korea, Cuba, Vietnam to name a few, and at enormous cost. Here is strongly anti-communist Rhodesia which has offered to send up to 6,000 volunteers to Vietnam, highly

trained in guerrilla warfare, just what we need, to join Australia, New Zealand and the rest. We refuse that help, and by rigid sanctions we put on the economic screws and do our best to overturn its government.

VII. A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE MAIN ARGUMENTS ADVANCED TO JUSTIFY U.N. AND U.S. ACTIONS

1. *The voluntary sanctions* voted by the U.N. and backed by our State Department were in part based on the idea that we should support our old ally Britain. If that is so, we should expect Britain to similarly support us. But Britain has continued shipments to Cuba, coolly refusing our request to stop. Great Britain has not contributed in any way to our war in Vietnam. In fact, British ships carry supplies to North Vietnam for use against our war effort there.

2. *Among the arguments for mandatory sanctions*, one was that the Smith Government was denying majority rule in Rhodesia, hence violated the purpose of the U.N. to promote "respect for human rights, for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." Yet, as we have seen, the Rhodesian constitution in principle and in practice in 1961 and reaffirmed in 1965, has no mention of race, creed or color as far as the franchise is concerned and is openly working toward black majority rule. And how about asking the question: Does majority rule now obtain in the Soviet Union, in Czechoslovakia, in Eastern Europe, in dozens of countries in South America, Asia and Africa? What kind of logic are we using? Should we also logically declare economic war against two-thirds of the civilized and non-civilized world?

3. *Another argument* for the application of sanctions is that Rhodesia is "a threat to the peace." Chapter 7 of the U.N. Charter indicates that what was meant by that was armed aggression at or across state borders, such as Soviet armies going into Hungary and Czechoslovakia. But Rhodesia is making no such threat.

In his column "A Conservative View" James J. Kilpatrick wrote "When Rhodesia is accused of being 'a threat to the peace' the mind reels at the inversion of the language and the corruption of law. Under Britain's Humpty Dumpty view, the owner of a jewelry store becomes a criminal when he displays diamonds in his window because the gems provoke potential thieves. Rhodesia's tranquil presence in this weird view is thus in itself a threat to the peace."

4. *As to the method of handling the Rhodesian affair* by the U.N., a curious contradiction arises. Article 33 of the U.N. Charter established the procedure that must be followed by "the parties of any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of peace and security." These proceedings include negotiating, mediation and conciliation. None of these proceedings have been evoked with Rhodesia, apparently upon the reasoning that Rhodesia is not a "state" and hence could not be a party to any dispute.

But if Rhodesia is not a state it must therefore be a colony subject to the jurisdiction of Great Britain. Yet if this were so, says the article of May 16, 1967 from which I quoted, "Article 2, Section 7 of the U.N. Charter would apply which says 'nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.' France adopted this view in abstaining."

5. *Denial of participation to Rhodesia*. Article 32 of the U.N. Charter guarantees that any country not a member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate. Three times Rhodesia was refused permission to appear before the Security Council.

An almost precisely similar case occurred, however, with Indonesia in 1947. Indonesia

had unilaterally asserted its independence from and was in dispute with the Netherlands. Notwithstanding its deficiencies from the point of view of acknowledged sovereignty, Indonesia was given a hearing in the Security Council. It was argued by the Australian representative at the time that "there is no provision in the Charter stipulating that, in order to appear before the Council or to participate in its discussions, a state must be sovereign. This is a case where we have to act with a sense of fair play. We have heard one side; surely we are entitled to hear the other."

Secretary General U Thant expressed in 1966 this identical sentiment in discussing the possible appearance before the Security Council of Communist China, not a member of the U.N. He said: "My attitude is guided by one single consideration; if the Security Council has to take any action on any dispute the first prerequisite is that it must be in a position to hear both sides; this is a must." (quoted from the American-Southern African REVIEW—May-June issue 1966).

What motivates the U.S. actions? On May 26, 1966 President Johnson said at a White House reception celebrating the third anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, "The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our country. We will not support policies abroad which are based upon the rule of the minority." We have supported self determination and an orderly transition to the majority rule in every quarter of the globe (he named India, Philippines, Vietnam, Pakistan). They guide our policy towards Rhodesia. Only when this is accomplished can steps be taken to open the full power and responsibility of nations to all the people of Rhodesia not just 6% of them.

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. representative to the U.N. said in part in an address on January 27, 1967 before the American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa, speaking specifically about Rhodesia: "Our country, founded on the proposition that all men are created equal—and have equal rights before the law—and currently engaged in a vigorous nationwide program to make equality rule for all citizens—cannot adopt a double standard on what is happening in Rhodesia. Experience demonstrates that in Africa today peace and stability are inseparable from orderly progress towards self determination and equality for all the peoples of that continent."

It seems obvious from the above quotes that great pressure was put on the administration by Negroes in this country, and the administration wanted those Negro votes; and that great pressure was also put on by the black ruled African countries in the U.N.—and the administration wants those colored votes there, too.

VIII. A CONCLUDING STATEMENT BY DEAN ACHESON

Finally, let me quote Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, his remarks made May 24, 1968 before the International and Comparative Law Section of the American Bar Association, Washington, D.C. published in full in *Barrons* of June 3, 1968.

"The United States is engaged in an international conspiracy, instigated by Britain, and blessed by the United Nations, to overthrow the government of a country that has done us no harm and threatens no one. This is barefaced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle."

"What did the Rhodesian Constitutional Commission see as the end of the matter? A progressive extension of the franchise but not majority rule. 'For a time which cannot be measured by clock or calendar' Europeans would exercise the more authoritative voice at national government level; the Africans would have a voice that must be allowed in-

creasing, but not limitless, power. The ultimate solution recommended was based on racial parity of representation as most likely to produce immediate and long-term confidence and stability. This was not everyone's cup of tea; neither was it everyone's business; nor was it apartheid. It was a matter relating solely to the internal affairs of Rhodesia—in which the United Nations was forbidden by its Charter to meddle—and to the political relations between Rhodesia and the United Kingdom. When the latter sought to impose a majority rule, in time measured by the calendar, Rhodesia severed the bands that bound them.

"It was this act and Rhodesia's assumption, among the powers of the earth, of the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitled her which the General Assembly and the Security Council said created a situation that threatened the peace.

"Contemplating the possibilities, I am moved to salute the shade of Senator Tom Connally and thank him for his reservation, which at the time I regretted, providing that our acceptance of the World Court's jurisdiction should not apply to disputes with regard to matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States.

"One of the troubles of the troubled age in which we live is that too many people are trying to achieve harmony of interest by forcing everyone to harmonize with them. Conscience used to be an inner voice of self-discipline; now it is a clarion urge to discipline others. It took a long time to develop the international precept that peace would be furthered by governments' having respect for each other's autonomy. That should apply to them when acting in concert. This is the notion embedded in Paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter. Whatever mistakes they may otherwise have made, the draftsmen of the Charter, at least, did not intend to open the way for endless conflict through unbridled impulses to reform. The new romantic impulse is to overthrow that wise inhibition in favor of a compulsion to reshape the world to fit all sorts of shared subjectivities.

"Another thought also occurs. Perhaps, if the meek are to inherit the earth, they might consider adding a clause to the litany. It could follow 'From all blindness of heart; from pride, vainglory and hypocrisy; from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness' and would add 'and from the United Nations Charter as distorted by professors of international law.'

"Good Lord, deliver us."

PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

The Battle For Rhodesia, Douglas Reed 1966.

Let Me Tell You A Story, George A. Roberts 1964.

Southwest Africa, The Last Pioneer Country, Thomas Molnar 1966.

Facing the Facts on Rhodesia, John Biggs-Divison M.F.

The Arrangements of International Lawyers, Dean Acheson 1968.

Department of State, many releases, speeches, folders, U.N. actions, 1964-68, with letter from Robert L. Bruce, Country Officer for Southern Rhodesia.

New York Times Magazine, October 27, 1968, page 40ff.

New York Times Issue of October 31, 1965, p.E7 adv. "The Truth About Rhodesia."

London Sunday Times, a series of articles, Fall 1964.

Canada Month, Dec. 1967, pp. 14-18, 2 articles on "Rhodesia" by Jean L. Howson.

Boston Globe, Mar. 15, 1968, "Rhodesia—Fiasco of Interference," Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

Canadian Intelligence Service, Jan., Feb., May, July, Aug. 1966 & later issues.

Intelligence Digest, Jan. 1968 and other issues.

American-African Affairs Assn., 550 Fifth Ave., N.Y., N.Y. 10038 212-685-0190.

American-Southern Africa Council, 200 Third St., S.E., Wash., D.C. 20003.

Last 2 groups have folders, letters, much current info. 202-546-2020.

A PORTRAIT OF NEW YORK'S WELFARE POPULATION

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years I have on numerous occasions pointed out the critical deficiencies which pervade our National, State, and local welfare systems. I have been especially—but by no means exclusively—concerned with the inadequacies of the welfare structure in New York City, which, according to the New York Times, now carries a welfare budget of \$1.4 billion. Recently it has been estimated that the welfare population in New York City will soon exceed 1 million people, which will make the welfare population of New York City alone larger than the total population of 15 American States. The critical lack of funds, staff, and rehabilitation programs necessary for a truly humane and effective welfare program constitute one of the most pressing problems facing our major urban centers.

For a particularly insightful analysis of the condition of New York City's welfare population, I commend for my colleagues' attention an article by Julius Horowitz entitled "A Portrait of New York's Welfare Population" which was published in the Sunday, January 26 issue of the New York Times Magazine. Mr. Horowitz's article provides a vivid—and sometimes horrifying—picture of the plight of human beings caught in a self-perpetuating cycle of poverty, deprivation, and inadequate opportunity. If we are to upgrade and humanize this woefully inadequate relief structure, it is imperative that we understand the effects the present system has on the lives of welfare recipients.

I enclose at this point in the RECORD the article by Julius Horowitz:

A PORTRAIT OF NEW YORK'S WELFARE POPULATION

(By Julius Horowitz)

Until the present decade the welfare population in New York City and throughout the nation was invisible to most of America. Occasionally a mink-coat scandal would create some excitement, but the scandals never excited the general population to the extent that it began to view people on welfare as living beings. Welfare was a place for the living dead.

A New York State welfare study published in 1961 made the alarming (then) prediction that 703,150 persons would be receiving welfare throughout this state by 1970. The study also estimated that statewide welfare costs would reach a high of \$536,665,000 by 1970. In fact, the current welfare budget in New York City alone is \$1.4-billion. By now, or within a few weeks at most, it is estimated that one million persons are or will be on welfare in the city. This is a population more

than twice as large as Buffalo, the second largest city in New York State. It is larger than 15 American states.

In 1965, the welfare population in New York City was increasing at a steady average rate of 4,956 a month. In 1966, the average began a rise to 8,311. In 1967, the increase leaped to 14,284 persons a month.

Last August, the 40 Social Service Centers in New York City received 23,996 applications for public assistance. Of these, the Department of Social Services accepted 21,506—or a total of more than 50,000 human beings.* Who are these new 50,000 welfare recipients, why did they come onto the rolls during a time of supposedly unruffled affluence?

The 50,000 new persons added to the welfare population in August were accepted from the following applications: Home Relief, 10,867 cases; Aid to Dependent Children (A.D.C.), 8,292 applications; Temporary Aid to Dependent Children, 1,060; Blind Assistance, 44; Aid to the Disabled, 1,660; Old Age Assistance, 2,073. Of the 50,000 about half were children.

FOR SOME, WELFARE IS A BANK

The traditional pattern of welfare as a form of paternalism began to change with the influx of low-income Puerto Rican families in the nineteen-forties and fifties. They used welfare as an economic stabilizer, a guaranteed income in case low-paying restaurant, hotel, nursing-home, hospital, garment-industry jobs could not support a family, or if the exorbitant rents in the West Side slums ate up the take-home pay. They paid little attention to the caseworkers. They saw welfare as a source of money, nothing else.

Similarly, the low-income Negro families who come to New York City from the South in search of the American experience of opportunity use welfare as a "bank." They know that they have "on deposit" in New York City enough money to take care of them—to compensate for the lack of jobs, the lack of enough money on a job.

In a welfare center on 14th Street off Fifth Avenue, a Negro man of 20, waiting to see his caseworker, told me: "I don't find welfare a shame. I paid my taxes even if they didn't believe it in Alabama. I heard about welfare being a kind of bank in New York. This is only tax money they're giving out. I lost my job at \$85 a week. I can make out on the \$66 they give me every two weeks. It really worked like a bank when I applied at the end of July. I filled out an application no more complicated than a short income-tax form, and that same day they gave me money for rent and food because my money ran out."

New York City is an open city; No passport or identity card is required to take up residence. As a result, it is almost impossible to measure the so-called in-migration to New York from the South and Puerto Rico. At best, there are only estimates and they are dated. From 1960 to 1965, according to the Community Renewal Program, the net addition of nonwhites in New York City was 154,120 persons; the net addition of Puerto Ricans was 36,692—and the out-migration of whites was 450,115. But these are estimates based on population projections—not hard data.

Nor is there any way of knowing how many of these in-migrants are motivated by the higher welfare payments in the North. But the hard fact is that while Mississippi, for example, estimates that a family of four requires \$201 a month to meet basic needs, in-

*During the same month, the department closed out 12,552 cases for such reasons as reclassification to other welfare categories, whereabouts unknown, refusal to comply with departmental policy, employment. Thus, the net increase was 8,984 cases, representing 20,301 individuals—an annual rate of increase of 243,612.

cluding rent, Mississippi actually pays an A.D.C. family of four only \$55—meeting 27 per cent of the family's basic needs. Alabama has a similar standard of \$177 a month, but pays \$89. New York, where living costs are higher, pays 100 per cent of the budget deficit—an average of \$278 a month for a family of four, including rent. It is a situation that prompted a task force appointed by President Nixon to recommend that the Federal Government set uniform minimum standards and take over a larger share of the costs.

I went out to talk to men who had made the migration. On a stoop on West 103d Street I found Mr. Williams, who came to New York from Georgia in 1959, and found himself on welfare in August, 1968. He said to me, "You don't want to go up to my room. Some junkie might hit you over the head. They stole all my clothes when I came out of the hospital."

"What did they take?"

"They took three shirts, two pants, one pair of shoes, six pairs of underwear, tops and bottoms, a razor, a comb. They left me one dirty pair of underwear. The shoes were brand-new. They cost me \$14.81. But I've also got some clothes in pawn. They're out in Long Island. When the pawn shops closed in Harlem during what I call the so-called riots—they weren't the real riots—my clothes went there. You can't find a pawnshop now in Harlem; they're closing up."

"What do you need from welfare?" I asked.

"Mostly money to get my clothes out of pawn." Mr. Williams took a card out of his wallet and showed me a job referral he had as a messenger for a Madison Avenue firm. "I'm supposed to go to work on Tuesday," he said. "I want to go on the new job looking like a gentleman. I don't have to take the job, you know. I can stay on welfare. But I want to see how they treat me, if they give me the money I really need to get back to work. I don't want to become a welfare addict."

"Why did you come to New York?" I asked.

"I got tired of segregation. I wanted free movement. You've got to leave the South to be free. But that doesn't mean the North is better than the South. You don't see welfare kids running around the South like crazy, not knowing who they belong to, or thinking they can rob or beat up whoever they see first on the street. You don't see kids on drugs in the South."

"Without being prejudiced, my own people turn on themselves in the North. They use the so-called freedom up here to rob from one another. In the South they call New York a gray train. A woman here with three kids on welfare calls up her sister in Georgia with five kids and says, 'Come up here where the welfare is better.' It's not better, it's just more money to buy the same things you get in the South for less money, and here with the extra money you get the pimps, the dope, the killings, the robberies."

"A lot of people come full of frustrations, they get lost in freedom here, they run wild, till a man who wants to live a clean life has to run away from his own people. Well, welfare adds to this crazy kind of freedom, but anybody is crazy if they think they'll find freedom on welfare."

Thomas Edwards, 26, came to New York from Mississippi. When I met him he was wearing a Harris tweed jacket, neat gray slacks, a button-down white shirt, a striped tie. He wore black-rimmed glasses, and had a beard. He seemed to have thrown off his origins as thoroughly as the young men from Cleveland who become New Yorkers overnight.

"My family is still in Mississippi," he told me. "Nothing has changed there. They just offered my mother \$13 a week to work as a cook. Mississippi hasn't been touched by what's happening in this country. That's why the South laughs at the North. There's still the company store, the company towns, and there's still that insane feeling that a

black man is nothing but an overgrown boy or puppy."

"They're still a little stunned when one of their overgrown puppies takes off for the North. They talk about the men who take off for the North like they're children who have run away from a birthday party. I was one of those happy puppies that took off. When I go back home the whole place looks like a crazy zoo to me. You still can't really talk to a white man there any more than you can talk to a zebra in the Bronx Zoo."

"What about welfare? What got you on?"

"I was in Roosevelt Hospital with back trouble. When I came out my job was gone. It came to me as a shock that I was completely without money. I was completely against the wall. It seemed wrong to me to ask for money without working for it. But I had no choice after awhile. I came down here and they looked at my clothes a little suspiciously—too suspiciously, I thought—but anyway they gave me money to live on, which I needed."

"What do you think of welfare now?"

"There has to be welfare. What's going to happen to people when they need money and they have no way of getting any? Do you know why I'm here now? I'm working now. I got a job as a trainee salesman. I get \$75 a week. But I don't get my first check until next Friday. My rent is due tonight in a place where you're out if you don't have it. I don't have a brother or sister, or aunt or uncle or friend who can loan me the money I need to live on until next Friday. Right now, they're discussing upstairs whether to give me the money."

"What will you do if they don't give you an emergency check?"

"What would you do?" he asked me.

THE CITY GROWS MORE RESPONSIVE

Quite aside from immigration, the welfare population in New York has been rising because of a change in policy under the Lindsey Administration. For years, the right to public assistance was kept carefully unpublished in New York, as elsewhere. There has always been the fear that the welfare population would soar if all the poor who were eligible for welfare should apply. Welfare officials accepted this code of silence, except for some Southern officials who passed out handbills urging the poor to migrate to New York. Every study of public welfare has criticized the secrecy of welfare bureaucracies. It was not until former Welfare Commissioner Mitchell I. Ginsberg, now Administrator of the Human Resources Administration, took over the department in 1966 that the paralyzing fear of public attention was brought to an end. Mr. Ginsberg revealed the magnitude of poverty in New York City. He made welfare a serious topic for national discussion.

The new attitude is reflected in the rise in the rate of acceptance of applications. The A.D.C. rate of acceptance rose from 66.5 per cent in 1965 to 81.4 per cent in 1968. The Home Relief acceptance rate went from 52.9 per cent in 1965 to 74.2 per cent in 1968.

As a result, thousands of New Yorkers who would otherwise be surviving—or not surviving—by who knows what means have been brought under the welfare umbrella. I talked to a 56-year-old Negro woman, a domestic, who came to New York 20 years ago. She told me she would never have needed welfare if her varicose veins had held out. But she had to go into the hospital and, when she came out, she needed money for rent, and her landlord had an eviction notice for her.

On 103d Street, I saw a 19-year-old girl who didn't know she was pregnant until she went to a clinic for stomach pains. She had to give up her job and go on Home Relief.

On West 85th Street, I talked to a woman who came to New York from Virginia 20 years ago. She was working in a dress factory

on West 37th Street when her 15-year-old son came from Virginia to live with her. She had to give up her job when she found out that he was a heavy drinker, stealing money from her to buy liquor. She needed welfare so that she could stay home to watch him. She said she had to do what she could to save her son's life.

At the St. Nicholas Center, I spoke to a 20-year-old girl who left home when she was 15. She had supported herself for five years by hustling, and now she was pregnant and unable to continue her business.

A 19-year-old girl wrote on her welfare application: "I have no one to help me. I was living with my grandmother, but she put me out on the street with my two children."

A 17-year-old girl told me: "My baby's milk bill is \$7 every two weeks. I have to pay my baby sitter \$30 every two weeks so that I can stay in high school and graduate. My full check is only \$76 every two weeks. I need more money for my baby sister or else I can't finish school." "What about the baby's father?" I asked her. "Him? I don't want to be bothered with him. Why should he see the baby? It's my baby. He did nothing for the baby."

A white man wearing the clothes of a longshoreman, but unable to do a longshoreman's work, told me: "I had to go on relief in August when I came out of the hospital. I didn't want to go back to the Bowery. I've lived there. I don't want to live that way again. This way, with welfare, I know where my check is coming from. I know just what I've got."

"But I also know I can't do what a working guy can do. I buy Bugler and Tops for smoking. I live like a loner. On welfare, you've got to live alone. If you go overboard and spend \$4 or \$5 on beer, you have to lock yourself in your room until your next check comes. You can't buy a friend a beer at a bar. I read old newspapers and paperback books that I find."

In the office of a director of a welfare center, I heard a discussion about a \$25,000-a-year public-relations man who lost his job, couldn't find another and had to apply for welfare to keep from starving.

On West 109th Street, I talked to a Puerto Rican mother who had to quit her job, after nine years, so that she could take care of her daughter's baby—so that her daughter could return to school. Her daughter was in the eighth grade.

A drug addict at the East End Center told me: "It's better for me to get welfare than to go out and steal. Do you see those eight guys against the wall? They're all addicts." At the St. Nicholas Center, I watched an addict haggle with an investigator for \$1.20 sarefare. Another addict, sitting next to me, said: "That means he won't have to steal some poor bastard's clothes."

ACTIVISTS EDUCATE THE POOR

Closely related to the city's new attitude is a campaign being waged by activists to educate the poor in their welfare rights. The pioneers in this movement are Richard A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven, authors of "A Strategy To End Poverty," which, after being privately circulated, was published in The Nation in May, 1966. They had observed that most of the people applying for help at Mobilization for Youth offices and the like were welfare clients complaining about the treatment they received at welfare centers. In addition, they estimated, on the basis of census studies, that for every person receiving welfare there was at least another in the community who was also eligible for welfare but did not apply because of shame or lack of information. They urged the poor to express themselves by getting on welfare and fighting for their legitimate legislative rights by exerting the pressure of their numbers on public officials. In the long run, they hoped, the rising case load would bring a crisis in the welfare system and force the nation to

adopt some such alternative as the negative income tax or guaranteed annual income.

Today, some 200 storefront centers are being operated by welfare groups in New York City. A typical one is the United Welfare League in a storefront at 105th Street and Columbus Avenue. Its rent and personnel are paid for by funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Its field director is Mrs. Sydele Moore, who went from being on welfare to her present job. She has more than 3,500 cases in her files.

"How did you add to the welfare population in the city?" I asked Mrs. Moore, who speaks quietly but with the power of experience. Her tone is that of an assistant professor and she probably knows more about welfare than most of the sociology professors in America.

"We can't take credit for all of the increase," she said.

"But we did bring welfare clients together for the first time, and that brought other people out too. We made them look at one another. We got them to talk about their troubles. We brought them out of their dirty rooms, their isolation. They were mostly ashamed, frightened, isolated. They took it for granted that the rats, the stopped toilets, the broken plaster, the hot-water pipes that only gave cold water, the steam pipes that never worked were their punishment for being on welfare.

"Then we began to find a lot of people who needed welfare but who were ashamed to go to the welfare offices. They would rather starve than ask for financial assistance. We began what we call our 'outreach program.'

"We think of our territory as covering most of the Upper West Side from Central Park West to Riverside Drive from about 125th Street down to the West 80's. This is a big part of the welfare world of New York. We go through the buildings on the West Side, knocking on the doors, talking to the people in their rooms, finding out if they need help. We've located a lot of people who needed welfare but who wouldn't have been found in a welfare center. We tell them about the Social Welfare Law. We let them know what their legitimate rights are, and we help them get through the intake process, which is often the most humiliating, though it doesn't have to be."

"How many people did you add to the welfare population in August?" I asked Mrs. Moore.

"We'd have to check our files. We found a lady on Central Park West who was behind in her rent. A lady and her son on West 107th Street. We find a lot of people who need welfare, who don't even know about supplementation. We're finding that people aren't afraid of welfare now. Not just us but all the poverty programs are making welfare more open. The VISTA workers are bringing people into welfare.

"But in the beginning the people on welfare were ashamed to come to our meetings. The poor don't trust one another. That's why the welfare workers have been able to get away with doing nothing for the poor. But now the poor have learned that they can demand their legitimate rights. This is what the welfare revolution is all about, the poor for the first time are demanding their legitimate rights and the public is angry at the poor for speaking up, when for years the public has said the poor are too apathetic and lazy to care about themselves."

"What are legitimate rights?" I asked Mrs. Moore.

"The right to your full budget allowance. The right to proper clothing. The right to job training. The right to proper day-care centers. The right to demand an increase in the budget allowances. Our studies show that the total costs for a year of a welfare family of four persons living on the Upper West Side of Manhattan are \$7,199.47. And all that a A.D.C. family of four gets today is about \$4,000 a year. The children on welfare

do not get money for movies, toys, games, books."

"About 45 per cent of all the people who work in New York City don't earn as much as \$7,199 a year," I told Mrs. Moore.

She said, "The welfare families need money to stay alive, to give them what they can't get by working. The people who work have something that money can't buy, no matter how little they earn. And if your figures are official, welfare may then become the biggest employer of persons in New York City."

During recent months, 500 to 1,000 West Side neighborhood people have crowded the offices of the United Welfare League each week seeking information about welfare or asking the League to intervene for them in problems they had with welfare. One was Mrs. Tonic Weston—her husband had died—his \$15,000-a-year income suddenly cut off. She was five months pregnant, she had an eviction notice, and the welfare investigator was insisting that she vacate her six-room apartment on the West Side that rented for \$138.50 a month.

"I never dreamt I would ever need welfare," Mrs. Weston told me. "I never knew there was an organization like the United Welfare League that could step in for people. I never dreamt a government employee would be sitting in my living room telling me that I had to move. Move where? Where can you get six decent rooms in New York City today for \$138.50?"

"Welfare makes people ignorant. They confuse you. They make you feel like you're stumbling around in the dark. I'm an actress. I'm used to taking direction. I can understand explanations. But I was as confused as hell about what was happening to me. Can you imagine the experience of people with less education and experience than I've had? You don't get reasonable explanations of what welfare is all about when you go into the office. When a caseworker talks to you there's no explanation of a lot of things; it's as though they're not talking to people but to objects. I know it's a heart-breaking job if you try to see every person as a human being, but that's the job."

"To do what?" I asked.

"The investigators shouldn't play guessing games with you. They should level with you about your rights and what you're entitled to. I was left really broke. But I had to find out through gossip that I was entitled to a layette, a crib and a lot of other things I'll need for my baby. It's eerie when you speak to an investigator. They don't hear what you say. They probably have a built-in recorder that speaks for them and that turns people off. It must make the job easier if they act on the assumption that all the people they're talking to are ignorant. When the investigator came into my living room he was surprised to see a wall of books and he kept talking about it as though it was the strangest sight he had ever seen in his life. A black woman with a wall of books."

"There's another funny thing about welfare. I only applied during the summer but I feel like I've been on welfare all of my life. I think it's because nobody sees a future for you. I'd like to see the welfare centers a place of hope, where people get excited about the changes that are going to take place in their lives and not sit the way I see them do, like they've been dead for 10 years. Welfare should be the starting place for people, not the end."

"I used to hear about the 15-year-old girls who were pregnant and who were second- and third-generation welfare mothers. I've seen them now in the flesh. They're sick kids. They have the look of doom about them. Who helps them? I wouldn't stay on welfare a minute after I get my Social Security check, my baby is born and I can find someone to look after it so that I can get to work."

"The most tragic group among welfare recipients is the children. There are 600,000

welfare children in New York, and 445,800 of them are fatherless.

"The basic rule in New York is that a man can be in the home but he must contribute whatever income he has toward the support of his family. This applies to married and unmarried men. Nobody knows how many men "abandon" their families so the families can receive welfare payments to "supplement" low-paying jobs. Nor does anybody know how many men desert their families because they are afraid of fatherhood.

But the results are clear. The children, whatever their age, become adults before they ever have a childhood. They leap from infancy into a fatherless world. They suffer a grade retardation twice as great as non-welfare school children. As many as 60 per cent of the referrals to mental retardation institutions come from welfare families. In more than 85 out of 100 cases the retardation results from environmental deprivation rather than organic brain damage. These children, except for the few who live in families where there is a link to stability, are exposed to a world that no child can survive without damage. They see adults as enemies. They understand perfectly their status as welfare children but they are helpless to change what they understand. How can any child be expected to stand up against the American way of seeing welfare recipients as the living dead?"

In a welfare center in Harlem I talked to a father who had deserted his children. I asked him why he never went once to look at the face of the child he had fathered. He told me he had never seen the face of his own father. "So what?" I said. He said, "What good is it seeing the face of my boy if I can't support him?"

"Did your father ever support you?" I asked. "No," he said. "Then you're just repeating history; you're not changing history." I said. He said "What the hell do I care about history? Whatever I do my boy has a long hard way to go."

"They're going to sign you now to sign a paper saying that you're the father of your boy. Are you going to sign it?" "It won't make me his father." "What will make you his father?" He was silent. He gripped the table as if he might tear it to pieces. He didn't answer my question. He didn't know how to answer it.

Where is welfare heading? In a welfare center on Eighth Avenue I sat down next to a Negro man in his late 30's. His name was Mr. Mitchell. He wore a leather jacket. His slacks were neat. He had a strong quiet face. His eyes studied the room. They had focus; they did not stare inward, which is what you usually see in a welfare center—row after row of people unable to see the world around them or to feel they have a place in it.

I said, "I'd like to talk to you about welfare. What it does for you. What it doesn't do. What kind of hang-ups welfare has for you. Is that all right with you?"

He looked at me for an instant to see if I was out of focus and then he said, "Sure."

"What do you think of welfare?" I asked.

"It's like being in bondage," he said, as though he had spent a lifetime thinking about it. "You can survive, but that's about all. I feel they should abolish welfare. The kids grow up on welfare with the attitude that everything should be free and easy. With parents that work, the kids are different, they look different, they think different, they see things ahead of them, they're moving toward something real in this world. The kids I see on welfare in the neighborhood around the West 140's are looking for a hand-out. It's killing them. I see kids of 10 and 11 and 12 on dope. They have babies when they're 12 and 13. They're pulling down whatever the rest of the black people are pulling up. These kids need leadership. They need it bad."

"How would you give it to them?" "Nobody ever asked me that before," he said. "But welfare should let a man in the

house. Forget the rules. If he's the kind of man you see around the blocks in Harlem he can't make enough money to take care of a family. But he makes some money. He can't take on the responsibility for a whole family. Some men can't face that kind of responsibility. It drives them away. But let them face whatever responsibility they can take and they might stay on."

"Would it drive you away?"

"No, it wouldn't," he said. "I don't have any children yet but one is on its way. It won't set me running. I wouldn't leave my kids. I take that seriously, having kids."

"What about the men you talk to, what kind of reasons do they give for leaving their children?"

"They say they don't make enough money. They say they don't have enough money for themselves if they have to give to the family. They never grew up in families where they saw a father giving money to the family. They don't know what it means to support a child. They never saw it done. They grew up without support. You can tell the guys who never saw their fathers. Something is cut out of them, like they don't belong to anyone, like everyone is an enemy. They produce babies but they never had any training to be a father. They never saw it done, being a father. They never come around to see their babies, most of them. You got a lot of guys that need to be made into fathers."

"Why are you here today, sitting in a welfare office?" I asked. "You look like you can make out."

"I can. I got on welfare in August because the place where I was working on 38th Street closed down. Then I had to go into Harlem Hospital for two weeks. When I came out I needed money to pay the rent that was due on my apartment. You don't get a chance to save for emergencies on \$54 a week. But now I found a job with the Board of Education. I'll be starting work next Monday."

"Then why are you here today?"

"Just to ask them for some money to buy working clothes. I need some winter clothes for this new job."

"Will the job pay you much money?"

"It'll pay me less than what they say a poverty wage is here in New York City. I'll get \$2,800 a year for a six-hour day. That's less than poverty. But I need a job. And I got it. After that stay in the hospital I can't take the kind of jobs I used to be able to handle."

"When did you come to New York City?"

"In September, 1957."

"Do you remember how you came, why you came, what made you give up your home in the South?"

"That's something you don't forget," he said. "I was doing construction work in Columbia, S.C. I was making \$1.50 an hour. I thought I could make more money in that same trade in New York. Some of my family was living here. I had some cousins, aunts, an uncle. I had a long talk with my mother about going. She said it was my decision. The South was getting worse. The court decisions made the whites begin to go by the rules, and they made all the rules go against you."

"I got on a bus and came to New York. I thought I could go right into construction work. I learned I had to get into a union first. No union would take me. I got a job in a restaurant I didn't want to do. I kept getting jobs I didn't want to do. There was no job I wanted to stick to because I knew that construction was my real job."

"That happens to a lot of guys from the South here in New York. They come knowing what they want, but nobody in this city wants to know it. That sets you drifting. You keep drifting. One day you find out that the only thing out there for you is welfare. Without welfare you have to kill or steal just to keep alive. I never thought I would end up needing welfare."

"Now that you're on welfare, what would you like it to be like for you?" I asked.

"Welfare should be quick, swift. They should have people working here who can immediately size up a person, they know what to do for them, real quick, to get them off and going again. There should be no more suspicion about money, thinking people are cheating. The important thing is to get people moving. But these people who work here are all blind. They don't look at you. They don't know you or want to know you. They want to keep things moving for themselves, not for you. They're supposed to be here working for you, not for themselves."

There would be nothing really wrong with the present system of public assistance if America would forget its punitive, deep-rooted, almost hysterical hatred of poor people who speak up before they are spoken to. The legal structure guiding welfare is not inhuman. The intake interview does not have to be dehumanizing. The welfare caseworker does not have to be faceless. The energy it now takes to destroy welfare children could be used to help the children get through the bleak days of dependency.

Somehow or other, America has to forget its puffed up image as a polite, pious, inviolate society, protecting the aged, the sick and dependent children. The image simply does not square with the facts. The welfare poor are now forcing this confrontation. For the first time in America the poor are throwing off the mask of meekness imposed on them by organized systems of welfare and charity. The Communists could not arouse the American poor. The radicals never did. But now the American poor have surfaced, whatever the historical reasons, and it is unlikely they will permit themselves to be drowned again by the milk of human kindness.

As President, Mr. Nixon will have to face a problem almost as great as that which confronted Mr. Lincoln, the emancipation of the American poor.

A TIRED AMERICAN

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. Speaker, Raymond J. Vince, 3442 Fir Street, East Chicago, Ind., has forwarded to me the following article which was printed in the Calumet News of East Chicago, Ind., in one of its recent editions.

U.S. Marine S. Sgt. Ralph A. Garcia, of East Chicago, Ind., now serving in South Vietnam, sent this article written by a service buddy expressing the feelings of the brave boys in his Marine outfit, "I Am a Tired American."

The article follows:
EAST CHICAGO MARINE TELLS HIS FEELINGS ON WAR FRONT

I am a tired American . . . I am tired of being called the ugly American. I am tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

I am a tired American . . . weary of having American embassies and information centers stoned, burned and sacked by mobs operating under the orders of dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

I am a tired American . . . weary of being lectured by Gen. DeGaulle (who never won a battle) who poses as a second Jehovah on righteousness and wisdom.

I am a tired American . . . weary of Nasser and all the other blood sucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and kick him in the shins and yank his beard if the flow falters.

I am a tired American . . . weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right

to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

I am a tired American . . . fed up with the mobs of scabby faced, long haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the "new wave" of America and sneer at the old fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity and morality on which America grew to greatness.

I am a tired American . . . weary of having my tax dollar go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

I am a tired American . . . who is tired of supporting families who have known no other source of income than the government for three generations.

I am a tired American . . . who is getting madder by the minute at the fifth peddlers who have launched America in an obscenity race, who try to force on us the belief that fifth is an integral part of culture, the arts, the movies, literature, and on the stage.

I am a tired American . . . weary of the bums who tramp the picket lines and the sit-ins, who prefer Chinese Communism to capitalism, who see no evil in Castro but sneer at our president as a threat to peace.

I am a tired American . . . who has lost all patience with the groups who show propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast; movies denouncing the United States; made in Communist China.

I am a tired American . . . who is angered by the self-righteous breast-beating critics in America and abroad who set impossible yardsticks for the United States to follow but never apply the same standards to the French, British, Russians or the Chinese.

I am a tired American . . . sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bedspreads in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

I am a tired American . . . who dislikes clergymen who make a career out of integration causes, yet send their children to private schools.

I am a tired American . . . who resents those who try to peddle the ideas in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed. They say hate capitalism but are always at the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

I am a tired American . . . real tired of those who are trying to sell me the idea that America is not the greatest nation in the world, a generous nation, a nation dedicated to a policy of helping the "have nots" achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise has brought about.

I am a tired American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears "The Star Spangled Banner" and who must fight to hold back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flagpole.

I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen, one nation under God, truly with mercy and justice for all.

A NEWSPAPER DIES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. ZWACH, Mr. Speaker, some of my good colleagues in the House Committee on Agriculture call me Mr. 100 Percent of Parity because of my efforts to get better prices for our farm products.

But higher prices for farm products are but a small part of my fight. I am waging a war for the development of the

countryside. If that fight is to be successful, we must first have full parity for the farmer.

Farm prices determine the economic climate of our thousands of rural towns. We, in the countryside, know this, but we have a problem convincing our urban brothers.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the 91st Congress: Death is a sad thing. It chastens all of us, whether it is the death of friend or loved one, the death of a family farm—and we are observing those at the rate of 100,000 a year—or the death of a newspaper.

Today, with your leave, I herewith insert in the Record the story of the death of a newspaper. This editorial, written by that very discerning rural daily newspaper publisher, O. B. Augustson, in the West Central Daily Tribune of Willmar, in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, ties the death of the Broten Review to inadequate farm income.

It has been said that \$1 of farm income generates \$7 worth of business in the community, so it is easy to understand why, with our farm prices at only 73 percent of parity, our rural towns' economy is in the doldrums.

Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, I recommend the reading of this insertion to each of you. As Editor Augustson says:

Truly it is always a sad day when a newspaper writes "thirty".

The editorial follows:

A NEWSPAPER DIES

In the December 26 issue of the Belgrade Tribune there was a regrettable announcement by its editor. It was relative to the Broten Review which the Belgrade editor and publisher has also owned in the past four years.

The announcement stated in terms of dis-

appointment that he has been forced to discontinue the publishing of the Review at Broten as a separate enterprise. From now on the circulation of the Tribune and the Review will be combined to receive one weekly paper which will aim to cover both towns and area around. The Review as such will be no more.

If this announcement is done with regret by the Belgrade publisher it is heard with a similar regret by all of us in the Fourth Estate. We hate to see any paper fold up. There should be more papers, not less. Every community of any reasonable size should have "its home town paper." When it is gone that community will have lost something.

But we know the reasons. It's all because of what is happening in rural America. The loss of family farms, the inadequate farm income—both these factors are basic causes. The less farm families you have, the lower is your rural economy—this is all bound to show up in less business on Main Street and including the newspaper. The latter will lose circulation revenues with less subscribers and when business is not good on Main Street there will also be less advertisers and less advertising revenue. It is that simple—but tragically so.

We during the past 15 years have been both writing and speaking about the farm problem, the preservation of the family farm, the need for a decent farm income. Added to this we have warned of what will happen to our rural America over a period of time. Well—the chickens have come home to roost. The predicted ill fruits have arrived. They are there in stark reality.

The sad part has been at times that when this message was endeavored to be brought before our towns we at times did not see many from Main Street at meetings where the farm problem was discussed and considered. Even in the days of 90% of parity when our family farms were still with us and when property was relatively oozing out of our ears, when all our stores and some more were doing well on Main Street—there was hardly a peep when certain big business interests declared to the nation that millions upon millions of small farms must go—that

the road should be cleared for the big farmer and the big agriculturist. This plot conceived in the minds of the Committee on Economic Development has been carried out—a Committee on Economic "Destruction" as far as rural America is concerned.

As publisher of this daily newspaper we have always been mindful of the weeklies in our area. With the growth of newspaper syndicates in this nation, such weeklies may be the last bulwark of a free press in this country. As a daily we have merely sought to be the rural daily for this part of Minnesota as against the Twin City press. A daily trying to serve our rural area and speaking for it as well as we could. But we always have had a standing rule that we limited our news from each weekly town only to those news items which a daily should have—to get all the local news you simply would have to keep the home weekly. As to advertising we have not gone into any of those weekly paper towns to solicit advertising. Have always felt that if Willmar advertising cannot support our daily—we will have to do something else. There is such a thing as live and let live. Our competition has been the Twin City dailies, not the weekly papers in our area.

And let us say this—if the family farms were all preserved, if the farm income had been as it should be—the weeklies would survive with ample circulation and ample advertising revenue—if such weekly paper is enterprising at all. But you simply cannot operate a newspaper with less and less subscribers and less and less advertising. They are the financial life blood of any paper. If you don't have them—it's curtains.

When we have both written and spoken for the preservation of the family farm, greater farm income, we know that also meant the preservation of our rural villages, their Main Street business and also their newspapers. We have written extensively on this subject but it is all done with a feeling of regret—that another nail has been driven into the coffin of journalism out here in rural America and another voice in a free press, stilled. Truly it is always a sad day when a newspaper writes "Thirty".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 30, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I have strength for anything through Him who gives me power.—Philippians 4: 13.

In Thy presence, our Father, we pause for a moment, lifting our hearts unto Thee in prayer. As we pray, our strength is renewed, our courage restored, and our path is made plain. What we felt we could not do, now we can do; what we thought hopeless, is now full of hope; what seemed impossible, now becomes possible. We are ready for anything through the strength of Thy spirit living in our hearts.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor and make her a channel for peace and good will in our world. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 17, 1969, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10. An act to increase the per annum rate of compensation of the President of the United States.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the continuities of our political traditions were reflected in President Johnson's choice, during the last hours of his administration, of a name for a tranquil and beautiful park in our Nation's Capital. President Johnson named the park for a national leader whose memory he reveres, a man dead these many years yet still regarded as their personal hero by an entire generation of Americans, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On the anniversary of his birth on

January 30, 1882, as my tribute to his Presidential achievements during the Depression years of terrible economic hardship for our people and during wartime years of peril for our country and the cause of freedom, I acknowledge that, for me, as for President Johnson and for those millions of Americans whom President Roosevelt casually, appropriately, and famously addressed only as "my friends," his memory is ever fresh.

Franklin Roosevelt's influence on our history has not been confined to the eventual and progressive years of his Presidency. That influence is also to be found in the record of legislative achievement of the Presidency so recently ended. Not the least of F. D. R.'s accomplishments was the fierce, lifetime dedication to the national welfare that he inspired in the young Texas Congressman of New Deal days who became our 36th President. It is not too much to say that the fruit of our labors for progressive and humane legislation in all the long years since President Roosevelt's death in 1945 owes much to the inspiration of his leadership, his devotion to the progress of the American people, and his dedication to the success