By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 14178. A bill to establish an orderly trade in textiles and in leather footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 14179. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 14180. A bill to prohibit hiring professional strikebreakers in interstate labor disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 14181. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 14182. A bill to establish a national program of assistance to the States with the goal of achieving equalized excellence in schools throughout the Nation over a 10-year period; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14183. A bill to provide for special programs for children with specific learning disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14184. A bill to designate the third Sunday in October of each year, as "Foster Parents Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14185. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, provide for automatic benefit increases thereafter in the event of future increases in the cost of living, provide for future automatic increases in the earnings and contribution base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 14186. A bill to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 14187. A bill to amend the act of March 29, 1956, chapter 107, 70 Stat. 62 (25 U.S.C. 483a) entitled "An act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 14188. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to repeal the special tariff treatment accorded to articles assembled abroad with components produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WINN, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mrs. MAY, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. POFF, and Mr. MCCLORY):

H.R. 14189. A bill to amend chapter 23 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code to revise proceedings regarding juvenile delinquency and related matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 14190. A bill to improve farm income and insure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities by extending and improving certain commodity programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14191. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 14192. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, to authorize restrictions and prohibitions on the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides which pollute the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 14193. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 14194. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 14195. A bill to revise the law governing contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 921. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. NIX, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WATSON, Mr. WIGGINS, and Mr. DENNEY):

H. Con. Res. 397. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the Surgeon General conducting a study of the social, behavioral, medical, and pharmacological questions relating to the use of marihuana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 14196. A bill for the relief of Carlota Gujmares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 14197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aprus Eshoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14198. A bill for the relief of Ali Samimi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOUSE PASSAGE OF H.R. 14000

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14000, the fiscal year 1970 military procurement authorization bill, has been passed by the House. I felt compelled, out of concern for national defenses and the national interest, to support final passage, despite the fact there are many expenditures in the bill I opposed and expressed my opposition by voting on a number of amendments offered. It grieves me, and my colleagues who feel as I do, that the bill appeared in this final form. Notwithstanding the objectionable portions, my position was motivated by a sense of responsibility and concern for my country and for the hundreds of thousands of American boys who are currently serving in the military services, who require continued support until the end of the war when they can once again return to their homes.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon me to etch into history a brief but vitally important footnote relating to the manner in which this bill was considered by the House of Representatives.

As reported out of the Committee on Armed Services H.R. 14000 authorized appropriations totaling $21,347,860,000. This report—No. 91–522—ran to 176 pages, and was dated September 26, 1969. The report followed extensive hearings on military procurement authorization which total thousands of pages of testimony. Yet the bill was first taken up on the House floor on October 1, 1969, which hardly gave time for due consideration of either the hearings or the report, and was passed shortly thereafter.

When all is said and done, probably the key vote in House consideration of H.R. 14000 was on House Resolution 561, by which only 4 hours of general debate were to be devoted to evaluation of the bill. This resolution passed in a rollcall vote on October 1, by 342–61. I joined 60 of my colleagues in voting "nay."

This particular vote, Mr. Speaker, raises grave questions about the propriety of the approach to basic national defense issues that this body has taken. As my colleague, Representative JOHN E. Moss of California stated on the floor just before passage of House Resolution 561:

We ought to know what we are doing. We ought to have adequate time to engage in meaningful debate and not be forced to compact it all into four hours. I know what is going to happen. We are going to try to get the four hours out of the way probably today and then under the pressure of avoiding a Friday session try to limit debate tomorrow. If we debated this thing for a week we would be giving it inadequate attention.

I believe that sufficient time be provided to consider every aspect of this authorization bill—to weigh all of the varied viewpoints that could well have provided substantial savings in military expenditures without endangering national security. These savings could have been designated to promote a healthier domestic economy and society. Further, such savings would assist in removing some of the inflationary pressures which are presently threatening the economy and affecting the wage-earner by reducing the value of his earnings. As a practical man, I believe it is logical to assume that it would be in the best interest of all concerned if spending more time resulted in spending less money in the area of military priorities.

What is done is done, Mr. Speaker. What is important is what will be done in the future. Never again, I submit to

this House and to both sides of the aisle, should a measure of this importance be permitted to escape the careful and detailed scrutiny that can only be made by the House of Representatives assembled in general debate. We have witnessed Members of this body being limited to a mere 45 seconds in which they could make known their views. This, Mr. Speaker, is unfair, unwise, and violates the principle of free speech.

I despair over the state of legislative affairs that I have just outlined, Mr. Speaker. But at least I have spoken out in what I hope will be a trenchant footnote to history that precedes later and more responsible episodes of congressional national defense decisionmaking.

I will continue to speak out in this vein, and I hope many other voices will joint mine in crying out "billions for defense, when necessary, but not 1 cent through hasty national defense decisionmaking."

JOUSTING—MARYLAND'S STATE SPORT

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I wish to call public attention to an interesting and colorful sporting event, the annual Maryland State jousting tournament, which is scheduled to be held tomorrow, October 4, near Baltimore.

Jousting is a medieval contest which has become Maryland's "official" State sport, and is in the midst of a real revival in Maryland and surrounding States. It is a sport demanding real skill and horsemanship, and tournaments usually include pageantry reminiscent of the elaborate rites which accompanied jousting tournaments among medieval princes.

The Maryland State Jousting Tournament Association has sponsored an annual State tournament every year since 1950. This year many local tournaments have also been held around the State. The second annual national tournament will be held on Sunday, October 12, on the Washington Monument grounds in the Nation's Capital.

These competitions have attracted many skilled riders. Among those competing tomorrow will be Leon Enfield, of Frederick County, last year's national champion; and Phillip Clarke, the defending State champion.

I invite the public to attend the State tournament on October 4 and the national tournament on October 12. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on jousting written by Earl Arnett, and published in the Baltimore Sun of October 3.

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

MEDIEVAL PAGEANTRY, HORSEMANSHIP TO COLOR STATE JOUSTING TOURNAMENT

(By Earl Arnett)

Remnants of medieval pageantry and colorful horsemanship will mark the Maryland State Jousting Tournament scheduled to begin 11 A.M. tomorrow at the athletic field adjacent to the Carling Brewing Company.

Jousting, Maryland's "official" sport, dates to the earliest days of English history in the New World, when Leonard Calvert founded St. Marys City in 1634. The sport of jousting at suspended rings had evolved from older, medieval tournaments when men jousted against each other in competition for kingdoms, women and wealth.

"Jousting became a sport with the discovery of gunpowder," Miss Mary Lou Bartram said recently. Miss Bartram has won the Maryland championship three times and one day hopes to write a book on the history of the sport.

"After the Civil War, jousting flourished in this country," she continued, "particularly in the South. Tournaments were held to raise money for monuments to the war dead. Jousting flourished particularly in the South because of the interest in horses. The sport combined skill, sportsmanship and horsemanship."

The sport seems to be in the midst of a modern revival in Maryland and surrounding states. The Maryland Jousting Tournament Association was formed in 1950 and has sponsored an annual tournament in the state since that date. Miss Bartram added that since June there has been at least one jousting tournament a week in scattered sections of the state.

IN WASHINGTON

Last year, she said, the first national jousting tournament was held in Washington. The second annual tournament will be held Sunday, October 12, on the grounds of the Washington Monument in Washington.

This weekend's tournament will probably attract about 100 riders, although only 12 to 14 will be eligible to compete for the championship. In the championship event, each rider will attempt to spear rings measuring one-half-inch in diameter while atop a galloping horse.

Every contestant is permitted a total of three charges down a straight 80-yard course beneath three arches from which the rings are suspended. The rider has 9 seconds in which to complete the course and spear the three rings with his lance.

The lances are generally 6 to 7 feet long and weigh 6 to 10 pounds. There are no age or sex limits for the competitors; only skill determines the classification in which they compete. Novices aim for rings one and three-quarter inches in diameter, amateurs at one and a half inches, semi-professional at one and a quarter inches, and professionals at one inch.

Those competing for the championship must have placed in the top three in the professional class at least twice during this year's tournament season. The winner will receive a nominal prize of $35 and a challenge trophy.

All the riders compete under a title. Phillip Clarke, for example, who won last year's state championship, calls himself "The Knight of Little Red Wagon." One of his chief competitors this year is Leon Enfield, a Frederick county dairy farmer who won the national tournament last year as "The Knight of Little Woods."

FORT M'HENRY

Prior to the five-event tournament, the riders will parade around the field behind the Marine Drum and Bugle Corps which conducts summer ceremonies at Fort McHenry.

In accordance with the medieval tradition, the winner of the state championship will crown "Queen of Love and Beauty" in concluding ceremonies on the field.

The Carling Brewing Company is located just north of Exit Nine off the Baltimore Beltway. There is no admission charge; refreshments are available on the grounds; and the public has been encouraged to attend.

JAPANESE-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE IN ASIA

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a bitter crisis may be in the offing between the United States and Japan over the island of Okinawa. For 25 years, Okinawa has served as a major American base in the Far Pacific and has been under complete American control even though we have acknowledged that it rightfully belongs to Japan. Over the years, political pressures have been building up within Japan demanding a return of the island to Japanese sovereignty. Now these pressures threaten to undermine popular confidence in the Sato government unless the United States takes positive steps to set forth a detailed plan for the ultimate return of Okinawa to Japan.

Some critics seem to feel that within the American Government, short-range considerations of military bases appear to be taking precedence over long-range considerations of peace and stability in Asia. They say if a shortsighted approach is taken and a determination of Japan's sovereignty over Okinawa is delayed, then a bitter crisis may develop. Not only could the Sato government fall but the long-range interest of the United States in Asia could be severely jeopardized. From my experience as chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee I know what a serious problem this is.

That is why I am delighted that my California colleague, Congressman JOHN TUNNEY, has spoken out on this issue and offered a detailed proposal for resolving the Okinawa question within a "Japanese-American Partnership for Peace in Asia."

Congressman TUNNEY should be congratulated for coming to grips with this problem and presenting a proposal for our consideration. I think it deserves serious study. His statement and a news article follow:

A NEW JAPANESE-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP FOR THE PACIFIC

(Statement by Congressman JOHN V. TUNNEY, prepared for the American Assembly Conference, Shimoda, Japan, September 2 to 4, 1969)

As the new decade of the 1970's begins, we mark the passage of a quarter-century in which the United States has carried the major burden for maintaining the peace in the Pacific. Despite the tragic wars in Korea and Viet Nam, this era has, thankfully, been free of any general conflict spreading throughout Asia and involving the major nations of the region.

During these past twenty-five years, most Asian nations have been free to focus their energies on internal renewal, strengthening the fabric of their societies and developing their economies. With only a few notable exceptions—like China, Korea, Viet Nam, and Indonesia for a few years—the nations of the region have felt secure enough to have small military establishments and low defense budgets. National resources have, therefore, generally been available for the task of building strong, self-sustaining societies.

Although peace has been maintained, it

has required the counterbalancing of some serious sources of tension. They have arisen primarily from the unfortunate political divisions between the Koreans, Chinese, and Vietnamese divisions which have caused persisting conflict between each of these peoples to unify themselves as a nation. China, of course, has been the source of other tensions caused by a determination to develop its latent power into a force of worldwide significance—a determination manifested by its acquisition of nuclear weapons. Yet, despite China's apparent commitment to expand its nuclear arsenal and to build intercontinental missiles, its efforts have encountered difficulties making it unlikely that such a striking power will be developed before the mid-1970's, if not later. Whatever China's future intentions, its continuing spirit of isolation toward the nations of Asia will remain a major source of tension as well as a major reason for efforts aimed at diplomatic reconciliation.

In spite of these tensions, the peace of Asia perhaps could have been, with the exception of Viet Nam, maintained over the past quarter-century without the counterbalancing power of the United States. Lacking the American presence, most Asian nations would probably have had to devote substantially more of their resources for defense purposes, slowing their rates of economic growth and risking strains within their societies. Such circumstances would have been contrary to American interests. Promoting the growth of strong societies and prosperous economies has been the major goal of American policy in Asia and the principal justification for the presence of our military forces stationed in the Pacific. Clearly, the United States has intended that its burden of maintaining the peace should result in precisely the kind of growth of resilient societies that has in fact occurred.

Even before the war in Viet Nam, the United States had as large a force in the Pacific as it maintained for the defense of Western Europe. And even if all of the forces committed to the Southeast Asian mainland as a consequence of the Viet Nam war were withdrawn and deactivated, the United States would still have over a third of a million men deployed in the Pacific. If there were such a return to the pre-Viet Nam posture, then the major components of American power in the Pacific would again be air and naval units concentrated in northern Asia and intended primarily for deterring aggression, especially against insular areas. Though the costs of these North Asian forces have never been of the same magnitude of the approximately $120 billion expended in Viet Nam, they have been costly, particularly during the years of the Korean War.

These costs of maintaining a generally peaceful Asia are often the source of controversy in the United States. But one of the strongest arguments in their favor has been the successful results from the policies of the American presence in northern Asia. Not only has the peace been kept but the nations of the area have grown in economic strength at an unprecedented rate. Taiwan, for example, has had an economic growth rate among the very highest of the world, averaging around nine percent for the past two years. This past year, Korea's national product rose by 12 per cent and is expected to average a 10 per cent annual increase at least up to 1971. But overshadowing these accomplishments has been the breathtaking achievement of Japan, which this past year had an astounding growth rate of 14.3 per cent even after adjustments for price increases. Alongside Japan, America's growth rate is almost puny by comparison. Japan's economy is growing about three times faster than that of the United States.

Japan's spectacular achievements have caused such rapid and historic changes in the ranking of economic power in the world that many people have been slow to understand their effects. Since the speed at which Japan has been growing is not only the fastest in the world but also unprecedented for an industrialized country, this lack of understanding is not surprising. Books written about Japan in 1967 are already hopelessly out of date. In 1966, Japan ranked sixth among the world's industrial nations, yet in one year she was able to leap ahead of both Britain and France to reach fourth place as of 1967. Even though earlier projections of Japan's economy had taken account of the fantastic growth rate, it had not been expected that she would surpass West Germany and become the world's third ranking economic power until 1985. Defying conventional assessments, Japan made this astonishing jump to third place in 1968 when her national product reached $147.4 billion! Now only the Soviet Union and the United States stand ahead of her.

Having attained the position of the world's third ranking power with such startling speed, Japan now commands profound respect for its vigorous leadership in the world's economic affairs. Because of this new position of power and respect, it is natural that Japan should want to review its relationships with other nations, especially the United States. Due to America's willingness to carry the burden of maintaining the peace of Asia, Japan has never had to allocate more than 1.5 per cent of her gross national product for defense, as compared with American defense expenditures of between 9 and 10 per cent of GNP. The major question confronting Japan as the 1970's begin, therefore, is what level of defense effort she should make to insure the safety of her people, and what kind of new defense strategy should be arranged with the United States. There is no question about the need for a new relationship between Japan and America; the question is rather what this new relationship should be.

In seeking a new basis for cooperation in maintaining the peace in Asia, I believe that Japan and the United States should emphasize the obvious complementality of the power between them. Both nations have distinctively different national characteristics and forms of power and both have distinctive contributions to make in Asia. Both nations should, therefore, seek to derive maximum benefit from their complementality in order to give greater force to maintaining the peace. To establish the basis for such an effort I believe that Japan and the United States should be guided by the following principles:

First, the two nations should declare a partnership for peace in the Pacific. This partnership should be based on the complementality of power that has developed between Japan and the United States over the past quarter-century. Its purpose would be to realize the new opportunities for strengthening the prospects for peace that this complementality has created. The United States would signify its understanding of this new partnership by announcing its intention to return Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty on a schedule which would minimize the strains on the island's economy as well as on Japan's capacity to absorb the burdens of the island's public expenditures. For its part, Japan would signify an understanding of the new partnership by announcing its intention to contribute to the maintenance of peace in Asia by making available its techniques and resources for economic growth on a scale commensurate with its position as the world's third largest power.

Second, the United States would continue to carry the primary burden for maintaining peace in Asia as well as for the defense of Japan through the presence of its military forces in the Western Pacific. One of the most important aspects of this burden would continue to be the deterrent against nuclear attacks on Japan. In maintaining this deterrence, both Japan and the United States should carefully review the requirements for bases to support deterrent forces, especially on the island of Okinawa. Both countries should proclaim their interest in the continuation of the existing Treaty of Mutual Defense and their intention to effect the transfer of Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty within the general framework of the treaty. The question of the right of the United States to retain "free use" of its military bases on Okinawa would be the subject of separate diplomatic initiatives. A time table would be devised which both nations could live with, particularly in light of the United States' present efforts in Viet Nam.

Third, both nations would recognize that the peace of Asia depends not only on the short-run needs for military force, but also—and more importantly—on the long-range reconciliation of underlying tensions. While economic growth cannot by itself reduce frictions, it is the most promising task that a world power can support within an underdeveloped country. In its new partnership with the United States, Japan would take the lead in promoting economic growth in underdeveloped countries in Asia on a scale which the United States had never attained because of the use of its resources for the short-run, military requirements of keeping the peace. By undertaking to stimulate the economic growth of Asia on a scale as unprecedented as its own internal growth, Japan would be establishing a new distinctiveness for itself as a world power.

In fulfilling the promise of this new partnership in Asia, Japan would have an opportunity virtually unique in the history of world powers. By devoting the same level of resources for stimulating the economic growth of Asia which nations of comparable power now spend on armaments, Japan would gain a reputation for peace unmatched among the leading nations of the world. The moral influence in world affairs resulting from such a reputation would be certain to be of substantially greater impact than that derived by nations of comparable power from their expenditures on armaments. This influence would not only be manifested by less developed countries in seeking the techniques and products of Japan, but also by recognition of Japan's new leadership for peace through requests for her mediation and reconciliation role in international disputes. Japan's permanent membership in the Security Council of the United Nations would be an obvious example of one of the first results which could flow from Japan's new role in the leadership for peace.

In recent years an expenditure of about 4 to 5 per cent of GNP for defense has been typical of most West European countries. Japan, however, spent less than 0.8 per cent of her GNP on defense, or about $1.17 billion, a figure which reflects dramatically the benefits to Japan of her mutual Defense Treaty with the United States. Yet the savings to Japan from these low defense expenditures have not been reflected in contributions to the economies of less developed countries. In 1967, Japan ranked sixth in the world in contributions to economic developments in terms of per cent of GNP with an amazingly low 0.54 per cent. Japan's development in terms of per cent of GNP million, over half of which was in the form of private investment and private loans. In terms of absolute levels of assistance, Japan's contribution was even surpassed by Britain's $980 million, not to mention France's $1.3 billion. Clearly, these comparisons indicate that Japan continues to be more concerned about its own growth than in assuming the role and responsibilities of a world power.

Such a priority is entirely understandable. Although Japan ranks third in the world according to total size of her economy, she is still significantly behind most Western European countries in per capita income. In 1967, Japan ranked 19th in the world—behind Italy and ahead of Ireland—with a per capita income of $921. Besides the obvious

desire of Japanese to increase their personal incomes, there are also requirements for badly needed public services, such as schools, roads and housing, which have been slighted in Japan's impressive effort to rebuild her economy over the past quarter-century.

But despite these understandable domestic priorities, Japan is aware of both the changes in world power, of which her growth is a dramatic part, and of the responsibilities which confront her as a front-ranked nation of the world. Several months ago, in fact, foreign Minister Aichi acknowledged that in the aftermath of a settlement of the Viet Nam War, Japan would face increased demands to act in accordance with her status as the great economic power of Asia. He left no doubt about how he felt Japan should respond to this challenge. "We must," he said, "make a peaceful contribution to the stability of Asia by contributing as much of our economic power as we possible can." But how much of a contribution will this actually turn out to be?

If Japan's defense budget stays around 1 or 1½ percent of GNP due to the protection she receives from her Mutual Defense Treaty with the United States, then shouldn't it be possible for her contributions to Asian development at least to match this level of expenditure? In other words, during the next three years, isn't it reasonable to expect that Japan could contribute about $5 billion to the peaceful development of Asia? A total contribution, therefore, of about 3 percent of GNP for both self-defense and Asian development should be within the range of Japanese capabilities even though there is an understandable eagerness to boost per capita income to West European levels. It should be noted, however, that Japan now enjoys a balance-of-payment surplus of $1.1 billion in her trade with the United States. This alone would enable Japan to begin to underwrite peace in Asia.

A true Japanese-American partnership in Asia will, of course, depend more on an understanding of common goals than of any specific level of initial expenditures. If Japan does not see her interests served by emphasizing the complimentality of power with the United States, then suggestions that she increase her contributions to Asian development will simply be welcome gestures rather than the foundation of a long-range policy. The advantages of such a partnership should, however, make it a compelling goal not only for Japan and the United States, but also—and especially—to the nations of Asia. If they could have the opportunity for sustained growth in a climate of security—like the opportunity Japan has had over the past quarter-century—then their contributions to a peaceful Asia would be the real fulfillment of a Japanese-American partnership in the Pacific.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Sept. 7, 1969]

BOOMING JAPAN'S EAST ASIAN ROLE

A weary United States wants to lay down some of the heavy economic burden it has carried in East Asia since World War II. But the Pacific basin's other economic giant, Japan, has for understandable reasons shown no eagerness to do the responsible thing and pick it up.

Protected by the American military shield, and thus freed of the enormous expense of defending itself, Japan has become the fastest growing of the big industrial powers. Last year it passed West Germany to become the third ranking economic power, behind only the U.S. and Soviet Russia.

Japan's growth is a testimonial to the capacity for hard work and enterprise of a remarkable people, as well as evidence of the great strides a free society can make when relieved of the need to commit resources to a military establishment. Very much the same can be said for the West Germans, our other major foe of those yesteryears when Soviet Russia was our formal ally, our nominal friend and our covert enemy.

The Japanese boom is further helped along by the fact that the Japanese are not helping less fortunate countries as much as they could. Rep. John V. Tunney (D-Calif.), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, pointedly told the Japanese in a speech in Japan last week that the help they were giving others was an "amazingly low" portion (0.54) of their gross national product. Even hard-pressed England and France give more. Moreover, most of the Japanese aid is private loans and investments.

Tunney proposed a new Japanese-American partnership for peace in the Pacific. Under its terms Japan would contribute $5 billion in aid over the next three years to help stabilize other East Asian nations. The U.S. would continue its protective umbrella over Japan and keep its big Okinawa bases but return sovereignty over Okinawa to Japan.

Japan has a good thing going, and it is not human nature to give up a good thing. Besides, Japan has much internal catching up to do. The per capita income of its people—$921 in 1967—is still lower than that of Western Europe. It has serious problems with radical youth. Many older Japanese, remembering the disaster brought upon them by the country's pre-World War II expansionism, fear that economic aid to neighboring countries would be looked upon suspiciously as Japanese domination in a new economic form.

But the East Asian world is changing rapidly as the U.S. seeks to wind up the war in Vietnam, reduce its commitments to East Asia generally, and direct more of its resources to domestic needs. The pressure on Japan to come out of its countinghouse and assume a bigger East Asian role, as the only democratic nation capable of doing so, is growing steadily.

These changes and pressures form a backdrop to the big Japan Week celebration now in progress in San Francisco. They will be very much in the minds of the diplomats, economists, bankers and industrialists who, as a part of Japan Week, will gather here Wednesday for a seminar on U.S.-Japan political and economic relations.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION WILL NOT TOLERATE ANY SCANDALS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there is a scandal of major proportions brewing in the Defense Department, involving the operations of officers and noncommissioned officers clubs, a scandal that dates back at least several years and one about which the Pentagon, under the leadership of Robert McNamara, apparently did nothing.

The scandal is only now just beginning to surface, thanks to the work of the Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee.

Unfortunately, it appears that it will involve some members and some former members of the Armed Forces.

Two of those mentioned who, at the least, will be called to testify, are retired Gen. Carl C. Turner and the Army's first sergeant major, William O. Wooldridge.

May I say, without imputing any guilt to either of these men, that I note with pleasure the alacrity with which the Nixon administration has acted, first in requesting and getting the resignation of General Turner as chief U.S. marshal, and second in reviewing the honors it has bestowed on Sergeant Wooldridge.

The Nixon administration is determined that it will not tolerate any scandals in this administration and it will meet head on any left over from the prior administration.

Mr. Speaker, to be effective any administration must have two things: integrity in its own ranks and the confidence of the people. I am pleased to see that the President is determined to maintain both.

NEGRO AIDES FIND GAIN UNDER NIXON

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear criticism of the President's approach to improving the opportunities of our minorities from people who do not know what they are talking about, because they have not taken the time or effort to find out.

The critics will be surprised to find, I am sure, that in a quiet, unobtrusive way, the administration is making progress in the area of civil rights.

James M. Naughton, in a recent article in the New York Times of September 29, makes that plain:

NEGRO AIDES FIND GAIN UNDER NIXON—NINE HIGH OFFICIALS EMPHASIZE PRAGMATIC APPROACH THAT FOCUSES ON GETTING JOBS

(By James M. Naughton)

WASHINGTON, September 28.—When President Nixon pledged at his inauguration to "bring us together," many Americans took a quick look at his Cabinet, noted the absence of black faces and reacted with skepticism.

The skeptics still abound. Yet Mr. Nixon has quietly installed 10 Negroes in important sub-Cabinet posts of his Administration. They expressed, as one of them stated it, a common theme:

"Civil rights is not on the back burner in this Administration. We may be quiet, but we intend to get results."

In separate interviews with nine of the 10—seven off the record at their insistence—this picture of the Nixon Administration approach to civil rights emerged:

It is, above all, quiet. A staff memorandum at the White House titled "Efforts of Administration in Civil Rights and Minorities Areas" makes the telling point in its first paragraph of noting "an excellent example of the quiet way to get things done." A political stance based on a so-called Southern strategy would not be easily compatible with an open, avowed civil rights crusade.

It is focused on economics. A rising tide lifts all boats. The emphasis is on seeking to float more black and brown individuals into the American economic mainstream by helping them find job opportunities.

It is pragmatic. After two decades of idealistic oratory, after scores of socially oriented laws, after a year in which physical confrontations reached new heights and racial despair new depths, the Administration appears resolved to "defuse" the tension and buy time for more subtle efforts—in courtrooms and conference rooms—to achieve results.

WILLINGNESS TO TRY

Even among Negroes in Government posts there are those who fear quiet pragmatism will not work. They are willing to give it a try, though.

"This Administration or any Administration is doing to make progress only when it delivers," said a Democratic black Assistant Secretary. "I want to see this Administration deliver. If I didn't feel it was going to, I wouldn't be here. I have a long time left to live with myself."

Few people seem aware that Mr. Nixon's Administration includes any top-level Negroes other than James Farmer, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. That is itself a testimonial to the President's quiet method.

The nine other Negroes holding sub-Cabinet posts with broad power are Robert J. Brown, special assistant to the President; Samuel C. Jackson and Samuel J. Simmons, Assistant Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development; Arthur A. Fletcher, Assistant Secretary of Labor; Ronald B. Lee, Assistant Postmaster General.

Also James A. Washington Jr., general counsel of the Department of Transportation; James E. Johnson, vice chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission; William Brown, chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, and Ben Holman, director of the Justice Department's Community Relations Service.

LITTLE VERBAL ABUSE

All but Mr. Jackson, who is in Europe, were interviewed within the last two weeks. Most contend they have suffered little verbal abuse by virtue of being in the Administration, but at least one has been booed at a meeting of a Negro group and one of them conceded "some uptightness in our ranks."

The majority expressed the belief that they are playing an essential role.

"Why did I, as a Democrat, accept the job?" asked one. "Well, I was at a cocktail party with a lot of other liberal expatriates of the Johnson Administration and it dawned on me how unfortunate it was everybody with a commitment to civil rights was quitting the Government. Somebody had to stay inside to make the case."

Several Negroes in the Administration have expressed amazement there has been no attempt to capitalize on their presence with a flood of press releases.

"If it weren't for reporters seeking me out, nobody would know I'm here," said a liberal black. "If the White House is 'using' me they're not getting much out of it."

"There are two ways you can look at it," he added. "You can say, 'Gee, that's great,' or you can say, 'Maybe they don't give a damn—they didn't get the black vote and don't want it.'"

NEGRO IMPACT DOUBTED

Mr. Fletcher, who was the Republican nominee for Lieutenant Governor of Washington in 1968, believes Mr. Nixon cannot win over the Negro majority.

"Negroes are as emotionally, politically prejudiced against Republicans as Wallaceites are against Negroes," he said.

But the point, he added, is that what another Negro in the Administration calls an "automatic, knee-jerk reaction" among blacks to Mr. Nixon's proposals will work to the disadvantage of minority groups.

"This is where the Negro community has got to develop some sophistication," said Mr. Fletcher. "They should be presenting their agenda to the White House and pressing for action just as they did under (Presidents) Kennedy and Johnson.

"The occupant of the White House changed twice after President Kennedy said we should put a man on the moon," he noted. "But NASA didn't give up. It continued to make its case to the White House for meeting the commitment. It is a tragic mistake for the black community to fail to do the same thing. Needs of black people are not going to wait four or eight years for a change of Administration."

Not all the Negroes in the Administration are flaming liberals. There is a particular mood of defensiveness among them when they are asked to explain the Administration's attitude toward school desegregation in the South.

NIXON SHIFTED APPROACH

When Mr. Nixon shifted the approach from administrative action—cutting off Federal funds of school districts that failed to integrate—to a courtroom attack on segregated schools, liberals said, the pace surely would slow.

The Administration's request for more time for 30 Mississippi school districts to devise integration plans met with outrage and a palace revolt in the Justice Department's civil rights section.

Attacks on the Nixon Administration for allegedly slowing school desegregation are not entirely honest, said Mr. Farmer. "A lot of people seem to think the impression we were going full speed ahead until January of this year," he stated. "There have been changes in "[desegregation] deadlines consistently over the years."

Mr. Fletcher believes the Nixon Administration "is developing its own unique thrust" toward school desegregation, which may be slower to work but surer to get results. "This Administration is not going out promising more than it can deliver," he said.

Another Negro in a high echelon position said Mr. Nixon's school desegregation approach is pragmatic.

"Let's be realistic," he argued. "If we ask the courts to delay until September, 1970, in September, 1970, those schools had better be integrated. It's that simple.

"In the meantime," he added, "we'll give them all the time and help they need instead of drawing up a plan in Washington and forcing it on them. I'm from the South and I'm black, but I know that people, black or white, rebel against others arbitrarily sending them orders. You've got to work with people. That's the only way we're going to get real meaningful desegregation."

POINT OF AGREEMENT

If there is one point on which all the Negroes working in Mr. Nixon's hierarchy appear to agree, it is that the time is right to shift the civil rights focus to the equal employment opportunity arena.

"This Administration is not going to spread itself thin over the whole range of civil rights activities," said Mr. Fletcher. "It's going to concentrate on economic opportunities. We got so hung up on the idea that civil rights was a social problem that we failed to see the connecting links. We've got to talk economics."

One Administration figure who works directly in this area stated the same point this way:

"Originally we felt that if minority people were educated it would change things. But studies show the average Negro college graduate earns $1,040 a year less than the typical white high school dropout.

"People have to be given the opportunity of a good job. If they are, some of the other problems will be less severe: they'll be able to demand better housing, to demand better health facilities, to demand better schools, because they too will be contributing members of society."

There is a common belief as well that Mr. Nixon can deliver more in the economic arena that might a Democratic President.

"Mr. Nixon has the confidence of businessmen of the country," said a Negro who is a former businessman. "These are the people who have to be involved."

There is little doubt among the black administrators that Mr. Nixon is deeply committed to equal employment opportunity. They cite his Aug. 8 executive order to Federal agencies as one example. One Negro who helped draft the order said he was amazed to find that "it wasn't watered down."

Furthermore, the word has been passed to agency heads that they will be reprimanded if they fail to give the executive order more than lip service.

Another policy adopted quietly inside the Government spells out a new rule of the General Services Administration: building sites or leased space for Government offices must be situated within "reasonable proximity" to low- and moderate-cost housing.

One department has become so conscious of developing opportunities to funnel Federal funds to minority groups that it requires "affirmative action to hire black consultants" for its projects. "In fact," said an official of the department, "we're required to justify if we don't hire black consultants."

The "Philadelphia Plan" requiring bidders on federally financed projects in that city to strive toward minority hiring goals in six skilled construction crafts went into effect last week with appropriate fanfare.

Unreported, however, are quiet plans to extend the plan to nine other cities. And the Labor Department, using the "Philadelphia Plan" as a potential threat to reluctant contractors, is quietly bargaining with company presidents across the country for voluntary programs to hire minority craftsmen.

The Justice Department has filed lawsuits charging both employers and unions with discrimination in Maryland, New Jersey, California and Kansas.

"When people say this Administration hasn't done anything, I don't understand what they're talking about," said a black Republican. "Maybe we haven't released statements with a flair and announced programs every other week that we know aren't going to work. But I don't think people want a whole lot of lallygagging about what we're going to do in 1973. They want results."

REPUBLIC OF GUINEA, OCTOBER 2, 1958

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Guinea has been, during its long history, one of the most independent minded of the African countries. Her independent attitude was generated over long centuries by struggles against foreign domination. Oppressed in earlier times—from the 10th to 15th centuries—by kingdoms spilling over from neighboring areas, Guinea was fiercely hostile to invasion during the next three centuries. She finally succumbed to French hegemony in 1898.

But the years under French tutelage proved beneficial. For a relatively quiet period of 40 years, the French constructed roads and hospitals, schools and businesses, and paved the way for modernization.

After World War II, reforms were gradually instituted which transferred the responsibilities of government to the Guineans. From this period onward, the traditional fires of independence were rekindled and culminated finally in complete freedom on October 2, 1958. Guinea voted for full independence, extricating herself from the French community en-

tirely. She was the only former French colony to do so.

The foreign economic and political policies of Guinea have been consistent with her stanchly independent attitudes. Since 1958, she has pursued close economic ties with the Soviet Union, has contracted a loan agreement and technical assistance with Communist China, and negotiated investment guarantee agreements with the United States, West Germany, and Switzerland.

Under the able and experienced leadership of President Sékou Touré, the Republic of Guinea can look forward to a productive and exciting future. We wish the people of Guinea, on their day of independence, our heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

VFW SETS PRIORITIES ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend, the national security and foreign affairs committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars met here in Washington to establish priorities for the coming year.

As a former commander in chief of this dedicated group of veterans, I am impressed with the scope and substance of this year's goals on national security and foreign affairs. It seems to me that the vitality and vision of this organization continues to grow as does the membership, and, as does the sensitivity of VFW's leadership to the true national interests of the United States. The VFW concentrates on the heart of each issue.

The VFW's new commander in chief, Ray Gallagher, of Redfield, S. Dak., was present for the meeting this past weekend and personally participated with the committee in establishing priorities for the period of his stewardship. Mr. Gallagher represents an imaginative, enthusiastic, and determined voice of the veteran. I wish to commend him and the committee for the excellent job they are doing and include the VFW's national security and foreign affairs goals for the coming year in the RECORD:

VFW NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS GOALS, 1969–70

PREAMBLE

Nothing is more important to the United States than national security. The primary threat to U.S. security is the communist doctrine of expansionism and aggression. The communist doctrine represents a total concept for conquest and control. So-called "wars of national liberation" are, in fact, wars to achieve communist conquest. The war now being fought on the soil of South Vietnam has been aided and abetted by the Soviet government and Red China. The Soviet government provides military assistance, supports subversive elements, and exploits weaknesses and frictions within nations and among nations, both in Southeast Asia and around the world. The Soviet government still wants to achieve world dominion. In addition to starting and fighting wars by proxy, the Soviet government continues to increase its military strength in such weapons systems as nuclear-tipped ICBM's, missile-launching submarines and combatant air and surface fleets. Soviet styled strong-arm tactics in Czechoslovakia are blantant and self-evident. They typify the raw power of communism.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States respects the principles of independence and self-determination for all people. We encourage and support all those nations and peoples who oppose communist aggression.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. Maintain a strong and modern national defense posture capable of deterring Soviet expansion anywhere in the world.

2. Support strong Reserve and National Guard forces organized and equipped to meet the requirements of modern warfare.

3. Support strong and meaningful military services—Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps—under their respective Secretaries.

4. Using the moon-landing technology, urge the development of a new age of 100-knot air-cushion, clipper ships as a giant step toward modernizing the U.S. Merchant Marine.

5. Support the Safeguard program as a deterrent and defense to ballistic missile attacks against the United States.

6. Support a modernization program for aircraft carriers for the continued deployment of mobile tactical air forces.

7. Endorse the world-wide deployment of U.S. armed forces to deter aggression and encourage stability in areas of tension.

8. Support the principle of military-industry-labor teamwork to maintain the most modern armed forces in the world.

9. Support the continuation of adequate research and development budgets to include such programs as manned bombers, fighters, close-air support aircraft, missiles, tanks, helicopters and surface ships, so that the United States will remain second-to-none during the 70s as a military power.

10. Urge the United States to take a new look at the rules of engagement in limited warfare to preclude self-imposed limits which could encourage aggression.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

1. Guarantee freedom to the people of South Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia as an essential to the credibility of United States commitments and the security of the free world.

2. Unless peace discussions show significant progress, within 90 days from a date to be set by the President of the United States, support new and expanded conventional military efforts to encourage such progress.

MILITARY MANPOWER

1. Demand that American prisoners of war being held by North Vietnam be identified, given relief and treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention.

2. Support all measures to enhance the prestige and dignity of servicemen and their families.

3. Strongly support modernization of the military pay system and adequate housing for all armed services personnel. Provide all possible assistance to retired military personnel.

4. Recommend the government provide air transportation for U.S. servicemen on emergency leave, overseas duty and convalescent leave.

5. Give all support to ROTC, Reserve and National Guard programs.

6. Support the adoption of universal training program and retention of the Selective Service system.

7. Urge prosecution and punishment of military deserters and of those obstructing military recruiting and induction activities.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. Support a strong U.S. policy to deter Soviet colonial expansion anywhere in the world.

2. Urge an aggressive U.S. foreign policy designed to aid, assist and encourage friendly nations, and a policy which anticipates and thwarts the ambitions of those who would destroy the United States.

3. Support the President of the United States as the leader of this country and encourage him to take such actions as are necessary to "preserve and defend the United States from all its enemies whomsoever."

4. Support and strengthen NATO.

5. Retain full U.S. control of Okinawa, the cornerstone of U.S. defenses in the Western Hemisphere.

6. Oppose any and all forms of economic assistance to Red China and oppose the admittance of Red China to the United Nations.

7. Permit only those U.S. citizens who are authorized by the government of the United States, and loyal to U.S. policies, to represent the United States on all official matters dealing with hostile nations.

8. Advocate strict enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine and retain control of Guantanamo Bay and the Panama Canal.

THE MEASURE OF TRAGEDY

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the difficult situation in South Vietnam is one to which there are no easy solutions. Too many people lately have been offering oversimplified answers which sound almost plausible, and seem to offer welcome relief to a nation weary of this faraway war.

These answers neglect to consider fully the bitter consequences which would result, should they be adopted, and the problems—even more difficult than the ones we now face——which would follow.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, discussing the Vietnam war and refuting the too easy solutions with which we are being tempted:

THE MEASURE OF TRAGEDY

Emotionally all Americans recognize the Vietnamese war as a tragedy, but intellectually they have trouble grasping the concept. They cling to the typically American belief that if they find the right combination of levers there will be an easy way to end the agony.

In this respect Senator Charles E. Goodell's resolution calling for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces by December 1970 is better than most. The policy it would mandate is absolutely cogent: Wash our hands of the affair and hang the consequences. We think the Senator vastly underestimates those consequences, but the starkness of his proposal is an important contribution to intelligent debate. At least he proposes an alternative that does exist.

We're not at all sure the same thing can be said for more "moderate" proposals for ending the war. Some apparently serious people seem to believe, for example, that it can be ended by offering to give the Vietcong a "fair share" of political power in the South, which we imagine would be somewhere around 20%. Some people even profess to think that once this is done free and honest elections can follow.

This is, among other things, an insulting underestimation of our antagonist. He is not a bandit who can be bought off with a few cabinet posts. He is a zealot who religiously believes that the majesty of history entitles him to rule Indochina. From his standpoint, the only honorable thing to do with partial power will be to use it as a stepping-stone in his drive for total power, and he will continue that drive by all means including shooting and killing whenever he deems the moment ripe.

To end an encounter with that kind of foe through an honest compromise simply does not fit the tragic themes the script has followed so far. Our role and our honor, of course, call for continuing to strive for such a compromise. But we need not delude ourselves; it is likely to prove a mirage.

To Senator Goodell's credit, he recognizes as much. Also to his credit, he is responding to the gut question: If no compromise settlement is forthcoming, what do we do then? Further, his answer of complete and unilateral withdrawal would end the American casualties in this particular war. But we very much doubt it would provide a happy ending.

The Communists would take over South Vietnam by military force, which would be a cheap enough price if the international effects stopped there. But just as the American debacle at the Bay of Pigs helped prompt the Soviet initiatives leading to the Cuban missile crisis, so we expect American defeat in Vietnam would encourage the adventurists throughout the Communist world. We do not know whether the next crisis would break out in Thailand, Berlin, South America or elsewhere, but we do feel that over the long run a show of American irresolution is likely to result in worse crises, not easier ones.

A Communist take-over in Saigon also would be likely to make American domestic discord worse—not better as is so often and so glibly suggested. Judging by what happened subsequent to Communist victory in North Vietnam and during Communist occupation of Hue during 1968, we can assume their victory in the South would lead to the massacre of several hundred thousand South Vietnamese whose crime was putting their trust in the United States of America. Those who talk about whether continued war is "politically acceptable" might also ponder whether the American people will reelect a President who presides over such a spectacle.

Reelection of any particular President, to be sure, is only symptomatic of the broader political-social costs at issue. Yet precisely in these broad terms, we see little in world history to suggest that military defeat is good for a nation's domestic problems, and little in the bitter aftermath of the Korean War stalemate to suggest that this nation is one of the exceptions. Some generals are already saying they could have won the war if unleashed. And as is being more widely recognized, white-working-class America is already seething with discontent against the prevailing establishment. For our part, we have no desire to see what, say, George Wallace could do with a stab-in-the-back theme.

If these are the likely costs of traumatic withdrawal, it's easy to understand why the Nixon Administration is withdrawing only gradually and carefully. If negotiations continue to yield no result, it seems likely the Administration will continue to pare down U.S. combat forces—looking less to complete withdrawal than to maintaining a smaller and less burdensome force, but still one large enough to help the South Vietnamese prevent a Communist victory.

This course too has obvious risks. For one thing, as Joseph Alsop has been pointing out recently, the Communists might again send full divisions across borders to fall on the smaller U.S. forces. At worst, there could be an outright military defeat. At best, careful withdrawal guarantees no quick end to the war, only a reduction in the U.S. participation.

The Administration's evident course obviously is no happy one, but it looks a little better when you also look clearly at the alternatives. It makes more sense if you understand there is no magic combination of levers, that there is no easy way out, that this war is indeed a tragedy in the full sense of that word.

NATIONAL ACCLAIM FOR HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., the distinguished dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, has won national acclaim for the outstanding role he played in having the eight Green Berets, who were charged with killing a Vietnamese double agent, freed.

PETE RODINO has represented the people of the 10th Congressional District with such excellence that each election he is overwhelmingly reelected to office by his appreciative constituents.

On September 30, 1969, Leo Standora, in a page 1 story in the Newark Star-Ledger, wrote a moving piece on the response by the House and by one of the Green Berets to Mr. RODINO's efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to take a few moments of their time and read this very moving story:

THE HOUSE RISES TO HONOR RODINO

(By Leo Standora)

The House of Representatives yesterday gave Rep. Peter W. Rodino Jr. (D-10th) a standing ovation for leading a successful fight to free eight Green Berets accused of killing a Vietnamese double agent.

As Rodino stood quietly at the speaker's podium on the floor of the House, his colleagues shouted, cheered and applauded in tribute.

Later he said "I have never had an experience like this before in all my years in Washington."

The outburst came after Rodino delivered a speech congratulating the Army's decision to drop all charges against the Berets.

As he stepped from the podium with applause still echoing through the chamber, Rodino was surrounded by about 20 congressmen who pressed close to pat him on the back or shake his hand. It was a full quarter hour before the House quieted down to a point where business could be resumed.

"The reaction, I think, shows vividly how the members of the House felt about this issue," Rodino said.

"I am proud that I and other members of New Jersey's delegation were able to play a part in its outcome."

In his speech to the House Rodino said:

"I am deeply gratified that the Secretary of the Army has finally addressed himself personally to all the issues in this case . . . and has taken a just and fair position.

"These dedicated servicemen have finally been released. However, nothing can undo the suffering experienced by them and their families.

"I pledge to these men and their families that I, for one, shall continue to do everything in my power to undo the damage that has been done and to ensure that never again will servicemen be exposed to the abuses and miscarriages of justice that have characterized this case."

After his speech and the tribute, Rodino went to his office to thank his eight-member staff for "working very, very hard" in doing research on the case.

TAKES CALL

While there he received a call from Capt. Robert F. Marasco in Long Binh, Vietnam.

Marasco said, "I have no words to express the deep appreciation for your efforts and those of the other congressmen who stood by us all the way."

Rodino said he plans to join Marasco's family to "welcome the soldier home" when he returns to the U.S.

Rodino later called Marasco's parents in Bloomfield whom he said were "simply jubilant.

"Mrs. Marasco said her only disappointment was that she wasn't in Washington to give me a thank-you kiss," said Rodino with a laugh.

"But the job is not over yet," he said. "Tomorrow we begin working to completely clear the names of these men. They deserve no less."

Rep. Joseph G. Minish (D-11th) another Jersey lawmaker who spoke out in behalf of the Berets welcomed the Army's decision but added:

"It is evident that the Army has bungled in the matter. It is extremely demoralizing, both to our servicemen and to our citizenry, to fear prosecution by the Army in cases where the evidence is as slight as it was in this case. I hope the Army will have learned something . . ."

Rep. Cornelius Gallagher (D-13th) called the decision "morally wise and politically imperative from a standpoint of national interest.

"But the government must now go further, indeed overcompensate for the sake of the six men involved," he said.

"These brave Americans stood resolutely in the face of grave charges, accepting the decisions of their country as soldiers, as patriots and as men. For this they deserve our admiration; for the sake of their careers, they deserve far more."

COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS AGAINST ABM

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of Congress received a memorandum from the Computer Professionals Against ABM, expressing their opposition to the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system.

In the decision we are making today on this subject, we should recognize the fact that the signers are among the best known and most highly qualified leaders in the computing profession. They speak as experts on computers.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of the American public on the feasibility of this system, I insert into the RECORD the statement made by these experts on the list of signatories subscribing to the concept of great doubt that the computer system of the ABM will work.

Many of these same computer experts oppose the deployment of the Safeguard

system on other grounds as well, but in this statement they argue that the system is of dubious technical feasibility.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS AGAINST ABM

We, the undersigned members of the computing profession, wish to record our professional judgment that there are grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the computer portion of the Safeguard Antiballistic Missile system. These doubts range from a profound skepticism that the computing system could be made to work, to a conviction that it could not.

Although no project of precisely this nature has ever been attempted before, the difficulty may be understood in terms of a close analogy. Suppose the task were to design and implement the computer portion of a national air traffic control system, and that it were part of the design requirement that at some unspecified instant the control of the air traffic of the entire nation would be transferred to the computer, without any period of parallel operation, testing under actual operating conditions, or evolutionary development. This, by analogy, is what Safeguard would require. Our experience with large-scale computer systems convinces us that such a pattern of development is highly unlikely to lead to a successful computer system.

Another analogy that may be instructive is the use of computers in predicting and reporting election results. These have been used in presidential elections since 1956 and in many local contests, allowing steady evolutionary development. The task is well defined. Realistic testing is possible and is done. It is known in advance exactly when the system will be required to act.

Despite these favorable factors the election systems often fail. In 1968 the data-gathering computer malfunctioned, delaying results by hours. One computer, because of a programming error, reported a total vote exceeding 100%.

If such systems can produce blunders, we must conclude that the Safeguard computer probably could not be made to work at all, since the conditions for it are much less favorable:

1. The computing task is much more complex than those of the examples cited.

2. The precise nature of the computing task cannot be defined. It cannot be known what kinds of electronic and other countermeasures would be used, for example, or what evasive maneuvers the attacker might employ. The offense has more strategic options than the defense in any case, and the defensive reactions have to be programmed and tested well in advance of an attack.

3. Realistic testing is impossible since it would require nuclear explosions in the atmosphere. Only artificial test data could be used.

4. Evolutionary development is out of the question. The computer systems for elections are used every four years or oftener and are improved on the basis of experience. The Safeguard computer would never get a second chance.

It is important to realize that the computer would have virtually all of the decision-making power, because the warning time in a nuclear attack would be so short—minutes at most—that presidential or senior military review would be almost impossible. Our experience with the failures of large computers (not to mention those that send out department store bills) makes us extremely reluctant to place so much life-and-death power in the control of a complex and untested machine.

Worse, the ABM system could by itself initiate a firing sequence without any attack taking place. This could happen through misinterpretation or radar signals from harmless objects, or because of machine malfunction or programming error. Since the defensive missiles themselves would carry nuclear weapons, destruction of American cities might result, or the action might be misinterpreted by other nations as hostile.

Our grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the Safeguard computer system, coupled with our recognition of the possible consequences of system failure, lead us to the view that the project is a dangerous mistake. Whatever other arguments may be brought to bear, for or against Safeguard, our conviction is that on technical grounds alone the project does not deserve the support of the Congress.

COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS AGAINST ABM

(Sampling, as of September 23, 1969, of the over 400 signatories of the June 14, 1969, statement. Organizations, where shown, are for identification only. Such listing should not be construed to mean that the statement is supported by the organization.)

James M. Adams, Larchmont, N.Y.; Philip N. Armstrong, Santa Ana, Calif.; Philip R. Bagley, Bala Cynwyd, Penn., Information Engineering.

Frank K. Bamberger, Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago; Frederick B. Banan, Phoenix, Ariz., General Electric; Jerry Berkman, San Francisco, Calif., Burroughs Corporation.

Carter Brouse, Somerville, Mass., MITRE Corporation; Gail A. Cazier, Skelly, Idaho; Ned Chapin, Menlo Park, Calif.

Leon Davidson, White Plains, N.Y.; Charles DeCarlo, Bronxville, N.Y., Sarah Lawrence College; Myron W. Curtis, Bowdoin College, Maine.

Thomas A. Dewey, Juneau, Alaska, Lockheed Missiles & Space; L. A. Donohoe, Detroit, Michigan, Auto Club of Michigan; Stuart E. Dreyfus, Berkeley, Calif., Univ. of California.

Sheldon Ellish, San Francisco, Calif., Honeywell; Richard V. Feldman, Bethesda, Md., National Institutes of Health; Robert W. Floyd, Menlo Park, Calif., Stanford University.

Marilyn Fontanetta, New York, N.Y., Joseph E. Seagram's, Inc.

N. A. Forte, Newport, Ky., American Computer Service; Kurt Fuchel, Bayside, N.Y., Brookhaven National Lab.;

Thomas M. Gallie, Durham, N.C., Duke University.

Umberto Garbassi, New York, N.Y., Esso Math. and Systems; Saul I. Gass, Potomac, Md., World Systems, Inc.

Charles W. Gear, Urbana, Ill., University of Ilinois.

Mark B. Gladstone, Bethesda, Md., Control Data Corp.; Robert B. Godwin, Lowndale, Calif., Litton Systems.

Barry Gordon, New York, N.Y.; William D. Grants, San Francisco, Calif., Safeway Stores, Inc.; Herbert Greenberg, Denver, Colorado; University of Denver.

James H. Griesmer, Ossining, N.Y., IBM Corporation; Fred Gruenberger, Woodland Hills, Calif., San Fernardo Valley State College; Jessica Helwig, New York, N.Y., Columbia University.

John G. Herriot, Stanford University, Rosanne Hesse, Plainfield, N.J., Bell Telephone Labs; Lance Hoffman, Stanford University;

D. Hogg Claudia, San Bernardino, Calif., Univ. Calif. Riverside; P. Z. Ingerman, Cherry Hill, N.J., RCA Corporation; Sanford M. Isaacs, Weston, Mass., State Street Bank & Trust.

Carl A. Kalinowski, Everett, Mass., NASA; Thomas A. Keenan, Potomac, Md.; William D. Kelly, Skillman, N.Y., Kepner, Tregoe, Inc.

Melvin Klerer, White Plains, N.Y., New York University; Daniel F. Langenwalter, Phoenix, Ariz., General Electric; Randall M. Lee, Palos Hills, Ill., University of Chicago.

M. L. Lesser, Armonk, N.Y.; Sidney L. Lida, Prairie Valley, Kansas; C. Denison Makepeace, Plainfield, Vt., University of Vermont.

William E. Massey, Fairfax, Va., General Electric; Jack Minker, College Park, Md., University of Maryland; Daniel O'Connell, Albuquerque, N.M., Missouri/New Mexico Computer Systems.

George O'Toole, New York, N.Y., Computer Methods Corp.; Marvin C. Paull, Princeton, N.J.; RCA Laboratories; Robert H. Penny, Bethesda, Md., General Electric.

Harold Peskin, Elizabeth, N.J., American Can Co.; Rick Pierce, Tiburon, Calif., Honeywell; Walter A. Ramshaw, Stony Creek, Conn.

Roger A. Ratcliff, Hermosa Beach, Calif., Litton Industries; Naomi Replansky, New York, N.Y., Rockefeller University.

Robert F. Rosin, Amherst, N.Y., State University of N.Y.

J. Paul Roth, Ossining, N.Y.; Norman B. Saunders, Weston, Mass., Circuit Engineering; Allan H. Schmidt, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University.

Marvin Shapiro, Bethesda, Md., National Institutes of Health; Robert Shapiro, New York, N.Y., Meta Information Appl.; Donald L. Shell, Schenectady, N.Y., General Electric Co.

Bernard Shlasko, New York, N.Y., Hunter College; Jerome Sitner, New York, N.Y., American Express Co.; L. Wheaton Smith, Palo Alto, Calif.

Chitoor Srinivasian, Princeton, N.J., RCA Laboratories; Donald N. Street, Katonah, N.Y., IBM Corporation; Steven D. Swatek, District Heights, Md., U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Charles J. Swift, Los Angeles, Calif., Computer Sciences Corp.; James W. Thatcher, Peekskill, N.Y., IBM Coporation; Leonard Uhr, Madison, Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin.

Stephen H. Unger, New York, N.Y., Columbia University; Donald E. Walker, West Concord, Mass., MITRE Corp.; Clark Weissman, Granada Hills, Calif., System Development Corp.

Robert W. Winder, Princeton, N.J.; RCA Laboratories; Barbara F. Young, Melbourne, Fla., Pan American World Airways; Richard L. Young, Albuquerque, N.M., Sandia Corporation.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

Daniel D. McCracken is a consultant and writer, with ten books on computer programming in print. He worked for General Electric from 1951 to 1958 in a variety of assignments in computer programming and training, at Hanford, Cincinnati, Phoenix, and New York. He has been a national lecturer for the Association for Computing Machinery.

Paul Armer entered computing in 1947 at the Rand Corporation. After serving there as associate head of the computer sciences department until 1968, he moved to his present position, director of the computation center at Stanford University. He is president of the American Federation of Information Processing Societies (AFIPS). He was a consultant to the Presidential Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, and has testified before various Congressional committees. In 1959 he was a member of the team of U.S. scientists who toured the U.S.S.R. to assess Soviet computer capabilities.

Joseph Weizenbaum is Professor of Electrical Engineering and Political Science at MIT. He is the inventor of several languages for communicating with computers. He was a charter member of Project MAC, the first major computer time-sharing project in the world. He was responsible for software development and software-hardware interface for the General Electric-Bank of America project that pioneered bank deposit accounting automation. He helped design and build two of the earliest computers, in the early fifties.

Gregory P. Williams has also been in computing since the early fifties, beginning with the Army Ordnance Corps. Since 1954 he has been with a major manufacturing concern, in computing assignments ranging from operations research and design automation, to automating university libraries and installing commercial computers.

The sponsors are without exception men who have pioneered the development and application of computers and now hold responsible positions in the field. It is doubtful whether another list of Americans with such fundamental and long-standing contributions to the field could be compiled. Some accomplishments:

Development of Fortran, by far the most widely used computer language: Backus.

Membership in committees that developed Algol and Cobol, two other widely used languages: Backus, Bemer, Bromberg.

Development of special-purpose languages that greatly expanded the horizons of computer usage possibilities: McCarthy, Minsky, Newell, Weizenbaum.

Leadership, both in early years and today, in the use of computers in education: W. Dorn, Forsythe, Scott.

Foundational work in artificial intelligence: Feigenbaum, McCarthy, Minsky, Newell.

Some of the earliest studies, the first implementation, and current leadership in computer time-sharing, a technique on which much of the Safeguard computer system would be based: Corbato, Fano, Licklider, McCarthy, Minsky, Weizenbaum.

Leadership positions in major professional organizations in computing: Armer, P. Dorn, and Ralston currently, but almost everyone listed has held such positions at some time. Forsythe and Huskey are past presidents of the Association for Computer Machinery, and Hoffman is a past treasurer.

Fundamental publications on the mathematical theory of computation: Knuth, McCarthy.

Leadership in the application of computers to the solution of practical problems in industry: P. Dorn, Weiss, Williams, others.

The founding of a major computer manufacturing company: Palevsky.

Major studies in linear and dynamic programming, basic techniques of operations research: Bellman.

It would be futile to try to list even a sampling of the publications of these men, who as a group have produced literally dozens of books and hundreds of papers on the design, programming, applications, and implications of computers. A complete program of computer education, from high school introductions to post-doctoral studies, could easily be based on the writings of this group.

GREEN BERETS

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the sense of pride and gratification that the charges against the eight members of the Green Berets were dismissed.

Through the efforts of our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Congressman RODINO, the public was provided with the opportunity to view the facts regarding the case and the Army was able to right the injustice that was done.

This shows that Congress and the American people do not want miscarriages of justice to prevail. To use the old phrase, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

THE PRESIDENT AND "THE EXTREMISTS"

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

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

THE PRESIDENT AND "THE EXTREMISTS"

Sometimes we think that President Nixon missed his calling. He should have been an editorial writer. Mr. Nixon seems to know all our professional secrets; he slips with ease into each and every one of those dreadful locutions that are as highminded as they are off the mark and which (we try to think) we only use when the hour is late, the typewriter stuck, and the issue layered in fog, mud, and glue. You know the crowd we mean—men of good will and their fellow amorphs, who can be called upon without fear or favor, to cease the bootless acrimony. Well, they—men of good will—have some blackguard cousins of whom we have all become too fond over the years; but it has been left to Mr. Nixon to exploit them to such a degree that we have begun to fear for their safety. We are thinking of our old friends, extremists on both sides.

Consider Mr. Nixon's recent press conference remarks:

"Well, on this very difficult problem I would say first that we've had a lot of criticism from the South insofar as our integration and desegregation policies are concerned, as well as from the groups [many civil rights groups] to which you refer. It seems to me that there are two extreme groups. There are those who want instant integration and those who want segregation forever. I believe that we need to have a middle course between those two extremes. That's the course on which we're embarked. I think it is correct . . . We are for it [desegregated education], but we are going to avoid extremes."

Now, Mr. Nixon said a lot of other peculiar things that day about his administration's desegregation policy. For instance he took credit for "progress" on this front that had in fact been made by the Johnson administration and—if anything—retarded by his own. And he defended his retreat on desegregation in Mississippi by declaring the preferability of his action to a cutoff of funds, even though a cutoff was not at issue in Mississippi. Still, it was the President's remarks about those ideological bookends that captured our attention and continues to engage it.

The "extremist" formulation has built-in dangers—especially if you are trying to run a country, not just trying to tell someone else how to do it in a few hundred well-chosen words every morning. Habitually placing oneself at a midpoint between extremes (real or imagined) lets the extremes define the middle: it is a sliding position, no position. Then again, there is the matter of "both" sides. Both? Most issues have around a hundred and ninety-two sides—unless they are complicated, in which case they, of course, have more. So there is also the danger of getting to think about things in a highly oversimplified way. But finally there is the overriding danger, with which we are not unfamiliar, that someone somewhere will start wondering just who these extremists are. If we were of a mind to, we might point out that the "extremists" to whom Mr. Nixon referred must necessarily be taken to include Father Hesburgh and the Civil Rights Commission, the majority of attorneys working in the Civil Rights Division of Attorney General Mitchell's Justice Department, the Senate Republican Minority Leader, Hugh Scott, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education whom Mr. Nixon appointed and whose office worked out the plan his administration junked. But we are not of a mind to do a thing like that. We just would like to urge that Mr. Nixon—out of compassion, if nothing else—give our overworked friends a rest.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORIES IN THIS YEAR'S SPECIAL ELECTIONS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the victory of Democrat MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON in the special election in the Sixth Congressional District of Massachusetts marked the third Democratic victory in four special elections held this year. This is particularly significant when it is noted that the three victories came in districts that had been represented by Members from the Republican Party. Further, the Republicans who held these seats—in Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and Montana, had been elected by substantial margins.

An editorial in today's New York Times comments on the above. I am including it with my remarks in the RECORD:

POLITICAL FEVER CHART

American Presidential campaigns usually begin the day after Election Day, and 1972 is no exception. Every poll, every endorsement, and especially every local and state election is mulled over in much the way soothsayers once plied their comparable trade by studying the entrails of a pigeon. To any supporters of President Nixon who may be given to this arcane activity the special Congressional elections held since the fall of 1968 must seem full of foreboding.

On Tuesday of this week in the Sixth District of Massachusetts, a liberal Democrat, Michael J. Harrington, defeated William L. Saltonstall, whose very name in that area should have assured him the election. Mr. Harrington emphatically favored a withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam by the end of 1970 and political reforms at home; his opponent favored the Nixon policies, foreign and domestic. Yet Mr. Harrington carried the district, which is so traditionally Republican that no Democrat had won it since 1875.

The first inkling the President may have had that the electorate that had chosen him was not necessarily to be counted permanently on his side came last March. In Wisconsin's Seventh Congressional District, voters who had returned Melvin Laird to the House in November by over 64 per cent of the vote had to fill the vacancy left by his elevation to the Cabinet. With a campaign assist from Hubert Humphrey, David R. Obey, a Democrat, defeated a self-styled "Laird Republican" who had clearly been expected to win. In a rash moment the Republican had proclaimed the election a "referendum on the Nixon Administration." Mr. Obey is now the district's first Democratic Representative in the twentieth century.

The second of these special elections, less dramatic but probably no less disturbing to the new President, took place in Montana's

Second Congressional District in June. Here Democrat John Melcher defeated a Republican by training his fire on the Administration's budget and tax programs. If he did not win by much, the wonder is that he won at all, considering that a Republican had carried the district just seven months before by 67.8 per cent of the vote, only to resign shortly afterward to go on the Federal bench.

To these overturns might be added the last Gallup poll, showing Nixon's popular standing to be respectively 14, 13 and 13 per cent below those of Presidents Johnson, Kennedy and Eisenhower at comparable points in their Presidential terms. The results may well persuade Mr. Nixon, present Republican theories to the contrary, that he will have to broaden, not narrow, his political base if he is to have hopes for 1972.

CONGRESS NOW A FOOD TARGET

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the attention of the Members of the House a news item that appeared in the Washington Star today. This story carries a message for us that should not be ignored. Our esteemed colleague from Illinois, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, with his solid background of experience with foods is unusually well qualified to deal with the perplexing problem being discussed. The news item follows:

TYPICAL OF BAD DIETS: CONGRESS NOW A FOOD TARGET

A White House nutrition expert has singled out Congress as the No. 1 target for a program to educate the nation on the proper foods to eat.

The average middle-aged overweight, underexercised congressman, Dr. Jean Mayer said yesterday, is typical of the American male most vulnerable to the ills of improper diet.

Mayer, special consultant to President Nixon on nutrition and health, gave his views to a committee headed by Rep. John C. Kluczynski, D-Ill., who at 5-feet-6 and 240 pounds occupies the bullseye in Dr. Mayer's target group.

Kluczynski's committee is charged with doing something to make the House restaurant fare more palatable and its operation less costly. A committee of congressmen's wives also wants the restaurant to become more aware of calories and cholesterol, and it was at their prompting the hearing was held.

Kluczynski, who has operated a restaurant in Chicago for 50 years, quickly made it apparent the ladies' concern is not his.

"I've always thought there was nothing better than a good meal," he said as he opened the hearing. "Wherever I go I say, 'What do you have that's fattening?' I never worry about that and I feel good."

Smoking a cigar and sipping coffee, Kluczynski nodded approval as Mayer listed the perils that shorten the lives of most American men: Overeating, lack of exercise, improper diet, heavy smoking and heavy coffee drinking.

Mayer noted that American women have a longer life expectancy than American men, and he said this is not a biological factor as commonly believed. "This is an American phenomenon," he said.

Mayer said Washington "is an extremely difficult city in which to be healthy."

It is hard to get any exercise, he said. The city is poorly organized for walking, the restaurants run to extremes of good and bad, with little in between, and the nature of their jobs puts many men in government under heavy work and travel pressures.

"If you defined a group that most needed to be reached by a nutrition and health program," he said, "it would be the members of Congress."

INTERN POSITION PAPERS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, for a 3-week period starting July 7, I sponsored an intern program for outstanding seniors from each public and private high school in the Eighth District of Maryland. Forty-seven students came to the hill every day for an intensive orientation on the operation of Government. In addition to their attendance at seminars with leaders from all branches of Government, they investigated in groups certain issues pending before Congress, according to their own interests. Their findings were documented in position papers presented to me. I submit two outstanding papers as a valuable contribution to the 91st Congress. The first-place paper is "Pesticides—Their Ecological Effects and Legislation"; and the second-place paper is "Inflation, Interest Rates and the Metropolitan Area."

The papers follow:

PESTICIDES—THEIR ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND LEGISLATION

(By Ita Killeen and James C. Doster)

PESTICIDES AND OUR ECOLOGY

Background

In this modern day, most of us realize that such discoveries as the "miracle drugs" are beneficial to the human race, and that such ideas as the H-bomb can destroy us in a matter of minutes. But what about insecticides? Are they beneficial, or are they also small H-bombs of our ecology?

The development of insecticides began after World War II when it was found that certain chemicals that had been developed to exterminate men were also highly effective in destroying insects. The result: a seemingly never ending stream of synthetic insecticides.[1]

The insecticides of today fall into one of two large groups. One represented by DDT is known as the chlorinated hydrocarbons. The other represented by parathion is known as the organic phosphorus insecticides.[2]

I. The Chlorinated Hydrocarbons

Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloro-ethane, DDT for short was first synthesized in 1874, but its properties as an insecticide were fortunately not discovered until 1939. Throughout the world DDT is thought to be harmless, perhaps because of its use as a delousing agent during wartime. DDT is fairly harmless in its powdered form since unlike other hydrocarbons, DDT in its powdered form is not readily absorbed through the skin. But! ! ! Add a little oil, is it absorbed into the body and stored in the fatty areas of the body waiting to be released in times of stress.[3]

Chlordane, another chlorinated hydrocarbon, makes use of all portals of the body to get into the body. It is readily absorbed through the skin, is breathed as a vapor, and even digested. Chlordane, as is with most of the other chlorinated hydrocarbons, is also stored in the body. A diet of 2.5 parts per million (ppm) can lead to a storage of 75.0 ppm. This stored chlordane (or any other insecticide of the chlorinated hydrocarbon type) could be released months, even years later in an obscure disorder that is virtually impossible to trace to its origins. On the other hand merely the handling of chlordane can result in death. One victim accidentally spilled a 25 percent solution of chlordane on his skin and died within 40 minutes.[4]

Heptachlor, another of these "elixers of death," has a high capacity for storage in fat. If a diet contains as little as 1/10 of 1.0 ppm. of heptachlor, there will in time be measurable amounts of the chemical in the body. Another curious but deadly feature of heptachlor, is that it undergoes a chemical change that transforms it into a distinct substance known as heptachlor epoxide. This epoxide is four times as toxic as the chemical it was derived from, which in turn is four times as toxic as chlordane.[5]

In the middle 1930's a special group of the chlorinated hydrocarbons, the chlorinated naphthalenes, were found to cause hepatitis, and a rare, fatal liver disease in persons subject to their exposure. These have led to the deaths and illness of people in the agricultural industries as well as cattle and workers in the electrical industries. These are the most poisonous of the chlorinated hydrocarbons. They are dieldrin, aldrin, and endrin.

Dieldrin, which was named for a German chemist, is about 5 times as toxic as DDT when swallowed, but about 40 times as toxic when it is absorbed through the skin. The effects of dieldrin are notorious for striking quickly, sending the victim into convulsions. Its effects as an insecticide as well as its residual duration make this contaminent one of the most widely used.

Aldrin is another extremely toxic insecticide. A quantity the size of an aspirin is enough to kill 400 quail. Imagine what a hundred pounds could do. A side effect of this chemical is sterility. The offspring of pheasants, rats and dogs fed small quantities of aldrin died within a few days. The effects of aldrin that occur in man are not yet known, yet we still allow this pesticide to be sprayed by airplanes over our crops.[6]

Endrin, with its little twist in chemical makeup, makes DDT seem almost harmless. It is 15 times as poisonous to mammals as DDT, 30 times to fish, and about 300 times to birds. This agent of death has killed cattle, wandered into orchards, poisoned wells, and even when carefully used and all precautions taken to ensure the safety of individuals, endrin has killed and crippled. This also is being sprayed on our lands.[7]

A very sinister feature of DDT and its related compounds is the way it is passed along in food chains. An example: an alfalfa field is dusted with DDT, and is then prepared as a meal for hens; the hens lay eggs containing DDT—or the alfalfa is fed to cattle and the DDT will turn up in amounts ranging from 3 to 65 ppm.[8]

The undesirable qualities of the chlorinated hydrocarbons are two in number. One is that they are termed "persistent pesticides," or that they last a long time in the environment without breaking down. Though they are broken down eventually, these pesticides may remain in the environment for more than ten years, and still bring about animal and fish kills. The second feature of these pesticides is that they are volatile and can be carried far from the point of application. Residues of DDT have been found in seals and penguins in Antarctica.[9]

II. The Organic Phosphates

Some organic esters of phosphoric acid were known for years. In the 1930's Gerhard Schrader, a German chemist, discovered their insecticidal effects. The German government immediately recognized their probable use in

Footnotes at end of article.

wartime and seized the opportunity of Schrader's discovery. They were developed into deadly nerve gases. Others, closely related became insecticides.[10] These poisons act on any animal which has a nervous system, because this is their target. They have a peculiar ability to destroy enzymes, especially those which are vital to life.

In the body, acetycholine is known as a "transmitting enzyme." It helps the brain transmit electrical impulses through the neurons. When its job is done it must be destroyed or it will build up and send the person or animal into tremors, convulsions, and eventually leads to death. Cholinesterase is an enzyme produced by the body to regulate the amount of acetycholine in the body. This enzyme is the target of the organic phosphates. If this enzyme is destroyed, acetycholine quickly builds up and death results.[11]

Parathion, one of the most widely used of the organic phosphates is so toxic that a curious chemist was killed by merely swallowing what amounted to about 0.00425 ounce. He was killed so quickly that he did not have a chance to use the antidotes he had prepared. In the early 1960's the State of California reported an average of 200 deaths a year resulting from parathion.[12] According to one expert, the amount of parathion sprayed on California alone is enough to "provide a lethal dose for 5 to 10 times the world's population."[13]

Malathion is another of the organic phosphates. It is widely used as a garden spray to control mosquitos and other insects. Malathion, one of the least toxic of the insecticides is readily assumed safe and harmless by consumers. Malathion is safe to the human only because the mammalian liver renders it relatively harmless through the actions of enzymes. But if something should happen to those enzymes.[14]

Many people may wonder why the human race is still alive if parathion and its related chemicals are so toxic. The answer is that we are saved from extinction only because the organic phosphates are shortlived in comparison to the chlorinated hydrocarbons. Even though they are easily broken down they do last long enough to cause considerable harm. In Riverside, California, 11 out of 30 men picking oranges became violently ill and had to be hospitalized. Their symptoms were those of parathion poisoning. The orange grove had been sprayed with parathion just two and one-half weeks earlier. This isn't the only example of parathion persistence, similar situations occurred in groves sprayed a month earlier, and orange peels have been found to contain residues of parathion six months after spraying.[15]

The unwanted effects

All the insecticides just described are excellent killers of insects. As they do their work on the insects they also do the same to birds, fish, mammals and man.

Would anyone like to live in a land where the songs of birds are unknown. The normal answer would be no, of course, yet we allow tons of poisons to be spread over our lands each year, most of which is consumed by birds, fish and even man.

Take for an example the University of Michigan which is located in East Lansing, Michigan. In 1954 the city began spraying with DDT in a futile attempt to control the spread of the Dutch Elm disease. Their target was the bark beetle. Later, additional spraying followed to control the gypsy moth and the mosquito. The first year of the spraying everything seemed to go as planned. The following spring, the migrating robins seen in great numbers each year began to return. Then something went wrong. Dead and dying robins were found all over the campus. Few nests were built and few young appeared.[16] In June of 1957, when at least 370 adult birds, the normal number in the years before the spraying, only one young robin was found.[17] Few would think that this bird massacre was caused by the seemingly safe DDT. That is until Dr. Roy Barker of the Illinois Natural History Survey at Urbana, linked the sprayed trees with the dead birds. It seems that the leaves were coated with an unwashable film of DDT. In the fall when the leaves fell they were decayed. The earthworms, feeding on the humus accumulated the DDT residues in their bodies. The next spring the migrating robins ate the contaminated worms.[18]

In Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin, before 1958, a thousand myrtle warblers could be seen in migration each year. In 1958, the year of the spraying for Dutch Elm disease, only two were found.[19]

In the Tule Lake-Klamath drainage area of Oregon and California, more than 1,000 fish-eating birds were killed in the years between 1960 and 1963, apparently by toxaphene (another of the chlorinated hydrocarbons) in the drainage and irrigation waters of a closed system.[20]

Soon we may have to begin looking for another national bird. Along the east coast from Maine to Florida, the Bald Eagle has almost stopped breeding. Two Bald Eagles, one from Florida and the other from Connecticut, examined by the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, in Laurel, Maryland, were found to contain 7.0 ppm. of dieldrin residue and 34.7 ppm. of DDT and DDD in the brain, respectively. Both apparently died from these insecticide residues.[21]

What would millions of Americans do if there would be no fish to be caught in our fresh and salt-water areas. Since whole businesses, as well as lives depend on the fishing industry, both sport and commercial, it would be a senseless waste to allow insecticides to contaminate our rivers, streams, lakes, bays, and oceans.

In the spring and fall of 1953, massive salmon kills were recorded in the Miramichi River of New Brunswick. It seems that in the spring of 1953, accelerated programs of DDT spraying to control the Budworm were undertaken. Brook trout were also among the victims.[22]

In one area treated with dieldrin at 4.7 pounds per acre, runoff killed minnows even when the runoff water was diluted 3 to 1 with clean water. Runoff from cottonfields treated with insecticides produced large fish kills in 15 Northern Alabama streams. In some of the streams, apparently all life was eradicated from them.[23]

In 1961, massive kills of fish were reported in the Colorado River below Austin, Texas. The kills began on January 15 in a town lake below Austin. On January 16, large kills were reported 50 miles downstream. By January 28, more of the same was reported some 200 miles below Austin. Odors from the river suggested chlordane and toxaphene poisoning. An investigation resulted and the odors were linked to a chemical plant producing DDT, benzene, chlordane, and toxaphene. The manager of the plant admitted that large quantities of insecticides were washed into the Colorado when a drain was flushed out.[24]

Fish and other aquatic animals examined in the Green Bay and Lake Michigan area of Michigan were found to contain large levels of DDT. Mud samples contained 1/100 ppm. of DDT related chemicals. Small aquatic animals of the mud were found to contain 30 times as much. Fish of the waters contained 10 times more than the small animals.[25]

Other effects of insecticide poisoning are also available, but they are too numerous to mention in any detail, but a list of some of them follows:

1. DDT residues have been associated with the declining reproduction in the Bermuda Petrel, already a nearly extinct bird.[26]

2. DDT associated with the decline in the numbers of the Bald Eagle, the Brown Pelican, the Osprey, and the Peragin Falcon.

3. An antimalarial program carried out by the World Health Organization killed so many cats in Java that the price of a cat nearly doubled.

4. Insecticides may be man-made carcinogens.[27]

Though the examples that have been given thus far in the paper are small in number, they are representative of the harm that insecticides cause. They are truly "elixirs of death."

THE LEGISLATIVE ASPECTS OF PESTICIDES

The threat of serious pesticide contamination of the nation's wildlife is fast becoming a reality. With it grows the concern for the danger of poisoning to humans. Already twelve states have reported pesticide residues in fish well above the Government's recommended 5 ppm. "Widespread, long-term contamination is a matter of great public concern."[28] The need for legislation is great. A study recently conducted by the US Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife confirms Rachel Carson's statement that "there will be an environmental disaster unless this is quickly brought under control." The "importance of a continuing program of research, education, surveillance, and legislation to prevent unhealthful contamination of food or injury to humans" cannot be overemphasized.[29]

Several laws enacted when pesticides first came into use have been: the Insect Pest Act (1902); The Plant Quarantine Act (1912); the Pink Bollworm Act (1930); Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (1938); Department of Agriculture Organic Act (1944); and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (1947). Today the more important and effective of these are the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

The Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938 gave to the Food and Drug Administration in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the authority and procedures to establish safe limits for pesticide residues on foodstuffs. The FDA, however, could not strongly enforce their laws until in 1954, the Miller Act amended the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, providing the machinery necessary for regulation of the quantities of pesticides allowed to remain in agricultural products. In 1966 the Federal Government tightened control over pesticides by requiring manufacturers to prove that a pesticide will not be harmful to humans when applied to food products. 375 chemicals are affected by this law, including DDT, aldrin, dieldrin, and heptachlor. Prior to this law, a pesticide had to be proven harmful in order to halt its use.

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act of 1947 is a law dealing with registration of pesticides and is enforced by the Pesticide Regulation Division of the Department of Agriculture. A major requirement for registration is that the manufacturer show that his pesticide will be effective in controlling certain pests and safe for the user and for other people and animals in the area when used as directed. When shipped, the package must have on it a registration number and ingredient statement identical in substance, to the statement submitted in registration. This law has been updated in 1959, 1961, and in 1964.[30]

More recently various bills have been introduced to further Government regulation of pesticides and in some, to even ban the interstate selling and distribution of certain pesticides. John D. Dingell, a Democratic congressman from Michigan has repeatedly, since 1964, introduced legislation to amend an act of August 1, 1958, in order to minimize or prevent injury to fish and wildlife through pesticides. Since 1965, Congressman Dingell has also introduced bills to provide

Footnotes at end of article.

for advance consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service and with state wildlife agencies before beginning any Federal program making use of pesticides. A bill submitted to the House of Representatives by Mr. Dingell proposes an amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which would set standards of decomposability for pesticides wherever public health is endangered because of a pesticide's failure to decompose. In 1965, Mrs. Neuberger proposed to amend the act of August 1, 1958, by increasing the Secretary of the Interior's authorization for pesticide research. The Federal Pesticide Control Act of 1967 was placed before Congress by Ribicoff. This bill called for every manufacturer or processor of pesticides to register with the Secretary of Agriculture. It also provided for the inspection of places of manufacturing and required manufacturing methods to conform with good manufacturing practices. Under this bill, the Department of Agriculture's enforcement of pesticide regulations would be strengthened by adding civil remedies to existing criminal sanctions and allowing Federal courts to issue injunctions to stop violations.

In April of 1969 Democratic Congressman Bertram L. Podell of New York presented a bill to establish an American Committee on Chemicals. This committee of eleven would study, investigate and make recommendations on the use of chemicals. A report would be presented to the President and Congressman by July 1, 1970.

More rigid legislation has been aimed at fostering the use of pesticides which break down quickly in the soil rather than more persistent pesticides. The State Legislatures of Michigan and Arizona have banned DDT, following the example of Sweden, which recently banned the use of DDT, aldrin, dieldrin, and dindane, and Denmark which will ban DDT this fall.

In April of 1969, Congressman Podell proposed a bill prohibiting the interstate sale and shipment of DDT. Since 1966, Senator Gaylord Nelson, a Democrat from Wisconsin, has proposed bills which would prohibit the sale and shipment of DDT for use in the United States. This year Senator Nelson has also proposed the establishment of a permanent National Commission on Pesticides to evaluate the environmental dangers of pesticides. The Commission would examine present pesticide use and current labeling requirements. It would also monitor pesticide residues in the environment, conduct research on pesticide breakdown, and develop less persistent pesticides. Yearly recommendations would be made to the President and Congressmen on improving the restrictions of pesticide use would be required.

Numerous programs and committees have been established by the Federal Government to report on the pesticide problem. The President's Science Advisory Committee issued a report, "Use of Pesticides," in 1963 which recommends that the levels of pesticides in man and his environment be determined. Also, the Committee report urged that the set toleration levels of pesticide residues be reviewed and safer, more specific control of pests be developed. The Committee also suggested a National Pesticide Monitoring Program, which was established. The objectives of this program would be "nationwide assessment of general levels of pesticide residues in the environment and location of possible problem areas wthin specific segments of the environment." [29] The results of the programs studies were inconclusive because of the great variations of amounts of residue in fish throughout the country. Further studies were urged by Federal and state agencies, universities, industries, and conservation groups. The program was established by the Federal Committee on Pest Control. The Committee, formed by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, the Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, monitors pesticide residues in foodstuffs inadequately, checking only one percent of foodstuffs involved in interstate commerce. Stepping up its research program in 1966, the FCPC spent nearly 18 million dollars on chemical research, and 45 million dollars on non-chemical pesticide research.[31]

One non-government program designed to give legal and scientific support to local groups struggling against pesticide pollution is the Environmental Defense Fund. The EDF was founded in 1967 by a young lawyer, Victor J. Yannacone, and his scientist friends. One suit, filed by the EDF against the U.S. Department of Agriculture, attempted to prevent the USDA from using dieldrin in Berrien County and recommended DDT as a cure for the Dutch Elm Disease. In Wisconsin, the EDF supported a petition by the citizens to ban DDT. In the Michigan Court of Appeals, the EDF tried to prevent the state's Department of Agriculture from dumping 3 tons of DDT on Berrien Co. This project was aimed at an "infestation of Japanese Beetles," actually numbering from 300 to 1,000 bugs. Soon after this case, DDT was banned in Michigan.[32]

THE PROS AND CONS

Since there are two types of pesticides, we naturally have groups in favor of the increased use of each. Some agriculturalists and many industrialists favor the use of the persistent pesticides. The conservationists and other groups favor the use of the non-persistent pesticides.

The defenders of the persistent pesticides point to their low cost and their effectiveness in the three decades that they have been at work. They also point out that there is no documented proof that the persistent pesticides have caused a human death. They also bring out that the persistent pesticides are not really persistent, but are slowly destroyed in the soil.

The defenders of the non-persistent pesticides point out that the chlorinated hydrocarbons are volatile and can be carried far from the point of application.

Though each group would like to see stricter control on the use of pesticides, neither would like to see them banned altogether. Through the use of pesticides millions of lives have been saved through increased crop production. The quality of crops has improved, and in some cases the quantity has doubled. If there were a complete ban on pesticides, prices would rise, and an inadequacy of some foodstuffs would result.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PESTICIDE LEGISLATION

As a group we have studied the problems concerning the use of pesticides as well as the legislation that has been proposed concerning pesticides. In a number of discussions we considered both the pros and cons of pesticide use, and have made the following unanimous recommendations that we feel would be for the good of the people. These recommendations are as follows:

1. A nationwide ban on the interstate sale and shipment of the persistent pesticides.
2. Strict control on the manufacture and use of the non-persistent pesticides.
3. The application of the non-persistent pesticides should be done only by licensed and fully trained individuals. The training required could be administered by state high schools or colleges. The licensing of the individual would be done by the state.
4. The banning of all aerial application of pesticides. Aerial application does not insure safe application as 50% of the pesticide never reaches the target it is intended for.
5. Greater research in the fields that would develop safer pesticides, but of pesticides that would do the job.
6. Greater efforts to discover natural ways to eliminate unwanted insect pests.
7. Greater efforts to develop better methods of application.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring*, p. 16.
[2] Ibid. p. 18.
[3] Ibid. p. 21.
[4] Ibid. p. 24.
[5] Idem.
[6] Ibid. p. 25.
[7] Ibid. pp. 26–27.
[8] Ibid. pp. 22–23.
[9] Philip H. Abelson, *Persistent Pesticides, Science*, May 9, 1969, p. 164.
[10] Op. cit. p. 28.
[11] Idem.
[12] Ibid. p. 29.
[13] Ibid. p. 30.
[14] Ibid. p. 31.
[15] Ibid. p. 30.
[16] Ibid. p. 106.
[17] Ibid. p. 108.
[18] Ibid. p. 107.
[19] Ibid. p. 111.
[20] Lucille F. Stickel, *Organochlorine Pesticides in the Environment*, p. 2.
[21] W. L. Reichel, T. G. Lamont, E. Cromartie, and L. N. Locke, *Residues in two bald eagles suspected of pesticide poisoning*, (summary).
[22] Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring*, p. 131.
[23] Lucille F. Stickel, *Organochlorine Pesticides in the Environment*, p. 2.
[24] Ibid.
[25] *Science News Letter*, September 11, 1965, p. 169.
[26] C. F. Wusrter and D. B. Wingate, DDT Residues and the Declining Reproduction in the Bermuda Petrel, *Science*, March 1, 1968, p. 679.
[27] Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring*.
[28] "Pesticide Pollution Control," H. Page Nicholson, *Science*, Nov. 17, 1967.
[29] "State of Illinois: Food, Drug, Cosmetic, and Pesticide Laws Study Commission," Report to Legislature, Jan. 6, 1969.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Congressional Records (Dates unknown), U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
[32] "Pesticide Pollution Control," H. Page Nicholson, *Science*, November 17, 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston (1962).

Stickel, Lucille F. *Organochlorine Pesticides in the Environment*. U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington D.C. (1968).

Magazines

"DDT Residues and the Declining Reproduction in the Bermuda Petrel," *Science*, March 1, 1968.

"Enforcing Insecticide Content Water Quality Standards," *Science*, March 8, 1968.

"High DDT Levels Found in Midwest Fish and Birds," Science News Letter, Sept. 11, 1965.

"New Pesticide Rules," The New Republic, April 23, 1966.

"Persistent Pesticides," Philip H. Abelson, *Science*, May 9, 1969.

"Pesticide Pollution Control, H. Page Nicholson, *Science*, November 17, 1967.

"Taking Polluters to Court," Frank Grahm Jr., *The New Republic*, January 31, 1968.

Pamphlets

"Monitoring Wildlife for Pesticide Content," E. H. Dustman. Reprinted from *Scientific Aspects of Pest Control*, publication No. 1402. Washington, D.C., 1966.

"Pesticide Official Publication and Condensed Data on Pesticide Chemicals," Association of American Pesticide Control Officials, 1955.

Residues in Two Bald Eagles Suspected of Pesticide Poisoning, W. L. Reichel, T. G. Lamont, E. Cromartie, and L. N. Locke. Patuxent Wildlife Research Center.

State of Illinois: Food, Drug, Cosmetic,

and Pesticide Laws Study Commission, Report to legislature, January 6, 1969.

Congressional Records, House and Senate, U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

Inflation, Interest Rates and the Metropolitan Area

(By Jim Bever, Frank Burnett, Carol Curtis, Steve Holliday, Mike McCord, Alan Shaffer, Belinda Shostak, Lyn Utrecht)

Introduction

According to Treasury Secretary Kennedy, "Interest in the price paid by a borrower for the advantage of using a fixed sum of money at one time and repaying the same fixed sum at a future date."

In many sectors of the country, the feeling is that the steep upward climb of interest rates is a result of inflation. Interest rates have been found to be closely proportional to inflation. Therefore, an examination of inflation is necessary to provide an understanding of interest rates.

Inflation in the 1960's

In the early 1960's, President Kennedy encouraged citizens to start spending because the nation was pulling out of a recession and a "shot in the arm" was needed in the economy. During the period 1960–64, the U.S. experienced an era of 1–1½% rise in the cost of living, and interest rates on loans wavered between 4–4½%. This shows that the supply of goods and services was almost able to keep up with the demand, due to moderate price and wage controls by big business and big labor. In 1965 the U.S. entered full-swing into the Vietnam War.

By 1966 the economy of the nation could be reflected by an article in the March 14, 1966 issue of U.S. News & World Report: "Prices will be under upward pressure. Runaway inflation is not to be expected. Productive capacity of this country is great and expanding . . . The boom is business now goes into its sixth year, and still shows no sign of running out of steam anytime soon. No previous boom in peacetime has ever lasted so long, or produced such an upsurge in business activity and general prosperity." However, with the increased government spending for war production and defense, and with continued expansion of domestic production, came near-full employment and therefore near-full production. The demand for goods and services has continued to grow, despite the maximum production of American business. Since the supply of goods has not been able to meet the demand, prices for goods and services have continued to rise to the present 6% annual inflation of prices, in which interest rates have shot from 4½% to 6% in 1967 to 8½% in July 1969.

Inflation raises interest rates

As a result of expected continued inflation, the trend in business has been to invest rather than to save. Since 1966 financial institutions like Banks and Savings and Loans corporations have noticed a slack in savings due to better returns for investors from stocks and from tax-free government bonds. Some patrons of these financial institutions have reduced their deposits for savings and instead have raised the demand for loans for investment purposes.

Low reserves from reduced savings and high demand for loans has caused banks to restrict credit and to attempt to improve their income on loans by raising their interest rates. Other factors contributing to high interest rates are:

1. The Federal Reserve Board's "tight credit" monetary policy on member banks to fight inflation by raising the required ratio of reserves to liabilities. This action reduces the amount of money that the member banks may loan, and with the high demand for credit, interest rates rise. Thus, money is harder for borrowers to obtain, and the supply of money is reduced, a significant factor in reducing inflation.

2. The prime lending rate offered the best patrons of the U.S.'s leading banks has recently increased from 7½% to 8½%. This rate must increase with the large banks' efforts to compete with the dividends offered depositors by government securities and commercial paper, and the cost of reserves borrowed from other banks or Europe. The prime rate is a base from which all other rates on loans for less "influential" patrons climb higher.

3. Efforts of the financial institution to maintain a constant margin of profit in light of real or imagined inflation, which reduces the value of assets. According to Treasury Secretary Kennedy, "When there is an expectation of stable prices, the interest rate reflects a normal return on capital and a risk adjustment based on the borrower's credit-worthiness. But when the expectation of unabated inflation is widespread the unprotected lender must charge—and the borrower is willing to pay—a premium to compensate for the decline in purchasing power of the funds to be repaid."

General effects of high interest rates on the economy

Interest rates play a large part in the cost of living. All business firms borrow to conduct their operations—some more than others. These include firms at every stage of production. The high interest rates have led to a protracted increase of $11 billion (from $36 to $47 billion) of nonfinancial business borrowing in credit markets for 1969, according to the Federal Reserve Board flow of funds data. This increased price of borrowing by business means higher costs of final product, which the consumer must pay, or output cannot be sustained. Thus, interest rates can contribute to inflation, or can contribute to recession.

Now that the Government is restricting money and credit, and interest rates get higher, firms find loans more difficult to obtain and production declines. Further, when production falls, firms which produce machinery or build factories find their orders slumping and lay off workers while cutting their own orders for goods. The economy pays for high interest in terms of incomes not earned and in output not produced. However, according to the Full Employment Act of 1946, underemployment should not exceed 4%, which is characteristic of recession unemployment.

With reduced investment, business is not able to take advantage of new efficient equipment and industry slows down the total output capacity of the country's factories. Thus production suffers and the rate of growth of output slackens when high interest prevails.

Specific effects of high interest rates on District of Columbia and Maryland

According to Wright Patman, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, in the *Congressional Record—Extension of Remarks,* July 15, 1969,[1] ". . . the small businessman, the farmer, the student and the housewife, not the big businessman . . . must bear the brunt of the Federal Reserve Board's Chairman William McChesney Martin's 'pain and suffering' because of current high level of interest rates."

None of the 50 states or D.C. is autonomous. They are all affected by policies of big banks in New York, the Federal Reserve Board and the situation of the national economy. All must compete with surrounding states for economic development and income. Certainly this entails competition for investment, business expansion and consumer business, which are all affected by the various interest rates on loans, which can be seen in the present ceiling rates for Maryland, D.C., and Virginia.

District of Columbia

Six percent—This is the general rate of interest in the absence of an express written contract. If there is a written agreement lender may charge up to 8%. Corporate borrowings are not subject to the usury statutes.

Statute cite: Dist. of Col. Code (1961) 28–3301, 3302, 3303, 3304, 3305, 29–904(h).

Maryland

Six percent—This is the general rate of interest; however, if there is an agreement in writing and the agreement sets forth the annual rate charge stated as a percentage and is contained in a separate instrument from the contract of indebtedness, 8% is permitted. In addition a borrower may be charged 12% interest on unsecured installment loans. The usury statute does not apply to business loans over $5000.

Statute cite: Ann. Code of Md. (1957) Art. 47–1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, Art. 23–125.

Virginia

Six percent—This is the general rate of interest; however, a borrower or a lender may contract for up to 8% interest. Corporate borrowers are not subject to the usury statutes.

Statute cite: Code of Va. (1950) 6.1–318, 319, 326, 327.

Enclosed also is a list of annual interest rates derived from a small sampling of metropolitan financial institutions. The comparative rates in this table help to explain the reasoning behind the specific effects of inflation and high rates on D.C., Md., and Va.

Two observations should be specifically mentioned:

1. Loan companies offering personal signature loans for D.C. are nonexistent because they must comply with low D.C. usury statutes.

2. Virginia Savings and Loans institutions have highest mortgage loans because of additional fees. This encourages some sparse lending for housing, which is more than any other financial institution in the metropolitan area is able to do.

Mortgage loans

D.C. banks—8% simple (present decline in loans).

Md. banks—8% simple (no more loans available).

Va. banks—8% simple (no more loans available).

D.C. Savings & Loans—8% (no more loans available).

Md. Savings & Loans—7¾%–8% (few loans available).

Va. Savings & Loans—8% and 1% fee (June sales up $500,000).

Personal signature loans ($1000 for 2 mths)

D.C. banks—8% simple.

Md. banks—12% simple.

Va. banks—12% simple and suggested 2% insurance.

D.C. Loan comp.—nonexistent.

Md. Loan comp.—15.75% excluding fees and insurance.

Va. Loan comp.—23.67%—includes cost of fees, etc.

Auto loans on new cars

D.C. banks—10% simple.

Md. banks—9½% simple.

Va. banks—9% and 2% insurance.

Charge accounts

D.C. institutions—18% simple.

Md. institutions—18% simple.

Va. institutions—18% simple.

As can be seen from these figures, the general consumer and small business interest rates in the metropolitan areas are all identically high. However, it should be considered that the majority of consumer activity is where most of the more affluent population is in the suburbs. Census Bureau figures in-

[1] Pg. 3, Primer on Money, Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, Committee on Banking and Finance, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2nd Session.

dicated that all of the 12% gain in retail sales for January to May 1969 was registered in the suburbs, while the department store sales for D.C. went down 1% for the same period. High rates of interest in D.C., coupled with declining sales, have resulted in 22 business failures in D.C. in the period January–June 1969, which is quite an increase compared with the same period last year, which registered 5 business failures.

It seems, however, that most retail stores have been able to hold their own with continued inflation, because the Washington Metropolitan Area has such a high per capita income. The Bureau of Labor Statistics consumer price index indicated a .3% rise for June 1969 in cost of clothing, yet out of seven clothing stores contacted in D.C. and seven in Md., the general feeling is that sales are up in both locations. The same is true for appliance stores in D.C. and Md., although there seems to be an increase in the use of lay-away plans for larger appliances like freezers, ovens, etc. Furniture stores in both D.C. and Md. claim that high interest rates on loans for furniture has had no marked effect on their volume of sales. This applies to both the local D.C. furniture company and the larger Metropolitan branches.

New car sales by Ford, GM, and Chrysler have declined by 36,527 units over the nation during mid-July as compared with the same period a year ago. This is partly due to restricted expansion of factories and less output (i.e.—a new factory being built for Chrysler outside of Pittsburgh, recently halted construction due to Chrysler's difficulty to borrow funds to finish the plant.) Truck sales by GM were also down, partly because of the tendency of companies to make better use of older equipment. Despite these national conditions, three auto companies in D.C. and three in Md. say that high interest rates on auto loans have not affected sales. The auto companies felt that there were enough credit-worthy customers receiving loans to keep sales up. The Bureau of Labor Statistics said that food prices in the Washington area rose 0.6% in June to 129.1% of the 1957–59 average. Small private groceries in D.C. reported that this has caused no marked change in the volume of sales. This could be attributed to the feeling that food prices in D.C. are abnormally high anyway and purchasing power is low. But in the suburbs food stores complained about lower sales on meat, fish, and poultry, especially due to higher prices. The high price of food is caused by higher cost for farm machinery and a .5% rise in the cost of transportation of freight, both of which are results of high interest rates.

The one market that seems to be in the most dire of situations is real estate and housing. Federal Housing Administration and Veterans Administration reserves are empty and the banks in D.C. and Md. have restricted new mortgages because investments in government securities and commercial paper are better and more secure.

High interest rates on mortgage loans by savings and loan associations are caused by the lack of investors due to the better and safer dividends on government securities. This, as has been mentioned before, results in lower reserves and higher interest rates. Many of the ten real estate agents contacted in Md. and the eight contacted in D.C. have stopped sales completely. One agent was forced to close down his business office and work out of his home in order to keep out of the red. Only some real estate agencies in Virginia have been able to maintain sales. Due to a liberal interest rate ceiling in WVa. more money is kept in the state because it is attractive to the lender. Thus, the financial institutions are able to lend more money for real estate and housing.

FEDERAL ACTION TO CONTROL INFLATION

Where will inflation end? As Treasury Secretary Kennedy says "Any backing away now from our policy of restraint—any reduction in tax rates while prices are climbing at a rate of 6% per year—is simply an invitation to more and more inflation, and, ultimately, a severe and painful economic adjustment."

D.C., Md., and Va. as has been mentioned before, are not autonomous units. Thus a slowdown in the national economy to reduce inflation will also reduce inflation in the Metropolitan area.

1. Monetary policy—includes Federal Reserve Board's attempts to reduce credit availability or money supply for borrowers. Banks' reserves are limited then and the amounts of loans are decreased. This also includes rationing of credit by large banks. At the July 7, 1969 meeting between big banks and Treasury Secretary Kennedy, Kennedy said that he stressed the importance, at a time when there is not enough credit to go around, of making sure that there was some credit availability for residential construction, state and local governments, and smaller borrowers. Some of the banks reported that they were leaving the smaller loans to the lending officers and requiring top-level review only on larger loans.

2. Fiscal policy—this would reduce the demand by consumers for credit and would force banks to lower high interest rates created by "tight credit" monetary policy. To accomplish this the first step is to continue the surcharge. The 10% surtax not only reduces the amount of money in circulation, but also helps to reduce the government's national debt. The second step is to decrease government spending, which also decreases money in circulation. Both, in turn, help to reduce the need for government borrowing. This allows more consumers to deposit in such institutions as savings and loan associations. In this case, with more reserves, Savings and Loan Associations can afford to make more loans, which also helps the real estate and housing market.

Both the present monetary policy and the proposed fiscal policy should reduce our inflation from 6% to 3% or 4% by the end of 1969, according to the Council of Economic Advisors.

Suggested reforms

1. Make Social Security payments equal to Welfare payments until interest rates and inflation drop. This would be but a drop in the bucket of government spending and would make life much more comfortable for elderly citizens who are the hardest hit by inflation.

2. Administration should wage a vigorous campaign to encourage consumers to save in private financial institutions instead of investing, and simultaneously encourage lending institutions to ration and restrict credit by reducing lending. This could be done by increasing the ratio of deposits to loans. One way to encourage savings in private financial institutions is to reduce dividends on government bonds. Banks would not have to offer such high deposit dividends in order to compete and could maintain good income on increased amounts of loans without raising interest rates, and still maintain boundaries of the ratio. Careful supervision would be necessary to avoid violation of antitrust laws.

3. Follow Federal Action to control inflation as previously mentioned, such as a surcharge.

4. Last, but not least, defense spending should be cut. Withdraw from the Vietnam conflict gradually and create markets and expansion of industry for returning men.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Extension of temporary interest rate controls, Hearings before Committee on Banking and Currency—House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 1st Session, on H.R. 12754, Sept. 14, 15, 1967.

Money Facts, Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, House Committee on Banking and Currency, 88th Congress, 2d Session, Sept. 21, 1964.

A Primer on Money, House Committee on Banking and Finance.

What you Ought To Know About Federal Reserve Regulations, Truth in Lending.

Federal Reserve Statistical Release on consumer credit, May 1969.

Tomorrow, U.S. News and World Report, Volume LX–No. 11, pp. 27, 28.

"Bankers Stress Credit Rationing", N.Y. Times, P. 13, July 8, 1968.

Statements of Hon. David Kennedy—Press Conference July 16, 1969 and before House Banking and Currency Committee on Interest Rates, June 19, 1969.

"High Interest Rates" and "Pain and Suffering", Wright Patman, Congressional Record, July 15, 1969.

Consumer Credit Protection Act, H.R. 11601, Hearings Aug. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 1967, before Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Banking and Currency Committee, 90th Congress, 1st Session.

Bert Cox, Council of Economic Advisors.

Governor Maisel, Federal Reserve Board.

Undersecretary of Commerce Rocco Siciliano.

Edgar Smith, Assistant Vice-President, American National Bank.

John Stone, Dept. of Chief of Consumer Credit.

J. T. Watson, Deputy Comptroller of Currency.

Assistant Secretary Wheatonbaum, Treasury Dept.

COMMISSION ON CAMPAIGN COSTS IN THE ELECTRONIC ERA

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 30, the Twentieth Century Fund's Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era issued its report suggesting an entirely new form of nationwide television and radio broadcasts for presidential candidates. I feel it important that all Members have the opportunity to read this report and include, under the unanimous-consent request, a news release relating to the report, biographical sketches of the members of the Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era and the report of the Commission:

COMMISSION ON CAMPAIGN COSTS IN THE ELECTRONIC ERA

The Twentieth Century Fund's independent Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era today called on the federal government to create an entirely new form of nationwide television and radio campaign broadcasts for presidential candidates.

These programs, to be called "Voters' Time," would be available to presidential candidates and would be presented in prime evening time simultaneously over every broadcast and community antenna facility in the United States during the 35 days before the election.

Unlike present political broadcasts, which are paid for by candidates, "Voters' Time" would be purchased by the federal government at half rates and thus, according to the Commission, would belong to the public.

In a unanimous report entitled "Voters' Time," the Commission presented a series of other urgent recommendations designed to help relieve the financial pressures of campaigning, to promote more rational political discussion and to stimulate greater public interest and participation in politics. The Commission stated that "access of voters to a candidate should not depend exclusively on his ability to raise campaign funds."

The Commission, a wholly independent bipartisan body established by the Fund in May 1968, had five members: Newton N. Minow (Commission chairman), former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and now a Chicago lawyer; Dean Burch, President Nixon's nominee for FCC chairman and former chairman of the Republican National Committee; Thomas G. Corcoran, a member of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Brain Trust" and now a Washington lawyer; Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University and an acknowledged authority on campaign financing; and Robert Price, former deputy mayor of New York in the Lindsay administration and now an investment banker. Director of the Commission's staff was Richard D. Heffner, communications consultant and University Professor of Communications and Public Policy at Rutgers—the State University of New Jersey.

M. J. Rossant, the Fund's director, said that the Fund created the Commission "because skyrocketing costs of broadcasting pose serious problems for political candidates and for the democratic process." He noted that total broadcasting charges for presidential and vice presidential candidates in general elections had risen from $4.6 million in 1956 to $11 million in 1964 and $20.4 million last year, with increased use of television the major factor in this escalation.

The Commission report urged adoption of proposed "Voters' Time" programs as a way of guaranteeing basic access to the broadcast media. The programs may also reduce campaign costs, thus easing the burden on presidential candidates who may lack personal wealth or access to sizable sources of financial support.

In seeking to guarantee access to presidential candidates, the Commission distinguished between major and minor parties.

Six 30-minute broadcasts would be allotted to candidates of major parties which had placed first or second in two of the three preceding elections, according to the Commission proposal.

Candidates of parties on the ballot in three quarters of the states accounting for a majority of electoral votes, which had won one eighth of the votes in the preceding election, would receive two 30-minute program slots. And the candidate of a party meeting the three-quarters rule but not having obtained sufficient votes previously would be allowed one broadcast.

The Commission believes that these proposed allocations of broadcast time would promote and preserve the two-party system, although not necessarily the present two parties. The proposal, in effect, would allow for reform of the present political system without completely transforming it, because it would allow for the development of a new major party.

All programs on "Voters' Time" would be broadcast in the final 35 days of the campaign, but could not be bunched together. The Commission report says that by concentrating the broadcasts in this period, a new impetus to shorter presidential campaigns would be provided.

A key feature of the Commission's plan is that "Voters' Time" programs would be viewed and heard simultaneously, which would mean that every station would have to carry them.

The report acknowledges that some might feel that simultaneous transmission would be an infringement on freedom of choice and speech, but the Commission holds that "the overriding importance" of choosing a president far outweighs these considerations.

The Commission sets down conditions for the "Voters' Time" programs, suggesting that they "utilize formats that substantially involve the live appearance of the candidates for President and Vice President and are designed to promote rational political discussion for the purpose of clarifying major campaign issues or developing insight into the abilities and personal qualities of the candidates."

The adoption of the Commission's proposals would require the amendment of the equal time provisions of the 1934 Communications Act. The Commission asks that they be suspended initially for the 1972 presidential elections, as they were in 1960. It believes that these steps would encourage debates between the leading candidates and, along with "Voters' Time," provide for a much more informed electorate.

The federal government would pay for "Voters' Time," according to the Commission proposal, but would be charged by broadcasters only half the normal rate. The Commission holds that the voters—through the federal government—should pay, but that the broadcasters should receive less than their usual income to insure that they do not make a profit from the broadcasts.

The estimated cost of a single half-hour broadcast is $265,000. The Commission calculated that the total cost, based on charges prevailing during the 1968 presidential election, would be about $4 million or less than $1 million at an annual rate.

Candidates for the House of Representatives and Senate should also pay only half the normal rate for their own telecasts and broadcasts, the report says. The Commission suggests that broadcasters be allowed a deduction on their federal taxes for the amount of the discounts to Congressional candidates.

The Commission believes that by allocating free or subsidized time to candidates for federal office, those seeking public office will have less recourse to high-cost programs sponsored by their parties. It expects that, following the adoption of its proposals, these paid political broadcasts would decrease, thus reducing total campaign costs. This shift would benefit candidates not having significant resources at their disposal.

As a further method of reducing the high cost of political campaigning and in order to encourage voter participation, the Commission also proposes that taxpayers receive a federal income tax relief for their campaign contributions. They could take either a credit up to $25 ($50 on a joint return) equal to one half the amount of their contributions to legally qualified candidates in general elections for federal office or a deduction from their total taxable income for their contributions up to $100.

The Commission proposes that the Comptroller General of the United States be responsible for administration of the "Voters' Time" programs. The Comptroller is appointed for a 15-year term and is responsible to Congress, not the executive branch. As a result, the Commission believes that he would be an effective and independent administrator of the arrangements.

The Commission's report is available from the Twentieth Century Fund, 41 East 70 Street, New York, N.Y. 10021, at $1 a copy.

TWENTIETH CENTURY FUND, COMMISSION ON CAMPAIGN COSTS IN THE ELECTRONIC ERA

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Newton N. Minow—was Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission from 1961 to 1963. A graduate of the Northwestern University Law School, he was law clerk to Chief Justice Fred Vinson, was Administrative Assistant to Governor Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois in 1952–53 and a partner in his law firm from 1955 to 1961. Mr. Minow assisted Mr. Stevenson in the presidential campaigns of 1952 and 1956. He was also active in the campaigns of John F. Kennedy and Hubert H. Humphrey.

While head of the FCC, Mr. Minow became known as a severe critic of the programming practices of the television networks, which he characterized as a "wasteland." He has written a book, *Equal Time: The Private Broadcaster and The Public Interest* (1964), and contributed to another, *As We Knew Adlai* (1966). He is now a senior partner in the law firm of Leibman, Williams, Bennett, Baird & Minow in Chicago and is Chairman of WTTW, Chicago's educational television station, and a Director of National Educational Television. He is 43 years old and lives in Glencoe, Illinois.

Dean Burch—is President Nixon's nominee as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Former chairman (1964–65) of the Republican National Committee, he was active in Senator Barry Goldwater's bid for the presidency in 1964. In that role he helped devise a fund-raising strategy that drew millions of dollars in small contributions, avoiding the reliance on a few large contributors, a situation criticized in the current Commission's report. In 1968 he managed Mr. Goldwater's successful campaign for the U.S. Senate.

A native of Enid, Oklahoma, Mr. Burch received his law degree from the University of Arizona in 1953. After two years as assistant attorney general in Arizona he joined Senator Goldwater's staff, leaving in 1959 for the law firm of Dunseath, Stubbs & Burch in Tucson. Mr. Burch is 41 years old and lives in Tucson.

Thomas Gardiner Corcoran—a key aide of Franklin D. Roosevelt in New Deal days, he is an experienced political adviser through service in many campaigns. Mr. Corcoran was a student of Felix Frankfurter's at Harvard Law School and joined the staff of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the administration of Herbert Hoover. Under President Roosevelt he was entrusted, along with Benjamin V. Cohen, with the task of drafting key legislation, including the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and pushing it through Congress.

After John F. Kennedy won the Democratic nomination for President in 1960, Mr. Corcoran played a key role in persuading then Senator Lyndon Johnson and his fellow Texan, House Speaker Sam Rayburn who advised him, to accept the nomination as Vice President. When Mr. Johnson assumed the Presidency Mr. Corcoran was known as an informal adviser to the President.

Mr. Corcoran is 68 years old and continues his law practice in the Washington firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe.

Alexander Heard—Chancellor of Vanderbilt University in Nashville, where he earned his Ph.D. in political science in 1951. He has long been known as one of the leading academic authorities on problems of campaign finance, and his book *The Costs of Democracy* (1960) was a primary source of data for the present Commission's report.

Dr. Heard joined the Vanderbilt faculty in 1950. In 1956 and 1957 he was a consultant to the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, and in 1961 President Kennedy named him Chairman of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. Its report, *Financing Presidential Campaigns*, was published the next year. Dr. Heard was also coauthor of *Southern Primaries and Elections, 1950: A Two-Party South?*, 1952 and has written numerous articles. He is 52 years old.

Robert Price—was Deputy Mayor under John V. Lindsay, the youngest man in the history of New York to hold the office. He was manager of the Lindsay mayoralty campaign and of his earlier Congressional campaigns. A lecturer on political strategy for the Republican National Committee, Mr. Price also has participated in numerous campaigns across the nation and managed Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller's successful primary campaign for Oregon's delegates to the Republican National Convention in 1964. He was delegate to the Republican Convention 1962–66.

A 1958 graduate of Columbia University

Law School, Mr. Price served as an assistant United States district attorney before forming a law firm in 1960 with Theodore R. Kupferman.

In 1966 Mr. Price returned to private life, subsequently becoming Executive Vice President of the Dreyfus Corporation (manager of the Dreyfus Mutual Fund). He is now an investment adviser and President of the Price Capital Corporation, a closed end investment trust. He has owned several radio stations, including WTSA, Brattleboro, Vermont; WLOB, Portland, Maine; and WNVY, Pensacola, Florida. He is 37 years old and lives in New York.

VOTERS' TIME—REPORT OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY FUND COMMISSION ON CAMPAIGN COSTS IN THE ELECTRONIC ERA

1. PERSPECTIVE

The sharply rising use of television and radio broadcasting by presidential candidates in the United States poses serious problems that affect politicians, the parties, the voters, and the very fabric of our democratic process.

This Commission has examined these problems from many viewpoints. But our major concern has been to determine whether the American voter is well served by the present arrangements for political campaigning. We have concluded that there is a need for change, mainly because of the changes that have been—and are being—brought about by evolving technology. The airwaves, especially those used for television, now play a dominant role in campaigning. They are a public resource, and the public is entitled to get the best from them. It is our contention that the public has not always gotten the best in political campaign broadcasting.

There is no single cause for this unsatisfactory state of affairs. Rather, it is attributable to a series of interrelated problems involving politics, money, and the nature of the broadcasting industry.

One basic question concerns the impact and effectiveness of the broadcast media, particularly television. Despite considerable research by academicians, commercial specialists, and the Commission's own staff, we have no accurate measure of the effect of broadcasting on society in general or of the impact of political broadcasting on voters. Yet most informed people believe that the impact is profound, and there is no question that political strategists and political candidates increasingly mold their campaigns around the use of television.

But campaign broadcasting is very expensive. Its costs may not seem high compared to the enormous sums spent by producers of cigarettes, soap, or automobiles. But to the candidates and the parties they are very high. And they are increasing.

Thus the problem of campaign costs has to be examined. After nearly two decades of only gradual rise in the cost per vote cast, the amount of money spent per voter has climbed steeply in the last three presidential elections. Greater use of the media, particularly television, has been the largest single factor in this increase.

Higher costs have thrust a heavier burden on political fund raisers. With few exceptions, modern campaigns have relied heavily on rich contributors. This reliance on relatively large contributions from a relatively small number of donors has inevitably raised questions concerning the obligations a presidential candidate may incur toward his sources of financial support. This question is also pertinent for candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, whose financial sources are even narrower.

The problem, clearly, is not so much that costs are getting out of hand—although they are rising steeply—as that the means of funding them are so limited and so suspect.

The questions do not stop there. Even if adequate financing is available, this Commission has sought to determine whether the public interest is well served by the way in which candidates spend their funds on broadcasting.

Specifically, does a series of short "spot" announcements contribute as much to the voters' knowledge of the issues and of the candidates as longer programs where issues are discussed and candidates are exposed to view? The answer is almost certainly no. Yet the ratio of "spots" to longer programs is increasing, partly because campaign managers have found that short messages usually reach more viewers at less cost, partly because they are convinced that "spots" are more compelling.

This Commission believes that the importance of television and radio in our society and their significance for presidential campaigns must be recognized. We believe that the electorate should have the opportunity to see and hear all significant candidates so that it can better judge their positions and their personal qualities. We believe that this access of voters to a candidate should not depend exclusively on his ability to raise campaign funds.

The Commission therefore proposes that *each significant presidential candidate and his running mate be given broadcast time simultaneously on all television and radio stations in the United States.* We call this provision *Voters' Time.* The stations would be compensated by the federal government, though not at full commercial rates. Candidates of major parties would receive more time than those of minor parties. Provision would be made for the rise of important new political forces, but minor parties would have to demonstrate meaningful support to qualify for Voters' Time.

The only requirements for the use of Voters' Time would be that *the programs promote rational political discussion and substantially involve live appearance by the candidates.* Candidates would remain free to buy additional broadcasts, but we expect—and hope—that the volume of such purchases would not be great. Voters' Time should bring a marked improvement in the quality of campaigning—and a check to the sharp increase in presidential campaign expenses.

Enactment of Voters' Time by Congress would require a change in the equal-time provision of the Communications Act of 1934. The Commission further recommends that the *equal time provision be suspended entirely for the presidential election campaign of 1972.*

To widen popular participation in the financing of campaigns, we propose that *taxpayers receive either a tax credit or an income deduction for campaign contributions to legally qualified candidates for federal office on their federal income tax returns.* We hope that this option would reduce the heavy dependence on a few large contributors. It should also encourage a broader sense of participation in the electoral process and help to diminish public cynicism about the integrity of candidates and their parties.

Ultimately, we would also like to see candidates for the United States Senate and House of Representatives provided with Voters' Time; immediately, we propose that *candidates for national legislative offices be encouraged to use the electronic media by requiring broadcasters to give them a major discount and allowing the broadcasters to deduct the dollar volume of such discounts from their taxable income on their federal tax returns.*

We believe that these reforms are urgent and necessary to strengthen our democratic process. Discontent with the way in which we elect our political leaders is not new; there have been many periods in the past when contempt and cynicism about our political leaders and parties were more prevalent—and had more basis—than they do now.

Nevertheless, our examination has led us to conclude that it is vital to raise the level of political discourse and broaden the base of political participation at a time when rapidly evolving technological change seems to have produced the opposite effects.

2. THE PROBLEM

Every four years American citizens make a momentous choice: Who is to be President of the United States? Perhaps no more important public act occurs in this nation than the motion of the hand that marks the X on a presidential ballot or pulls the lever on a voting machine. For on the decision of the American electorate hangs the fate of millions at home and abroad. That decision, indeed, may answer the very question of war or peace, of human survival.

What influences the voter in making his choice?[1]

Many things. Party loyalty. Family tradition. A candidate's record. The record of the incumbent administration—national prosperity or depression. Outside events in mid-campaign—the sudden outbreak of war (or peace), the fall of a foreign government. The opinion of others—his union shop steward, his closest friend, his fellow commuter. Columnists and commentators, political reporters and editorial writers. Precinct captains, volunteer workers. Billboards. Newspaper advertising. And campaign broadcasting.

No one knows just how important television and radio are in determining the outcome of an election.[2] A voting decision is the result of so many influences that it is all but impossible to isolate one, such as electronic campaigning, from the others.

The use of television in presidential campaigns is only seventeen years old. It may be many more years before we know what it is doing to politics, or to society. We may never know.

Nevertheless, the power of political broadcasting is assumed by large number of politicians and broadcasters alike. According to some political scientists and sociologists, a sizable number of people felt that the 1960 television-radio debates between John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon helped them to make up their minds. And certainly at the time there was widespread public sentiment, reflected in the studies, that Kennedy "won" these confrontations by showing that he was a match for his older, more experienced opponent. These facts taken together have led many people to suspect that the debates gave Kennedy his slim margin of victory.[3]

Other researchers, including some studying the same evidence, have held that broadcasting has only a reinforcement effect on many people already committed to one candidate or the other. Others have adopted the term "cumulative effect" to suggest that people are influenced by the images they receive from the broadcast media, especially television, over long periods of time. They contend that the impressions that enter into a voting decision are gradually built up through the years and that broadcasting plays a large part in shaping this political imagery.[4]

All agree that the media that take a candidate's voice and individual traits into a voter's home make his message powerfully personal and are bound to have an effect at the ballot box.

The broadcast media

Since its development in the late 1940's television has become the most accepted medium of mass communications in the United States. Ninety-five per cent of all American homes have television sets—more than have bathtubs or telephones. In 1969, television sets are expected to outnumber passenger cars.

Footnotes at end of article.

The average American home has a television set turned on for more than five and a half hours each day, and American adults spend more time watching television than they do in any other single activity except working and sleeping.[5]

The British critic Malcolm Muggeridge asserts that "of all the so-called wonders of our time, television may well be the most momentous. Nothing since the invention of printing has so drastically affected the way human beings live, think and generally react to their circumstances." [6]

And the political consequences may be as great as the cultural and commercial consequences. For a decade, Roper Research Associates have periodically asked people to identify their major source of news about national candidates for public office (Table 1). Of those surveyed in the 1968 poll, 65 per cent named television, but only 24 per cent named newspapers, 4 per cent radio, and 5 per cent magazines. In 1963, television had replaced newspapers as the chief source of all news; by 1968, 59 per cent of the people surveyed claimed to get most of their general news from television. When asked which source they were most likely to believe, more than twice as many people mentioned television as newspapers in 1968. And according to a 1969 Harris poll, nine out of ten Americans regularly watch television news programs.

Radio, too, is a major news medium, estimated to reach 98 per cent of all American homes. According to the Roper surveys for the last ten years, between a fourth and a third of the population have gotten most of their general news from radio. Although only 4 to 8 per cent of those surveyed in 1968 rated it as a major source of political news, radio is certainly the most mobile and ubiquitous of our modern communications media. It reaches more than 75 per cent of Americans 12 years of age and over every day. In the last decade it has become a prime communications medium for young people.[7]

Broadcasting and politics

These facts about broadcast media had enormous significance for a candidate in the 1968 presidential campaign because, almost alone among aspirants for high political office throughout the world, he could "buy" time on the air.*[8]

With a single message lasting one minute, presented within one program, on one television network, he could reach as many as 23 million viewers of voting age—a number equal to almost a third of the votes cast in the 1968 election.[9] With the most intensive old-fashioned whistle-stop campaign, a candidate could have reached only a small fraction of that audience.

Politicians believe, even without scientific proof, that the broadcast media provide the best way in certain campaigns to get their messages to the people.[10] Consequently, broadcasting has had an enormous influence on our political affairs. Television, particularly, makes political life more fluid and more volatile. It affects the tempo of campaigning. Adroit candidates—or their staffs—plan morning events that will gain free coverage in the evening newscasts. In fact, campaign strategists devote a great deal of effort and ingenuity to getting free television coverage for their candidates. It has put a stronger emphasis on the personality and appearance of candidates. It has helped to nationalize political life. The sum is a revolution in political campaigning.

A telling measure of the importance of both television and radio for many candidates is the rise in political broadcasting expenditures since the 1956 presidential campaign, when a basis for comparison became available (Tables 2 and 3). In 1956, total broadcasting charges for presidential and vice presidential candidates in general election campaigns were $4.6 million. They were $11 million in 1964 and rose to $20.4 million in 1968. Thus they quadrupled in twelve years.

When professional politicians say, as many do, that broadcast campaigning is decisive in a presidential race, they mean it. Some would go so far as to predict that before long presidential campaigning will be done almost entirely by television and radio. This Commission does not go so far; there may be less here than meets the eye. But the fact that many politicians believe that broadcasting is of major importance tends to make it so. Certainly it has resulted in an impressive increase in the use of the broadcast media by presidential candidates and their running mates. And this in turn has led to an impressive increase in the total cost of presidential campaigning—which is one of our concerns.

Costs of campaigning

The Citizens' Research Foundation estimates that in 1968 total political spending by all candidates and committees at all levels in the United States reached $300 million. This was 50 per cent higher than the total of $200 million estimated for 1964.

These figures can be considered only rough approximations of total spending.[11] Difficulties in determining campaign costs are formidable. Disclosure of contributions and expenditures as required by federal and many state laws fails to bring together all direct or indirect receipts or expenditures at local, state, and national levels.

By far most political spending occurs below the national level. But analysis of state and local campaign expenditures is hampered by the combination of inadequate statistics and diverse conditions.

It is somewhat easier to estimate general election expenditures of campaigns at the national level since federal law requires that interstate committees file receipt and expenditure reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. But even these figures are incomplete, since the law exempts reporting of campaign spending by any group whose operations are confined to a single state. And these groups are legion.[12] In addition, the national-level party committee figures comprise mostly presidential campaign expenditures but also contain some spending by parties before the presidential candidates are chosen and some for congressional candidates.

Yet, despite this contamination of data and the glaring omissions, the combined national-level party and campaign committee figures give us a reasonable basis for comparison. They are the figures that have been used over the years in studies of presidential campaign spending.

The estimated direct spending of national-level party and campaign committees (Table 4) was $11.6 million in 1952 and rose to $12.9 million in 1956, to $19.9 million in 1960, and to $24.8 million in 1964. In 1968 it reached $44.2 million, a rise of 78 per cent. About a third of this increase at the national level, however, was spent by the campaign of George C. Wallace.[13]

Television costs

Television has contributed greatly to the growth in presidential campaign expenditures.

Television is ideally suited to reaching a national constituency, and presidential candidates have regularly accounted for a high percentage of total political spending on television in general election campaigns. Furthermore, the growth in campaign television spending has shown little sign of abating, as some once expected. In 1968, half of all political television costs in the general election period were charged to candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency (Tables 2 and 3).

Further evidence that television has driven up costs of presidential campaigning can be found in the growth of national-level expenditures since 1952, a growth that has gone far beyond past historical patterns.

When television first became a serious tool in political campaigning, it was expected to displace some of the money formerly spent on radio (just as radio has displaced some of the money spent on newspapers) rather than increase costs. But after 1952, when television emerged as a dominant form of communications in presidential campaigns, the estimated cost per vote took a sharp upward turn. From 19 cents in 1952, the cost per vote rose to 29 cents in 1960 and to 35 cents in 1964. In 1968 it jumped to 60 cents.[14]

Many factors contributed to the big 1968 rise. Wallace's campaign alone added about 10 cents per voter. The consumer price index rose 12 per cent between 1964 and 1968. And parties made more use of costly new tools, such as computer technology and jet travel, in 1968. But no single one of these factors seems to have had television's explosive effect on the cost of each vote.

Candidates for public office use broadcasting because it offers unprecedented opportunities to reach the electorate—an electorate that is growing rapidly, growing beyond the power of candidates to reach by other means. Broadcasting requires candidates to raise large sums of money for buying time on the airwaves and for the production of programs using that time.

Problems of financing

Raising money for political campaigns in America has never been easy. Television has exacerbated the problem, for now that the candidate can reach almost all of the people, he wants to do so over and over again. And to do that he must spend heavily.

In the early years of this century, money seemed to be the key to winning elections. In 1904 and 1908 the Republicans spent 75 per cent and 72 per cent of all direct expenditures made by the national committees of both parties, and the Republicans won; in 1912 and 1916 the Democrats outspent them with 51 per cent and 53 per cent, and the Democrats won. Then through the 1920's the Republicans consistently outspent the Democrats, with 75 per cent in 1920 and 1924 and 56 per cent in 1928, and they won consistently. The correlation was very strong, the case seemed proved.

But the correlation was less marked and the case collapsed in the 1930's and 1940's. In 1932 the Democrats spent 49 per cent of the total reported by both national committees, yet won. In 1936 they spent 41 per cent; in 1940, 35 per cent; in 1944, 42 per cent; and in 1948, only 39 per cent—yet they won every time.[15] Money, it appeared, might talk without winning. It is doubtful that Herbert Hoover could have been reelected in 1932 had he spent many times what Franklin D. Roosevelt did. No more would Adlai E. Stevenson have been likely to win in 1952 even if he had commanded far greater resources.

Since 1952, however, big television has meant big money. And while even big television would probably not have turned the tide for Hoover or Stevenson, in a close election in a reasonably prosperous period television may be decisive.

Money may not win elections today, but candidates lacking access to large amounts of money cannot buy broadcasting time and are thus denied full access to the major means of communication in this era. This fact has reinforced the notion that "politics is a rich man's game." True, in 1968 neither Nixon nor Humphrey was a rich man. But their personal finances made no difference. Their parties raised large sums for them, the Republicans much more than the Democrats; and they spent large sums on broadcasting for them, the Republicans much more than the Democrats: $11.5 million and $5.5 million respectively.[16] Without such broadcast ex-

Footnotes at end of article.

penditures, the campaign managers of both parties thought that their candidates had little chance to capture the full attention of the American voter.

To be sure, there are those who are not alarmed by the rise in presidential campaign expenditures, pointing out that even now they are only a small fraction of the sums regularly spent on advertising autos, cigarettes, or soap. But they ignore the possibly degrading effect on candidates of the need to wheedle large contributions from individuals. They also ignore the possibility that a presidential candidate will feel obligated to his campaign's financial benefactors. And they forget that any suspicion that money buys elections and that contributors buy candidates undermines the credibility of our political system.

The popular suspicion that "politics is a rich man's game" adds to public synicism about politics itself. Its prevalence is suggested by such research as a poll conducted by the Louis Harris organization in 1967. More than 60 per cent of those interviewed in the poll expressed the belief that politicians take graft and that very few of them are dedicated public servants.[17] However unfair this judgment may be, it is abetted by the loopholes and violations of the reporting laws and occasional scandals.

Even if an average citizen would like to support his favorite candidate's campaign, the amounts of money required may lead him to conclude that only big business or big labor can foot the bill—a conclusion with its own dividend in cynicism. Possibly as a result, many people tend to avoid financial participation in politics. The percentage of people who give to any campaign is low. It has ranged from 6 to 12 per cent of the adult population since 1956.[18]

Ordinarily, once a candidate is nominated by one of the two major parties he can expect to raise money, somehow. But there are exceptions. Humphrey, in fact, was one. He had great problems in raising money in September 1968, not because he was poor but because, among other things, so many potential contributors judged—along with the polls—that he was a sure loser following the Democratic convention in riot-torn Chicago that was so fully covered on television. The problem is worse for a third-party candidate who is relatively unknown and has no established power base. Thus the forces of politics and the private guesses of contributors often determine whether the American voter has an opportunity to watch all of the presidential candidates on television.

Problem of reform

Nearly everybody believes these inequities should be corrected. Some, confronted with the intricacies of the problem, have simply proposed that all candidates be prohibited by law from purchasing television time. The Commission not only feels that this proposal may be unconstitutional but also considers it unacceptable to most broadcasters, politicians, and elected officials. Television is a fact of life, and one way or another it will continue to influence elections. In our view, it ought to be transformed into a positive influence.

The problem of money and politics has been with us almost since our beginnings as a republic. But it has taken on a new dimension and heightened urgency with the emergence of television and its high—and rising—costs.

John F. Kennedy expressed concern about the problem of money and political television in 1959. He was quite clear on the decisive role played by the medium and on the possible impact of the large contributions that now make campaign broadcasting possible. As he put it:

If all candidates and parties are to have equal access to this essential and decisive campaign medium, without becoming deeply obligated to big financial contributors from the world of business, labor or other major lobbies, then the time has come when a solution must be found for this problem of TV costs.[19]

Concern about the influence of money on politics has led to a variety of legislative restrictions to limit campaign expenditures and contributions.

The federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 requires political committees operating in two or more states to file reports of their receipts and expenditures. It also sets campaign expenditure limits of $25,000 for candidates for the Senate and $5,000 for candidates for the House of Representatives.

The Hatch Act of 1939 places a limit of $3 million on the expenditures of any committee operating in two or more states. It limits to $5,000 the amount of money that an individual may contribute to any candidate or political committee.

Most states require public reporting of campaign disbursements and thirty-three have spending ceilings, but only seven limit individual contributions.[20]

All too often these attempts at regulation are voided or simply ignored. Their weaknesses were suggested by one authority on campaign financing, Louise Overacker, when she wrote:

The Hatch Act limitations were included in an act which purported to "Prohibit Pernicious Political Practices." One might almost parody it to read: "An Act to *Promote* Pernicious Political Activities." It defeats its own purpose by encouraging decentralization, evasion and concealment. Worst of all it makes difficult if not impossible that publicity which is essential to full understanding of who pays our political bills—and why.[21]

Undoubtedly the weaknesses in our legislation are a main reason for the cynicism about money in politics. As President Dwight D. Eisenhower once observed:

It does mean, in effect, that we have put a dollar sign on public service, and today many capable men who would like to run for office simply can't afford to do so. Many believe that politics in our country is already a game exclusively for the affluent. This is not strictly true; yet the fact that we may be approaching that state of affairs is a sad reflection on our elective system.[22]

The trends in the use of paid broadcast time may not serve as much as they should to allay public cynicism. When television began to be widely used by political candidates, some observers suggested that its extraordinary intimacy would improve the quality of campaigns. Television, it was thought, would give voters a sharper personal impression of the candidates and a deeper understanding of the issues. The voter, watching and meditating before his set, would arrive at a more informed and intelligent choice than he would by attending a political rally, where he might be swayed by partisan hysteria. But the degree to which television has met this ideal is questionable.[23]

Use of television

Two main kinds of paid political broadcasts are widely used today. One is the "spot," similar to a commercial, lasting for a minute or less (a related variety is the short message lasting up to five minutes). The other is the program lasting a half-hour or an hour (it sometimes stretches over several hours, as in "telethons"). Candidates have shown increasing preference for "spots."

The tremendous growth in the popularity of "spots" has occurred for two major reasons: they enable a candidate to reach a large number of viewers at a relatively low cost per viewer; and they allow him to address people he could not reach by any other means.

In October 1968 a presidential candidate might have bought a one-minute network 'spot" in "Gunsmoke" at almost $50,000 (not including the cost of producing the "spot"). It would have entered an estimated 13 million homes and been seen by approximately 19 million people of voting age. A thirty-minute network program scheduled at a similar time woud have cost more than $80,000 in time charges (plus a sizable expenditure for production) and could have been expected to reach an audience of 6 to 8 million homes.[24] Thus the longer program would have been a far more expensive purchase in relation to the number of homes—or viewers—reached.

Some campaign strategists, however, believe that the longer programs are decidedly useful. Although the viewers who remain might consist largely of the candidate's partisans, whose minds are already made up, they cite the reinforcement effect already mentioned—the motivation to work harder for the party's candidate.

Even so, a political "spot" in a high-rated program can attract the attention of many viewers who would not watch a half-hour political program. Its audience is a much better cross-section of the voting—and nonvoting—public, since it can be assumed to contain a much higher proportion of uncommitted voters. And in a year such as 1968, when the margin of victory was narrow (about a million votes—1.5 per cent of those cast), these uncommitted voters can hold the balance.

Political candidates in general election campaigns during 1968 chose to spend more than three-quarters of their total television budget on "spots," and they spent nearly twice as much for this purpose as the candidates in 1964. But expenditures for all other television time in the 1968 general election campaign changed hardly at all from the 1964 level. This shift toward the one-minute spot narrowed the viewer's opportunity to hear a serious discussion of issues or to observe the candidate himself for a length of time that would permit him to judge his personal qualities.

Candidates are under increasing pressure to get maximum return for their money. And broadcasters prefer to sell campaign time in small segments, since they are more profitable than longer programs and less disruptive of schedules.[25] In the absence of counterpressures, the proportion of short messages can be expected to increase.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The Commission does not question whether television is the appropriate instrument for informing the electorate. But it does believe that ultimately the voter has much to lose from present arrangements. For the democratic process requires open forums for political ideas and the widest possible dissemination of information. Letting ability to pay determine access to the great audience and fostering the development of commercial-like campaign spots rather than rational political discussions may in time subvert the democratic process.

The first and most essential aim of this Commission, therefore, is to make recommendations for changes in public policy relating to campaign broadcasting that will primarily assist and benefit the American voter, not the broadcaster or the candidate. To accomplish that aim the Commission has identified these specific goals:

1. To guarantee that there is basic access to the broadcast media for all significant candidates for President and Vice President.

2. To help relieve the financial pressures of broadcast campaigning on presidential and vice presidential candidates.

3. To promote rational political discussion in presidential campaigns, thus exposing as many voters as possible to candidates and issues within a rational context.

4. To stimulate effective citizen participation in the processes of democratic govern-

Footnotes at end of article.

ment by encouraging small contributions to political campaigns.

We also wish to take a significant step toward relieving candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of some of the burden of their costs for campaign broadcasting.

The Commission believes that these goals can be achieved. In our view, they must be achieved if the public interest is to be protected.

3. PROPOSALS

Basic access to all candidates: Voters' time

The needs and interests of the American voting public have dominated the deliberations of this Commission. It is our conviction that the strength of a democracy depends on a well-informed electorate. While we frame our recommendations in terms of providing presidential and vice presidential candidates with basic access to the broadcast media, our main concern has been to bring to the potential voter who watches television and listens to radio the information he needs about the candidates. If the voter is to choose wisely, he needs some guarantee of a basic access through the electronic media to all significant candidates for our highest political offices.

To this end, we propose that each presidential and vice presidential candidate who meets criteria of seriousness and significance be offered broadcast time on all American television and radio stations at the expense of the federal government. We have termed this concept "Voters' Time." The time would be available both to major and to minor candidates, although the amount would vary according to the electorate's past response to a candidate's party.

What a candidate does with his Voters' Time, to impress himself upon the electorate, is largely up to him. We would not prohibit candidates from buying time of their own; they would be free to buy whatever other broadcast time their resources—and the public's tolerance for political campaigning—would permit.

Some critics of political broadcasting suggest that nothing short of equal time on the air for all presidential and vice presidential candidates will solve our problem. They argue that even if guaranteed a basic amount of campaign time on television and radio, a heavily backed candidate will quickly swamp an opponent who lacks strong financial support. They hold that whatever financial advantages a party enjoys momentarily or has gathered over the years must be discarded when its candidate appears on the air—the government must enforce absolute equality.

The Commission disagrees. The competitive marketplace of American politics has served us well, not ill, over the past two centuries. Now is the time for reform, not repudiation. Our recommendations are designed to strengthen, not to destroy, our traditional political patterns.

Differences in financial resources do indeed exist among rival parties and candidates. These reflect differences in popular support as well as in the personal wealth of a candidate or his friends. We do not ignore such differences; but we make no attempt to eliminate them. Instead, we affirm our belief in the benefits of a competitive political system.

Standards of eligibility

Who would be eligible for Voters' Time? This has been one of the most important questions before the Commission. We believe that all presidential and vice presidential candidates whose parties command significant support from the electorate should be eligible for some basic amount of campaign broadcast time. But what is the measure of significance?

We favor the two-party system. Not necessarily *this* two-party system, in which Republicans and Democrats are clearly dominant—for over the sweep of history once-powerful parties such as the Federalists and the Whigs have lost the support of the electorate and disappeared—but, rather, the two-party system as such.

But to provide Voters' Time to all legally qualified candidates might encourage the rise of irresponsible and disruptive candidates. It might fractionalize and factionalize the American political system. It would inevitably encourage the proliferation of splinter groups, provide publicity-seekers with an invaluable opportunity to attract nationwide attention on television and radio, and swamp the airwaves with a suffocating confusion of voices.[26]

Since the Commission does not wish to encourage such proliferation, we have established what we think are reasonable requirements that candidates must meet to qualify as significant.

At the same time, the Commission believes that the dissenting voices of candidates who disagree with the views of the major parties and who can marshal a substantial number of voters for their own support should be heard.

In our relatively short history as a nation, ideas brought forth on the fringes of our political life have often become, in time, doctrine for the dominant center. Thus railroad regulation, the encouragement of cooperatives and labor unions, high standards for civil service, and many other ideas first advanced by the Populists and Progressives have gained general acceptance. Indeed, some minor parties quite legitimately regard proselytizing, rather than vote-getting, as their principal objective, and they participate in the electoral process as a means to that end.

We have considered the argument that new parties that have not yet demonstrated near-majority support need not share in basic access to the broadcast media—that they can continue to use the more traditional communications media, such as the press, by which historically they have made their contribution to our political life. We believe, however, that the voter should be able to see and hear the candidates of minor parties on the electronic media as he sees and hears the candidates of major parties.

The Commission believes, then, that we must recognize dual needs: the preservation of a two-party system on the one hand, and an opportunity for dissent and flexibility on the other. What we do seek is the interplay of ideas—a healthy chance for the upward movement of new parties and candidates and the possible decline of the old, as well as the stability provided by a strong two-party system.

The Commission is convinced that these objectives are best met by a three-category standard of eligibility for Voters' Time that guarantees significant minor party candidates a basic amount of television and radio exposure, although less than the amount guaranteed to major party candidates.

Category I would include only candidates of parties that had placed first or second in two of the three preceding presidential elections. Thus it would normally admit only the candidates of the two major parties, although on rare occasions three parties might qualify.

Category II would consist of candidates of parties that had received a truly sizable vote in the preceding presidential election. We would define this as one-eighth of the votes cast. Such party successes have occurred only rarely in our history (one such success occurred in 1968), but the Commission believes them to have been of such importance as to deserve a separate category in the standards of eligibility.

Category III would comprise candidates of all parties that show evidence of a fair degree of potential voter support but not necessarily a past electoral record of significance. This category makes room for the new party that arises from new or unique circumstances inadequately dealt with by the older, major parties.

All three categories would have to meet one common eligibility requirement: Any party wishing to qualify for Voters' Time in any category would have to appear on the ballot in at least three-quarters of the states—with the District of Columbia considered a state for this purpose—and these states would have to represent enough electoral votes to constitute a majority in the Electoral College.*

The Commission believes that this three-quarters requirement guarantees a significant national candidacy. The legal and practical obstacles to getting on the ballot in that proportion of states can be overcome only by the expenditure of considerable time, money, and organizational effort; it is no mean achievement.

In the past, only a few parties would ever have qualified under the three-quarters standard that is our requirement for eligibility in Category III (though who can say what might happen in the future if politicians are offered Voters' Time?). Those parties whose candidates appeared on the ballot in three-quarters of the states were all of some substance in their day.

For example, Henry A. Wallace's Progressives would have qualified for Category III in 1948, as would have Robert M. La Follette's Progressives in 1924 and Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party in 1912.

With more than one-eighth of the popular vote for President in those years, La Follette's Progressives and Roosevelt's Bull Moosers would have moved up to Category II in the following presidential campaigns. But Henry Wallace's Progressives, with only 2.38 per cent of the 1948 popular vote, would not have done so.

The Socialist Party of Eugene V. Debs and Norman Thomas might have qualified for Category III seven times. But it never achieved the one-eighth share of the popular vote needed to move up to Category II.

Clearly, a candidate who appears on the ballot in three-quarters of the states has considerable, broad-based national support and organization behind him. To decrease the number could too easily allow many insubstantial candidates to qualify for Voters' Time. And increasing the number of states could subject a candidate to undue pressure from state-level political interests and machines. To take the extreme case, the number could hardly be set at 51 (including the District of Columbia) because political maneuvering could force a legitimate national candidate off at least one state's ballot. In such a case, indeed, even an incumbent President could become ineligible for Voters' Time.

The Commission's choice of ballot qualification as the basic entry requirement, rather than a percentage of the vote cast at the preceding election or a number of petition signatures—criteria recommended in many of the quite ingenious proposals made in the past for campaign assistance—deserves explanation.

Quite simply, we rejected the requirement of a prior election record because we believe that it is important not to close the door to new parties whose perspective on new circumstances may be of great value to the people.

We also believe that merely gathering a number of petition signatures, even from a specified number of states, is not as true a proof of serious national purpose as is actually qualifying to appear on state ballots. The process of gathering signatures by itself perhaps provides too much invitation to improper manipulation. It also poses massive administrative problems with regard to federal verification of signatures gathered from voters registered under state jurisdiction.

Footnotes at end of article.

We felt it important to make the qualifications for eligibility simple, fair, and understandable.

Eligibility for Category I has deliberately been made dependent on a party's performance in the three most recent elections—rather than on some more distant occasion—in order to allow for change.

It is possible under our proposal for three parties to place first or second in two of the three preceding elections and thus qualify for time in category I. Thus the emergence of a new party is provided for.

From 1900 through 1968, however, only the Republican and Democratic parties met this requirement.

Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party ran second in 1912—ahead of the Republicans with William Howard Taft (the only time in the twentieth century that a major party has been dropped to third place)—but ranked a poor fifth in 1916, when Roosevelt declined the Progressive Party's nomination. If Roosevelt or some other very popular figure had chosen to run on the Progressive ticket in 1916, and if he had won or had repeated the party's second place showing of 1912, then in 1920 the Progressive Party would have qualified for Category I.

Eligibility for Category II would depend on performance in a single election, the most recent presidential election. A party that showed impressive voter support at one election would thus be able to use Voters' Time at the next election to demonstrate that its appeal transcends the issues or personalities of a single campaign.

Only three parties in the twentieth century would have qualified for Category II in this way. Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party, which polled 27.4 per cent of the vote in 1912, would have been eligible in 1916; La Follette's Progressive Party, which polled 16.6 per cent of the vote in 1924, would have been eligible in 1928; and George C. Wallace's American Independent Party would be eligible in 1972, having polled 13.5 per cent of the vote in 1968.

One further stipulation. It is possible that a candidate may be the nominee of more than one party. For instance, the Populist Party, which garnered twenty-two electoral votes for James B. Weaver in 1892, endorsed a Democrat, William Jennings Bryan, in 1896 and 1900. Hence *we provide that a candidate can only use Voters' Time offered in the highest category for which he qualified.*

Amount and apportionment of voters' time

The Commission would provide enough Voters' Time to give viewers and listeners a chance to assess all significant candidates for President and Vice President. We would provide enough Voters' Time for each such candidate to state his case—to present himself and his views fully. But we would not provide the same amount of time for each candidate.

Again, the Commission's purpose is not to equalize broadcast time for all significant candidates. Rather we seek to guarantee all significant candidates basic access to the great audience. No such candidate should be denied this basic access because he lacks the financial resources.

After considering many suggestions for providing access, we have agreed on the following as a fair and workable formula:

Category I candidates, those of the major parties, would each be given six prime-time half-hours; Category II candidates, two such half-hours; and Category III candidates, one such half-hour program.

Some will feel that we are too generous to splinter candidates; others, that we are too restrictive. Consistent with our purpose of maintaining a balance between stability and flexibility, we seek to give a hearing to new parties but not to encourage their proliferation unduly. Our aim is not to impose mathematical precision upon the American political structure, but to assume a measure of fairness and justice.

Often the opinion is expressed that people's attention span for political matter is limited—that the lengthy political broadcast, such as the half-hour program, is too quickly tuned out. Increasingly the politician feels that he must get his message across briefly if he is to get any message across at all.

Without disputing the view that short political announcements, or "spots," can transmit some kinds of information efficiently and well, the Commission contends that they can and often do stultify meaningful political discourse. We select the half-hour format as a more appropriate vehicle for candidates to address themselves fully and conscientiously to the issues.

If in a particular presidential campaign two parties should qualify in Category I, one in Category II, and two in Category III, total Voters' Time would amount to eight hours. In our view, eight hours every four years is not too much television and radio time to ask broadcasters and the American people to make available for so important a decision as the choice of President and Vice President of the United States.

The Commission has proposed two additional requirements for the scheduling of Voters' Time. Candidates in Category I would have to broadcast at least one program in any seven-day period, while candidates in Category II could broadcast no more than one of their two programs in any seven-day period; and for all eligible candidates, these programs are limited to the last 35 days preceding the Monday before Election Day.

Requiring the candidates of the major parties to broadcast at least once in any seven-day period clearly prevents a last-minute "blitz" campaign with all of a candidate's Voters Time bunched together. It prevents any candidate from swamping his opponents and the broadcast audience.

We limit Voters' Time to the last 35 days preceding the Monday before Election Day, because, in our judgment based on considerable practical experience, presidential campaigns are too long.

Campaigning for the Presidency is, of course, not limited to the months immediately preceding the election. It goes on between elections and intensifies during each election year. But specific campaign activities—the rallies, the speechmaking, the trips, and the hoopla—begin soon after the national conventions, pick up speed after Labor Day, and continue virtually nonstop until Election Day.

Nine or ten weeks of campaigning may have been necessary at one time. They are not now. In the age of the jet plane and the handy television or radio set, the candidate can reach the voters in a shorter time than ever before. He can spend more time thinking and less time traveling and talking. We wish to help him. If long hectic campaigns cannot be proved to be boring to the voters, we do know that they are debilitating to the candidates. It is no wonder that after an election both winner and loser often retire to recuperate.

There are many other questions about Voters' Time, of course. But the Commission believes that specific programming details are best left to be worked out among candidates and broadcasters. It has to be recognized that broadcasters do have commitments that prohibit frequent pre-emptions except at very great financial penalties. Thus, broadcasters must be given some leeway in arranging the programming of Voters' Time. Many combinations are possible. Our concern is only that these important aspects be worked out in accordance with the principles we have expressed.

The issue of cost

It is sometimes held that broadcasters should provide political time free. In this view, free time is a service the stations owe to the nation in return for the franchise granted them to use public airwaves for commercial purposes. There is much to be said for this argument. Its supporters are fond of citing the analogy of charging cattlemen a fee for the privilege of grazing stock on public lands, but broadcasters and many others feel that the analogy to a grazing fee is not exact.

They point out that airlines, which use the public skies, and newspapers, which receive government subsidy through mailing privileges, are not expected to provide free services in the presidential campaign process. Why, broadcasters ask, should they be singled out to bear a large part of the campaign financial burden?

Since we believe that Voters' Time is public time, serving all the people, we hold that the public should pay for it.

Furthermore, the Commission strongly believes that whoever pays for time is likely to influence its use. Since one of our primary objectives is to elevate the quality of political television, to direct it more to the issues and the candidates and less toward commercials and extravaganzas, we deem it unwise to leave the use of Voters' Time exclusively to the broadcaster or, for that matter, to the politician.

Some who require broadcasters to provide free time suggest that they be given tax deductions or credits as partial compensation. While this would tend to reduce the burden imposed on broadcasters, it leaves untouched our objective of raising the level of campaign broadcasting. This can best be achieved if the public pays for Voters' Time and requires that it be used in the public interest.

We have considered proposals that broadcasters be required to devote a certain percentage of their broadcast schedules to political broadcasts each year, in an out of the presidential election season. Although arousing the understandable opposition of many people, this is a matter for further consideration. The British, for instance, incorporate regularly scheduled political broadcasts into their programming, both during and between election time campaigns, at no cost to the parties.

It has been suggested, too, that politicians continue to pay for their campaign time, as they do now—but that, in order to limit campaign costs, the federal government restrict the amount of time they may buy.

Such a solution would, of course, leave control of almost all political programs exclusively in the hands of the politicians, where it is now, to be used as they see fit, not necessarily to inform the electorate. And it would do nothing to help the candidate who cannot afford to buy any time at all. In addition restricting the purchase of time might be considered an unconstitutional infringement on the candidate's right of free speech.

There have also been proposals for matching contributions to candidates with federal money under one or another formula to purchase campaign broadcast time. Some such scheme might preserve the private character of campaigning and, at the same time, shift some of the financial burden to the public, but many think the machinery needed to administer it would probably be too cumbersome.

Still another approach involves a direct federal subsidy for broadcasting alone or for all communications—or, indeed, for *all* campaign expenditures. Many types of subsidies are possible, such as payment in advance, reimbursement for expenditures, or the federal assumption of certain campaign debts.

One subsidy plan, the Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966—the now inoperative Long Act—allowed the taxpayer to allocate one dollar from his federal income tax payment to a general campaign financing fund, disbursements from which would be made to national party committees in amounts deter-

mined by each party's share of the popular vote at the preceding presidential election.

A number of objections were raised to this plan. It was feared that it would cause undesirable changes in traditional relationships between the different levels of party organization, that it would prevent the taxpayer from exercising his choice between the parties benefiting from his tax dollar, that it would result in too great a loss of revenue to the federal government, and that it made insufficient provision for significant new parties without an election record.

The Commission recognized another problem closely related to the question of who pays—that of displacement.

If the public provides time without cost to the candidate might he not simply accept this time as a bonus, raise the same amount of money he would have raised anyway, and divert it into other uses, such as campaign literature and precinct organizations, or, more to the point, spend some of it on political broadcast programs or "spot" announcements?

Quite possibly. And so, rather than free time, some have proposed an absolute ceiling on broadcast expenditures. The Commission has studied this possibility carefully and has concluded that a ceiling would be as unenforceable as most limitations on campaign expenditures are today. We are also concerned that setting a ceiling on political communications in this manner might violate traditional American concepts of unhindered political competition. It might well increase the advantage already enjoyed by the incumbent, who is better known to the public and who can go on the air free in his capacity as President while his opponent must depend largely on paid political broadcasting to catch up with him.

The Commission did not attempt to deal exhaustively with the intricate question of the proper role of the federal government in campaign financing. Many proposals advanced in the past have merit and deserve further study. For the present, however, we believe that the wisest course is to pursue the concept of Voters' Time, asking the public itself to buy the time with federal funds. In this way Voters' Time will belong to all the people. It will not be the broadcasters' time; it will not be the politicians' time; it will truly be the voters' time.

Just as we believe that a candidate for President or Vice President has a public obligation to use Voters' Time within the guidelines for responsible campaign programming that we suggest, so do we believe that the broadcaster has a public responsibility. Unlike other media operators, broadcast licensees are charged with operating in the service of the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The election of a President and Vice President should not be the occasion for financial profit, regardless of who pays the bills. Therefore *we propose that broadcasters sell Voters' Time at a discount from their regular rates.*

Arriving at a fair rate of compensation to broadcasters for their cooperation is a difficult task because of the very nature of their industry. Like other businesses, commercial broadcasters are concerned with generating profits; they are faced with varying operating costs, depreciation and appreciation of resources, and the vagaries of supply and demand. Like some other businesses broadcasters' costs and revenue vary considerably from one geographic location to another. It is obviously inappropriate to compensate a large metropolitan television broadcaster with the same amount of dollars disbursed to a small-town radio station. His costs and potential revenue are far greater. Adequate compensation for Voters' Time should reflect the varying earning potentials of individual stations.

One way to do this, the Commission feels, is to compensate stations for transmitting Voters' Time programs at no more than 50 per cent of the commercial rate card each broadcaster charges for such time, or at the lowest rate charged to any commercial advertiser, whichever is lower.

The precedent for a 50 per cent discount already exists. One network voluntarily offered such a discount on a limited basis to candidates in 1968. The industry's pricing structure poses difficulties and no formula that more fairly and readily takes into account the different economic situations of the networks and of the approximately 7,000 commercial television and radio stations in the United States has presented itself to us.

We believe that compensation at a 50 per cent discount from a station's established rates is fair. But the Treasury should not be obliged to pay this rate if any commercial advertiser is charged a lower rate. *So we recommend payment at 50 per cent of the applicable rate charged by broadcaster's lowest rate to any commercial advertiser, whichever is lower.*

Estimates based on the best available data suggest that less than $250,000 would have been required in the 1968 election campaign to compensate *all* commercial television and radio stations and networks for each half-hour Voters' Time.

The Commission considers it essential that non-commercial or educational television and radio stations also broadcast Voters' Time programs. Their number and importance is increasing. Their participation befits their avowed objectives of public service. They are eager to participate.

By definition, these noncommercial stations do not operate for profit. Neither they nor commercial broadcasters should benefit financially from carrying Voters' Time programs.

Noncommercial stations must, however, meet their operating costs. Therefore, *we recommend that noncommercial stations be compensated for their operating and network interconnection costs.*

Estimates suggest that approximately $15,000 would have been required to compensate all noncommercial television and radio stations for each such half-hour program in the 1968 election.

Thus we estimate that approximately $265,000 would have been required to compensate all commercial and noncommercial television and radio stations for each half-hour of Voters' Time. Hypothetically, then, total disbursements from the Treasury for the amounts of Voters' Time we have suggested would have totaled about $4 million if there were two major party candidates in Category I with six half-hour programs, one Category II candidate with two half-hour programs, and two Category III candidates with one half-hour program each.

This is a considerable sum of money. But it is a very small item in the federal budget. In fiscal 1969, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission is estimated to have spent $5.6 million and the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission had a budget of $1.3 million. We are proposing the expenditure of about $4 million (at current rates) every four years, or roughly the amount it would have cost to send a nickel postal card to everyone who voted in the 1968 election. We are aware that our society faces pressing needs and conflicting priorities. We feel that $4 million—or $1 million a year—is a very small price to pay to reform presidential campaigning.

Simultaneity

The Commission feels strongly that each Voters' Time program must be broadcast simultaneously over every television and radio facility in the United States, including network outlets, independent and noncommercial stations, and community antenna systems.* Simultaneity is the cornerstone of our recommendations.

Footnotes at end of article.

During Voters' Time, any television and radio set turned on anywhere in a given time zone would bring a potential President or Vice President to his constituency. Americans could sit down together to watch, listen, and make judgments about the men who would lead them.

Voters' Time is a wholly new approach to the use of broadcasting facilities for presidential election politics. Simultaneity is an integral part of the concept of Voters' Time. To place Voters' Time in the position of competing with standard programing, to identify it with the conventional would be to lose sight of its unique importance. It would compromise the seriousness of the presidential race.

In recent years the suspicion has arisen among some of the hard-headed politicians who buy campaign television time that when Democratic candidates appear on the screen, Democratic voters watch, while Republicans switch to an entertainment program on another channel; and that the Democrats switch when the Republicans are on screen. They suspect, too, that many voters—Democrat, Republican, and independent—perhaps bored with the quality of political television, switch to another channel when *any* candidate appears. (As we have noted, longer programs also have their advocates.)

The Commission believes that all voters should see and hear all significant candidates. Only simultaneity can come close to accomplishing this.

It may be too much to hope that all voters would watch or listen to all Voters' Time programs; but they could not take the easy way out and turn to another channel. In 1960, when Kennedy and Nixon debated on all three networks and many independent stations simultaneously, the average audience was estimated at 71 million.

Viewers or listeners could, of course, simply turn the set off. But broadcasting experience indicates that not many are likely to do so. The British employ simultaneity for their election-time party broadcasts, and their sets in use do not drastically decrease.

We would hope that as the institution of Voters' Time developed, this direct and regular confrontation with the candidates would give voters a sense of direct participation in presidential politics heretofore unknown. And we think they would welcome it.

There will, of course, be those who object that simultaneous transmission is an improper infringement on the viewer's and listener's freedom of choice and the broadcaster's freedom of speech. Some may see this provision as a step toward the Big Brother control of political thought portrayed in George Orwell's novel *1984.*

Although we have considered this argument at length, we find it without real merit. Just as candidates are under no compulsion to appear on Voters' Time programs, viewers are under no compulsion to watch or listen to them. Those who may see in Voters' Time the specter of government control of broadcast programming would, we believe, be misinterpreting its nature. Voters' Time would be a cooperative venture in which the efforts of candidates, broadcasters, and the public combine to create an extraordinary new vehicle for political enlightenment. It is true that all broadcasters would have to carry Voters' Time programs. But they would be compensated for their time, and it has seemed to us that the overriding importance of choosing a President and Vice President far outweighs any temporary inconvenience to broadcasters who do not wish to participate.

Technically, simultaneous broadcasts should not be difficult to arrange. Television and radio stations can connect, via existing lines or microwave links, with a central source of programming. Network-affiliated stations daily make use of such links on a large scale. Television stations without network affiliations could connect via "loops" with the nearest network outlet. And those

radio stations unable to link with a network affiliate could take the programs off the air from a neighboring station and retransmit them.

Simultaneous transmission of Voters' Time programs would increase the impact of candidates' messages. It would also impress on the American people the importance of the presidential campaign process. Finally, it would stimulate candidates to reserve their best efforts for this great confrontation with millions.

No candidate today can buy simultaneity on all stations. Given it, he would devote his best efforts to it. Several experienced political managers have told us that if their candidates were offered time on all stations in the nation simultaneously, they as strategists would spend most of their time deciding how best to use it. Six chances to reach every television and radio home in America simultaneously and exclusively— this is an opportunity that no politician would take lightly. Voters' Time programs could well become the focal point of a candidate's campaign.

The use of voters' time

Voters' Time is uniquely public time, endowed with the public interest and bought with public funds. We believe that candidates should use Voters' Time in ways that clearly serve the public interest. If candidates are given something they cannot buy—simultaneous access to every television and radio home in America—it seems reasonable to require them to use it sensibly and responsibly.

But here we step onto difficult ground. To what extent should the federal government restrict the right of politicians to be foolish? They should not fritter away Voters' Time. But how much government influence is too much?

The Commission carefully considered this matter. Indeed, no other question received more consideration. At one extreme. Voters' Time could simply be turned over to the candidates to use at their own discretion. At the other, a single rigid format for Voters' Time could be established.

Neither choice seems satisfactory.

Giving the candidates totally free rein might well defeat one of the Commission's objectives: to elevate the quality of political discourse.

Establishing a single rigid format might mean forcing some candidates to use formulas ill suited to them. All candidates should not be forced into the same inflexible pattern.

We considered requiring candidates to take their choice from only a limited variety of formats: Submitting to questioning by nonpartisan or bipartisan panels; speaking directly and without adornment to the audience on a single substantive issue; debating their opponents.

All these seem too coercive. *We decided only to suggest certain simple requirements for the use of Voters' Time programs: (a) that they substantially involve the live appearances of candidates for President or Vice President of the United States; and (b) that they utilize formats intended to promote rational political discussion, to illuminate campaign issues, and to give the audience insight into the abilities and personal qualities of the candidates.*

All too often, we believe, political broadcasting makes use of advertising techniques more properly suited to the sale of a commercial product. Such political advertising has been marked by appeals to the emotions of the viewers or listeners rather than to their intellect; it succeeds often through the skillful editing of film or tape or through special lighting and sound effects.

Advances in broadcasting technology have made it possible to present a candidate in the best possible light, with all inept answers to hard questions edited out of the tape, with false starts and all uncertainties and human failings eliminated, all warts and blemishes removed, a single smooth image alone remaining. It is no criticism of television or radio to say that some day it may be possible to offer a wholly plausible and wholly false impression of a candidate. Broadcasting would become an impenetrable shield for a candidate, would not open a window on him through which the public could see him clearly. Thus would its technology defeat itself. As in other fields, technology in broadcasting needs to be restrained from controlling its creators. By requiring candidates to appear in person on Voters' Time programs and appear for at least a substantial part of the program—not merely to poke their heads into the studio door, then beat a hasty retreat while the comics and dancing girls take over—we seek to help them appear before the public as most of them would wish: as they are.

Live appearances by candidates do not preclude dramatic or emotional appeals, of course. But they do help ensure that the audience will not be imposed upon by manipulative techniques.

We are aware that candidates often are able to present some of their messages more effectively by using film or tape. Such techniques, for instance, allow a candidate to document—with pictures or other voices—a presentation of his or his party's past accomplishments.

The public interest, we feel, is frequently well served on such occasions. The reasonable use of audio or visual devices is legitimate and even desirable. Hence our recommendation that formats utilize "substantial" live appearances, rather than a complete ban on film and other audiovisual techniques.

The Commission hopes that the formats devised by the candidates along the guidelines suggested will supply that element most sadly lacking from presidential campaign rhetoric and most sorely needed by voters: the substantive discussion of issues. It would help if rival candidates chose to present their Voters' Time programs back-to-back so that voters could compare directly those who seek their support. Debates, probably the most illuminating format, could result.

We recognize, too, the value of programs that provide insight into a prospective President's or Vice President's personality, ability, and character. Not only are a man's views on the issues important; so is the man. How the public feels about a man may vitally affect his ability to exercise leadership. Therefore, to discussion of the issues we have added insight into the abilities and personal qualities of candidates as a legitimate aim of Voters' Time programs. If a candidate chooses to devote a program to sober discussion of an issue, the voter will take that into account. If he chooses to preside over a collection of slogans, celebrities, and film clips, that says something about him too, and the voter will note it. As can readily be seen, we are relying here on the good sense of the American people. And we are relying, too, on the pressure that the mere existence of Voters' Time would put on the candidates to do their best.

It should be made clear that no candidate would be required to make use of Voters' Time. A candidate who thought he was not at his best on television might hesitate—in which case, however, his opponent would almost surely plunge in, and by taunts drag the reluctant one in too.

This is a serious objection. It is at least conceivable that a man might make an excellent President or Vice President yet make a poor appearance on television. Such a candidate, if left to his own devices, might choose to buy television time for his supporters or for carefully manufactured films while he himself avoided live exposure and devoted his energies to issuing position papers, conferring with leaders of his political organization, and making speeches to selected groups. Under our plan, of course, he could not have this choice. But we live in a television age; no candidate, and no President, can escape television's pitiless, ubiquitous eye. And since the Commission would give candidates considerable latitude in format on Voters' Time, each candidate could design his own personal appearance to his best advantage.

It has been proposed by some that candidates be forbidden to purchase additional broadcast time of their own. In this view, Voters' Time would simply increase the amount of political broadcasting—to permit candidates to buy further time would simply swamp the airwaves without cutting campaign costs. More particularly, it has been proposed that candidates be forbidden to purchase television or radio "spots." Many people believe that "spots" simplify complex issues, distort issues, sell candidates like soap, and debase politics.

The Commission would not disagree, at least in some instances. Certainly the Democratic "spot" of 1968 showing people erupting in laughter at the mention of the name "Spiro Agnew" clarified nothing. Nor did the Republican "spot" of 1968 showing the Democratic candidate laughing and also showing scenes of dead babies in Vietnam contribute much to the public's knowledge of the Vietnam issue.

While such tactics are questionable if not disgraceful, the Commission doubts the wisdom and legality of forbidding "spots" or of prohibiting candidates from buying other broadcast time. As to "spots," the Commission hopes their impact will fade as the impact of Voters' Time increases. As to forbidding candidates from purchasing other time, we have limited Voters' Time substantially to live appearances by the candidates. If a candidate also wishes to present a serious film recounting the history of his party, we can hardly object. And if he wishes to present a half-hour of nonsense, we must rely again on the good sense of the people.

If our proposals are accepted, we doubt that candidates would buy much more time. For one thing, they might have trouble raising money for it. Political contributors could say, "Why do you need my money? You've got the government's." More substantially, candidates might well think that too much radio and television would be self-defeating, that it would irritate or bore voters—who would tend to feel that in eight hours they had seen and heard enough.

EQUAL TIME

If the Commission's recommendations are to be implemented, Voters' Time programs must specifically be included in the various exemptions to the equal time provisions of Section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934. *We also recommend that in 1972 the equal time provision be totally suspended for the presidential race.*

Section 315(a) requires a broadcaster to sell or give equal time to all legally qualified candidates for the same elective office. If he sells or gives time to one candidate, he must sell or give equal time to all candidates for the same office. Thus, regardless of how remote his chance of success at the polling booth, however minimal his claim may be upon the attention of the constituency, Section 315(a) elevates each candidate to the level of every other. Cranks and serious contenders for public attention are lumped together; all must be treated impartially.

The iron rule pinched when, in 1959, Mayor Richard Daley, a candidate for re-election, was shown briefly on television newscasts greeting the President of Argentina and opening a March of Dimes drive. Promptly a minor party candidate, a man who had for years run unsuccessfully in Chicago for all sorts of offices from Mayor to President, usually wearing a Uncle Sam costume, demanded equal time. The Federal Communications Commission had no choice but to grant it.

Almost as promptly, broadcasters asked Congress to exempt news and interview programs from Section 315(a). Congress did so.

Then in 1960 Congress suspended Section 315(a) temporarily, for presidential and vice presidential candidates, to make possible the historic Kennedy-Nixon debates. Without that suspension at least a dozen legally qualified presidential candidates other than Kennedy and Nixon would have claimed equal time.[27] There would have been no debate. In the spring of 1968, when the withdrawal of President Johnson and other dramatic developments created political confusion, eliminating leading candidates and bringing forward new ones, one broadcaster declared that now, as never before, the people needed all the help that broadcasting could give them in sorting out the candidates and participating in the choice of a President. Despite the pleas of the broadcasters—and of one or another of the political parties—Section 315 (a) has not been suspended since 1960.

The Commission recognizes the force of the arguments that led Congress to adopt the equal time provision in the first place. But we must agree with those who feel that untrammeled debate lies at the heart of democracy. We therefore recommend that Congress again permit such debate for the presidential election of 1972. Suspension of the equal time provision would permit the significant candidates for President and Vice President—if they choose—to debate face to face, live. If to Voters' Time could be added such direct debate, the American people in 1972 would benefit enormously. So would the political process.

Administration

The Commission believes that Voters' Time programs possess the potential of becoming the most important broadcasting events of our presidential campaigns.

Their administration must be the responsibility of those whose impartiality is beyond reasonable question and in whom trust is widely reposed. We recommend, therefore, that the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States assume this responsibility.

Accountable not to the executive branch but to Congress, the Comptroller General is the only federal official who serves a fifteen-year term. Both his removal from the political arena and the high level of public—and official—confidence he has traditionally enjoyed should enable him to resolve without taint of partisanship the differences that are bound to arise under our recommendations. (It is worth noting that Congress chose the Comptroller General to administer the provisions of the Long Act that it passed in 1966.)

It should be made clear that we have deliberately left open many questions of administration and direction. Voters' Time is a new concept. Only by trial and error can a significant and workable pattern of relationships be developed among broadcasters, candidates, government officials, and the electorate. We have attempted to explain our own views. But we have not attempted to devise and impose an inflexible structure upon a political system whose very genius is its capacity for adaptation and change. Instead, we have established only general guidelines for the future, leaving many aspects of administration both to the realities of political experience and to the integrity and wisdom of the men who can make this departure in political broadcasting work.

Unquestionably in many instances the Comptroller General would have to take the initiative in bringing the broadcasters and the parties together. He would need restraint, patience, and impartiality in reconciling differing interpretations of how Voters' Time would work out in practice. The ultimate fate of our proposals, if adopted, will depend on precedents that must grow out of experience. What is needed in the administration of Voters' Time is strength and the capacity to moderate and reconcile varying points of view—always with an eye to a single criterion: the public interest.

Small campaign contributions

Campaign contributions, too often fraught with objectionable practices, have been a source of public cynicism and criticism for decades. As the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy said:

"The mounting cost of elections is rapidly becoming intolerable for a democratic society, where the right to vote—and to be a candidate—is the ultimate political protection. For we are in danger of creating a situation in which our candidates must be chosen only from among the rich, the famous, or those willing to be beholden to others who will pay the bills. Heavy dependence on the relatively few who can meet these enormous costs is not only demeaning and degrading to the candidate, it also engenders cynicism about the political process itself."

Many people feel that the way to solve the problem is to broaden the base of candidates' support by encouraging small contributions from a large number of individuals. Leonard Hall, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, spoke for many when he observed:

"All of us engaged in political activity agree that every effort should be made to interest more and more individuals in political campaigns, and, in particular, to increase the number who provide financial support through their contributions. Every political leader is desirous of broadening the base of financial support . . . in designing any new legislation, you should be certain that it makes it easier for Americans in every walk of life to participate both as active workers and as financial contributors, no matter how small."

Dependence on large contributors demoralizes candidates. It puts them under obligations, to some extent corrupting the body politic. Worse, since candidates often accept contributions in dubious circumstances and in excess of the legal limits, people tend to assume that candidates are under even heavier obligations than they actually are; and this feeds the cynicism that could destory democracy.

It would be far healthier if a larger number of individual contributors gave small sums. Small contributors in greater number would not only reduce a candidate's reliance on a few big givers but also help improve the political climate by increasing direct citizen partcipation in politics.

Unfortunately, figures on presidential campaign contributions, required by law to be filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, are incomplete and are often filed in disorderly form, thus limiting our knowledge of what is really contributed and spent. But they are indicative.

With two notable exceptions, individual contributions of $500 or more accounted for well over 50 per cent of the total individual contributions to national-level committees of the two major parties in presidential campaigns between 1952 and 1964 (Table 5). The Democrats had an exceptional year in 1956, when the percentage their national-level committees raised in large sums was down to 44 per cent. In 1964, the percentage for the Republicans was down to only 28 per cent, but this sharp drop was not due to any failure in large contributions (they were down only slightly from the 1960 level) but to a huge increase in total contributions from individuals, in response to special efforts to obtain support from small contributors. Only preliminary estimates are available for 1968, but they suggest that contributions of $500 or more comprised more than three-quarters of total individual contributions raised by the Democrats. For the Republicans the proportion is estimated to have risen to nearly half.

Between 1960 and 1964, the number of people who contributed $500 or more to national-level committees increased from about 4,000 to about 6,700, and total receipts of both parties from this source increased from $5.6 million to $8.3 million. At least 95 people made contributions of $10,000 or more in 1960 and at least 130 in 1964.[28]

Unfortunately, public cynicism generated by this overwhelming preponderance of large contributions in presidential campaigns, coupled with ineffectual techniques for encouraging and collecting funds, has kept the number of small contributions extremely low.

The Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan has made studies on the numbers of contributors in presidental election years. In 1952, only 4 per cent of the population is estimated to have made a contribution to any committee or candidate. In 1956, 1960, and 1964, the percentage stabilized at between 10 and 12 per cent, although the absolute numbers involved increased each year with the rise in population. In 1968, an estimated 6 per cent of the population made some monetary contribution to a political cause.[29]

If we are to broaden significantly the base of candidates' support, we must deal with this widespread public indifference or resistance.

Political campaign financing is in a vicious cycle. Some people see no point in contributing because they believe politicians and candidates are corrupt. Yet corruption is fostered by reliance on a few large contributors.

From time to time, nationwide, statewide, and local efforts, both partisan and nonpartisan, have been made to break this cycle. Almost all have met with failure. The political parties have so rarely met with any degree of success that they have preferred to fall back on large contributors rather than undertake sustained, costly efforts to encourage small contributors.

There have been two particularly notable exceptions in recent years. In 1964, according to the Citizens' Research Foundation, national-level committees committed to Goldwater raised approximately $6 million, or 70 per cent of his presidential campaign fund, in sums of less than $500, obtaining about 650,000 contributions of less than $100 apiece. These small contributions included the year's returns from the Republican Sustaining Fund appeal, which had been established in 1962 in an effort to attract a wide membership at $10 a year. People gave to the campaign in great numbers after mail solicitations and television appeals. These methods were expensive, however; the cost of direct mail alone was more than $1 million.[30] Wallace's campaign in 1968 also gathered many small contributions, from about 750,000 persons.

Senator Goldwater and Governor Wallace proved that the big money necessary for a nationwide campaign can be raised in small sums, if people feel strongly about the candidate and if they are asked and encouraged to give. Moreover, in Gallup polls since 1953 about 30 to 40 per cent of Americans have expressed the willingness to make a political contribution if asked. Part of the blame, then, must rest with our political parties for not making the necessary—but expensive—continuing efforts.

The Commission feels that voters would be more willing to give if they knew their contributions would help their candidates defray the production and other costs of Voters' Time programs. We recommend that as an additional incentive *small contributors be permitted a limited deduction from income or from tax liability on their federal income tax returns. This deduction would apply to contributions in behalf of candidates in the*

Footnotes at end of article.

presidential campaign and in campaigns for membership in the United States Senate or House of Representatives.

We propose that $25 ($50 on a joint return) be the limit for this incentive if the tax-credit method is used, or $100 if the incentive is a deduction from total taxable income.

We believe that such a permanent, national tax incentive would produce large numbers of small contributions. It would encourage the parties to wage more aggressive campaigns for small contributions. It would increase the number of participants in the structure of political finance. It would broaden the base of candidates' support. And it would tend to break the vicious cycle of public distrust and unwillingness to contribute.

We know of no better or more direct way of accomplishing these results.

Congressional and senatorial candidates

In taking our first steps toward dealing with the problem of campaign broadcasting, we have outlined a plan for presidential and vice presidential candidates alone. We wish this were not so.

Our plan is not immediately or directly applicable to the vitally important races for the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. We wish it were.

The complexities of electronic frequency assignments and the range of individual stations' signals, together with the location and wide variation in size and shape of congressional constituencies, do not permit a direct and immediate extension of presidential Voters' Time in all its details.

Yet the concept of Voters' Time could and probably should be extended to candidates for the House and the Senate. Its underlying approach seems to us as appropriate for the men who seek election to national legislative offices as for our candidates for Chief Executive. So we urge that others pick up where we have left off.

But the problem of financing political broadcasting on the congressional level is too pressing not to be dealt with in some meaningful fashion now. Money is hard to raise for these candidates, too, and campaign costs have risen sharply over the past two decades.

In some urban congressional districts it costs more than $150,000 to run. In some of the more populous states, running for the United States Senate means raising a campaign fund of well over $1 million.

This is an area of particular concern to us for several reasons. First, these elected federal officials are closest to the people. They are their direct representatives. They must not be overwhelmed by the new financial burdens of running for office in the electronic era. Second, House and Senate seats are among our highest offices. No man should be kept from running because he cannot raise sufficient funds.

Third, a large contribution could carry more weight in a race that has a fairly small budget than in a big-budget national race.

Finally, broadcasting costs may already have reached such heights as to make them prohibitively expensive for all but a few campaigns for Congress. We believe that the public can only gain from seeing more of their candidates for Congress and from hearing more from them about the issues on the media on which they rely for so much of their information about the world.

Many congressional constituencies, though small in comparison with a television or radio station's audience, are so large today that a candidate cannot reach each voter adequately merely by going to shopping centers and rallies. The electronic media provide a new way of communicating with all voters.

Senatorial constituencies, which correspond more closely (although certainly not perfectly) to the patterns of broadcasting station coverage, are enormously expensive to reach by radio and television. Candidates must therefore use broadcasting sparingly, if they can afford it at all.

We believe that the costs of political broadcasting should be lowered for Senate and House candidates. As the most direct way of doing this we recommend that *all commercial broadcasters be required to charge all legally qualified general election candidates for the House and the Senate for political campaign time at no more than 50 per cent of the lowest charge made to any commercial advertiser.*

This would place radio and television within the reach of many more candidates. It would also help cut costs for those candidates who already use the broadcast media, and would thereby reduce the need for raising large sums.

We do not think that the broadcaster should be forced to bear the burden of providing this assistance to the candidate and his constituents. Therefore *we propose that broadcasters be allowed, for federal income tax purposes, to deduct from their total taxable income amounts equal to the dollar value of such discounts to candidates for the House and the Senate.*

We believe that the recommended course of action could create a union of candidate, broadcaster, government, and the public that would move us closer to our goal of assisting candidates for the House and Senate.

The electronic future

What of the electronic future? The Commission believes its recommendations, if adopted, would result in satisfactory reform of political broadcasting as it now exists. But technical innovations that could change broadcasting greatly are now in development. Among these are the growth of cable (or community antenna) television systems, the introduction of domestic space satellite communications, the establishment of home information centers with the ability to request and receive masses of programming and information, pay television, home video recorders and playback machines, and the spread of ultra-high-frequency television stations.

Nobody knows what the electronic future holds. It seems inevitable that the demand for improved forms of political communication will continue and that evolving technology will meet that demand. It is the task of policy-makers to ensure that technology itself does not alter our fundamental political principles, that men remain the masters of technology and not the other way around.

SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSALS

The Commission recommends—

Title I—The basic proposal

A. That the federal government provide significant candidates in general election campaigns for President and Vice President of the United States with basic campaign broadcasting access to the American voting public (Voters' Time), within the context of programs that will promote rational political discussion and that will be presented in prime evening time simultaneously over every broadcast and cable television facility in the United States.

Which candidates?

B. That eligibility for Voters' Time be extended to candidates for President and Vice President who are in any one of the following three categories:

Category I. Nominees of parties that (a) support the same candidates for President and Vice President in at least three-quarters of the states* and qualify electors for those candidates on the ballot in that proportion of states, provided that the electoral votes of these states are sufficient to elect a President and Vice President; *and* (b) ranked first or second in the popular vote in two of the three previous presidential elections.

Category II. Nominees of parties that (a) support the same candidates for President and Vice President in at least three-quarters of the states and qualify electors for those candidates on the ballot in that proportion of states, provided that the electoral votes of these states are sufficient to elect a President and Vice President; *and* (b) received at least one-eighth of the popular vote in the preceding presidential election.

Category III. Nominees of parties that support the same candidates for President and Vice President in at least three-quarters of the states and qualify electors for those candidates on the ballot in that proportion of states, provided that the electoral votes of these states are sufficient to elect a President and Vice President.

How much time?

C. That Voters' Time be offered to candidates for President and Vice President in amounts and under conditions applying to the highest of the above categories for which they qualify, these amounts and conditions being as follows:

Category I: Six prime-time thirty-minute programs within the 35 days preceding the Monday before Election Day, provided that at least one program be broadcast in each seven-day period.

Category II: Two prime-time thirty-minute programs within the 35 days preceding the Monday before Election Day, provided that no more than one program be broadcast in any seven-day period.

Category III: One prime-time thirty-minute program within the 35 days preceding the Monday before Election Day.

Rational Political Discussion

D. That Voters' Time programs utilize formats that substantially involve the live appearance of the candidates for President and Vice President and are designed to promote rational political discussion for the purpose of clarifying major campaign issues or developing insight into the abilities and personal qualities of the candidates.

Simultaneity

E. That each program be presented simultaneously over every broadcast and cable television facility in the United States in prime evening time.

Who pays?

F. That this time be paid for by the federal government at no more than 50 per cent of the commercial rate card charge for such time, or at the lowest charge made to any commercial advertiser for such time, whichever is lower; or in the case of noncommercial broadcast facilities, that costs incurred in presenting political programs during Voters' Time be reimbursed by the federal government.

Equal time

G. That Voters' Time offered to candidates for President and Vice President pursuant to these recommendations be included in the various exemptions to the equal time provision of Section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and that, in addition, Section 315(a) be suspended for the presidential election campaign of 1972.

Administration

H. That the Comptroller General of the United States be responsible for the administration of the foregoing recommendations.

The Commission further recommends—

Title II—Other Candidates on the Air

That commercial broadcasters be required to charge all legally qualified candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States for such political time as they buy in general election campaigns at no more than 50 per cent of the lowest charge made to any commercial advertiser for such time, provided that broadcasters may then, for federal income tax purposes, deduct amounts equal to the dollar value of such discounts to candidates from their total taxable income.

Footnotes at end of article.

And, finally, the Commission recommends—

Title III—Small Contributions

That individual taxpayers be permitted to receive federal income tax credit equal to one-half the dollar amount of their annual contributions to all legally qualified candidates in general election campaigns for federal office up to $25 ($50 on a joint return) or to deduct their contributions up to $100 from their total taxable income.

FOOTNOTES

* The Commission has for the most part concentrated on "paid" political campaigning, rather than on "free" time or political broadcasts on networks and stations during political campaigns.

* The last provision is added because it is possible to carry the popular vote in three-quarters of the states, the least populous thirty-nine, and still have only 257 electoral votes, less than a simple majority in the Electoral College. The Commission deems it inappropriate to extend the privilege of Voters' Time to a candidate who does not have a mathematical chance of winning the election in normal circumstances.

* By "simultaneously" we mean simultaneously by time zone as practiced by the networks. Ideally, a program originating and available on the East Coast at 8:00 p.m. would be broadcast an hour later in the Central Zone, two hours in the Rocky Mountain states, three hours later on the Pacific Coast, and five hours later in Alaska and Hawaii, so that the program would be available to everyone at his own 8:00 o'clock.

*The term "states" includes the District of Columbia.

[1] The voting behavior of the American public and the factors that influence decision-making at the polls have received considerable scholarly scrutiny. The following by no means represents a full bibliography on the subject, but it will serve as a reading guide for anyone interested. In addition to the titles listed, the reader is encouraged to examine the *Public Opinion Quarterly* and the *American Political Science Review*.

One of the earliest studies of voter behavior, and certainly a classic, is *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*, by Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948). It examines the effects of the 1940 election campaign on 600 voters in Erie County, Ohio.

A second study, similar in orientation but somewhat more complex in scope, investigates the reactions and decisions of 760 voters in Elmira, N.Y., during the presidential campaign of 1948. This is *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*, by Bernard Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

Other basic research on voting behavior is the work of Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. Their volume *The American Voter* (New York: Wiley, 1960) analyzes the behavior of those voters who participated in the presidential elections of 1948, 1952, and 1956. Another book by the same authors, *Elections and the Political Order* (New York: Wiley, 1966), is concerned less with the behavior of the individual voter than with the behavior of voters as a group and the collective decisions made by the electorate. It includes data on the 1960 election.

Among the works of the late V. O. Key, Jr., a major analyst of how and why people vote as they do, are *Public Opinion and American Democracy* (New York: Knopf, 1961) and *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups* (5th ed., New York: Crowell, 1967).

Two works by the political scientist Robert E. Lane help trace the personal relationship of the individual to the political structure and ideology within which he functions: *Political Life: Why and How People Get Involved in Politics* and *Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes What He Does* (New York: Free Press, 1959 and 1962 respectively). The analysis in Lane's *Political Life* is carried forward by Lester W. Milbrath in *Political Participation: How and Why Do People Get Involved in Politics?* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), and by Jerry Warden Friedhein in *Where Are the Voters* (Washington, D.C.: National Press, 1968). Friedhein's book contains an introduction by Richard Scammon.

John F. Kennedy's 1960 presidential campaign provided the basis for a research project by Ithiel de Sola Pool and his associates at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in which the specific factors affecting voter choice were programmed into a computer in order to evaluate the predictability of voter behavior. They were interested in the extent to which a voter's behavior at the polls could be predicted from knowledge of his background. See *Candidates, Issues, and Strategies*, by Pool, Robert P. Abelson, and Samuel L. Popkin (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1964).

Influencing Voters: A Study of Campaign Rationality (New York, St. Martin's, 1967), by Richard Rose, examines political campaign behavior in England, using the 1959 and 1964 general elections as case studies. Chapter 11 compares British and American campaign techniques.

The Survey Research Center, a division of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, has been studying and publishing reports since 1946 on American political behavior. The Center's inquiries cover the broad fields of voting and elections, political representation, and public reactions to public policy. Its data on voter performance at presidential elections go back to 1948. Among the authors cited above, Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes are associated with the Survey Research Center.

[2] Psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, public opinion analysts, and the research departments of advertising agencies have examined the influence of the mass media on voters' decisions at the polls. There is no useful way to sum up this research; the conclusions reached are often hypothetical and contradictory. But the following are offered as representative studies.

For the uninitiated, Joseph T. Klapper's *The Effects of Mass Communication* (Glencoe, Ill.; Free Press, 1960) provides a good survey of the mass media not limited to their impact on politics.

Probably the fullest data on the effect of radio on voting decisions are to be found in Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet's *The People's Choice*. Examining the relative impact of personal influence, radio, and print on the voter during the 1940 presidential campaign and ranking them according to their persuasive power, this study placed personal influence first followed by radio and print in descending order. Data on the impact of radio alone are very difficult to obtain after the 1952 election, the beginning of major television coverage of presidential campaigns.

Samplings of inquiries into broadcasting in general and politics are reprinted in *American Voting Behavior*, edited by Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959). Selections include a chapter by Ithiel de Sola Pool on television and the 1952 election and a chapter by Kurt and Gladys Lang on the influence of the mass media on voting.

The Langs have done considerable research on the effects of broadcasting on politics. Their relevant studies include *Politics and Television* and *Voting and Non-Voting*, both published in Chicago by Quadrangle Books in 1968. *Politics and Television* presents case studies on the political impact of television—starting with its coverage of General MacArthur's homecoming in 1951. *Voting and Non-Voting* deals specifically with the ramifications of broadcasting early election returns from the eastern states before the polls are closed in the West. Another important study in this field is by Herbert Simon and Frederick Stern, "The Effect of Television upon Voting Behavior in Iowa in the 1952 Presidential Election," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 44, No. 2, June 1955, pp. 470–77.

A wider study, *The Influence of Television on the Election of 1952*, was made by members of the Department of Marketing at Miami University in Ohio and published by Oxford Research Associates, Inc., Oxford, Ohio, in December 1954.

The 1960 radio-television debates of John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon provided an unprecedented opportunity in political broadcast campaigning. The background, the issues, the event, and the aftermath have all been examined by communications experts and political scientists. A collection of the material was gathered by Sidney Kraus in *The Great Debates: Background, Perspective, Effects*, a 1962 publication of Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Bernard Rubin, in *Political Television* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1967), provides a general survey of the uses and influences of television within the American political process from 1959 through 1964.

For a comparison of British and American experience, see *The Half-Shut Eye: Television and Politics in Britain and America*, by John Whale (New York: St. Martin's, 1969).

Two studies from England, though not dealing with the American electorate, provide some of the most precise data on the correlation between watching candidates on television and choosing among them at the polls. One, a study of the 1959 British election, is *Television and the Political Image*, by Joseph Trenamen and Denis McQuail (London: Methuen, 1961). The other, on the 1964 election, is *Television in Politics*, by Jay G. Blumler and Denis McQuail (London: Faber & Faber, 1968).

The 1959 study indicated that television provided voters with increased information about candidates and issues. But it appeared unlikely that political broadcasting had changed voters' attitudes. The second study verified one aspect of the first; again political television undoubtedly contributed to the electorate's knowledge of campaign issues and personalities. But the authors concluded that during the 1964 campaign an increasingly favorable public attitude toward the Liberal Party was a direct result of exposure to election television. This study also provides a provocative analysis of the varying uses the voter makes of political broadcasts—from seeking direct guidance to obtaining subtle reinforcement of voting decisions.

An example of commercial research is a study by a New York advertising agency, Cunningham & Walsh, of the role of television in the 1958 New York gubernatorial campaign. It pays special attention to the impression the voter received from television of the two major candidates, W. Averell Harriman and Nelson A. Rockefeller. The manuscript, dated March 1959, is titled "Television and the Political Candidate."

[3] Elihu Katz and Jacob J. Feldman review and tabulate the results of 31 independent research studies on the public reaction to the debates in a chapter titled "The Debates in the Light of Research: A Survey of Surveys" in Kraus' *The Great Debates* (Chapter 11, pp. 173–223).

[4] Klapper has found that the mass media may reinforce opinions already held rather than convert viewers or listeners. At least in part, this is because the influence of the media is supported by other factors and conditions, such as group membership, ego, opinion leaders, and the like. For more on this,

see *The Effects of Mass Communication*, cited in note 2.

Similarly the Langs have found a "crystallizing effect" upon voting intentions—movement away from being undecided, or even ready not to vote at all, to having a clear-cut preference. They discuss this effect and the "cumulative effect" in *Politics and Television* (note 2).

[5] Several organizations gather data on the pervasiveness of television. The Media Research Division of A.C. Nielson Co. has compiled many of the relevant statistics from its surveys made for the broadcasting industry in *Television '69* and in *U.S. Television Ownership Estimates* (1968).

Two research firms, the Television Information Office and the Television Bureau of Advertising, conduct surveys or sponsor studies on and for the industry.

[6] From "Is Anyone Really Listening?" in Muggeridge's *The Eye and I* (London: Triangle, 1966).

[7] The basic facts of radio growth and effect have been compiled by the Radio Advertising Bureau. Many of the surveys have been made by Trendex, Inc., R.L. Polk, and the U.S. Department of Commerce. These are reported in *Radio Facts Pocket Piece*, published by the Bureau, which has offices in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Detroit. According to this source, Brand Rating Index surveys in 1967 showed that 47 per cent of young men aged 18–24 are exposed to more than 120 minutes of radio in a normal day. For young women 18–24 years of age, 39.2 per cent are exposed to more than 135 minutes of radio per day.

[8] Basically a commercial system, coexisting with a smaller educational network, broadcasting in the United States presents a pattern far different from that of other countries.

Despite variations in broadcast structure from country to country, broadcasting in Western Europe either is completely noncommercial, with air time not for sale to anyone, or it integrates a limited form of commercial broadcasting, in which restricted portions of the broadcast day are available for commercial use. All countries in Western Europe that do permit the sale of air time prohibit broadcasters from selling time for political purposes. In the Communist countries of Eastern Europe no candidate buys political broadcast time. The broadcast structures of both England and Japan function on a dual basis—an older noncommercial system and a newer commercial enterprise. In the European pattern, both countries prohibit the commercial broadcaster from selling time to a political party or candidate.

Although these countries all prohibit the sale of time for political purposes, the democracies also supply limited amounts of broadcast time to the political candidates at no cost to him or his party. And since no additional time can be purchased, political broadcasting in Western Europe, England and Japan does not represent the potential financial burden to the candidate that it does in the United States.

Two excellent general surveys of political broadcasting in other countries are *National and International Systems of Broadcasting. Their History, Operation and Control*, by Walter B. Emory, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1969), and *Radio and Television Broadcasting on the European Continent*, by Burton Paulu (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967). Wilson P. Dizard's *Television: A World View* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1966) focuses on the rising influence and uses of television around the world. For an account of the English broadcasting experience, see two books by Burton Paulu, *British Broadcasting: Radio and Television in the United Kingdom and British Broadcasting in Transition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956 and 1961 respectively).

[9] National audience levels for network television programs are measured by the A.C. Nielson Co. and the American Research Bureau (Arbitron). From the published results it is possible to derive the number of viewers aged 21 and over who watched a given program. The 21 and over audience during an October 1968 "Rowan and Martin's Laugh-in" show was estimated at 23 milion. Slightly more than 73 million voted for President in 1968.

[10] Following is a partial list of sources for observations by candidates and those close to them on the importance of campaign television: Theodore H. White, *The Making of the President, 1968* (New York: Atheneum, 1968) and prior volumes; Penn Kimball, *Bobby Kennedy and the New Politics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968); Robert MacNeil, *The People Machine: The Influence of Television on American Politics* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968); James M. Perry, *The New Politics: The New Technology of Political Manipulation* (New York: Potter, 1968); and Gene Wyckoff, *The Image Candidates: American Politics in the Age of Television* (New York: Macmillan, 1968). See also Walter Troy Spencer, "The Agency Knack of Political Packaging," *Television Magazine*, August 1968; "Why Not Ban Paid Political Broadcasting?" *New Republic*, June 15, 1968; Thomas J. Fleming, "Selling the Product Named Hubert Humphrey," *New York Times Magazine*, October 13, 1968; *Broadcasting*, September 30, 1968 and June 2, 1969; *New York Post*, October 15, 1968; *Wall Street Journal*, October 4, 1968.

[11] The role of money in politics has not received extensive attention from scholars, but over the years several distinguished political scientists have specialized in this field, adding considerably to our knowledge of campaign financing.

In 1926, James K. Pollock's *Party Campaign Funds* (New York, Knopf) marked an important first step into such research. Concentrating on the presidential elections of 1900 through 1924 and using public files as well as party statements to which he was given access, Pollock studied campaign receipts and expenditures without attempting an exhaustive compilation of statistics. He also examined changes in federal statutes in this field.

The works of Louise Overacker of Wellesley are the major sources on campaign receipts and spending on the national level for the first forty years of this century. Her *Money in Elections* (New York: Macmillan, 1932) was a comprehensive study of campaign funds in the presidential elections of 1904 to 1928, focused mainly on national-level spending—where money was collected and where it was spent, who contributed and why. The study also summarized federal and state campaign financing legislation.

Miss Overacker supplemented *Money in Elections* with articles in the *American Political Science Review* about the elections of 1932 to 1944. The figures compiled in these works are interpreted in *Presidential Campaign Funds* (Boston: Boston University Press, 1946), a collection of her lectures on party finance and political campaigning.

Alexander Heard is also a major scholar in this field. His 1960 book *The Costs of Democracy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press) is the most exhaustive work to date on the complexities of modern campaign financing. It concentrates on the presidential elections of 1952 and 1956, covering the whole range of pertinent questions: Does money win elections? How is money raised? Who gives, and why? What is the role of labor and of business in politics? What have the electronic media, particularly television, done to the costs of campaigning?

The Citizens' Research Foundation in Princeton, N.J., regularly conducts research on election finance. Herbert E. Alexander, director of the foundation, has written extensively on the finances of presidential campaigns, in many articles and his books *Financing the 1960 Election* and *Financing the 1964 Election*.

From time to time, Senate and House committees have studied the financing of elections, especially at the presidential level. The most comprehensive report was made by the Gore Committee—the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections—on the election of 1956 (*1956 General Election Campaigns*, Report to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, 85th Cong., 1st sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957).

In *The Costs of Democracy* (pp. 7–8), Heard estimated that total political costs at all levels were $140 million in 1952 and rose about 11 per cent to $155 million in 1956. The Citizens' Research Foundation has estimated that in 1960 there was an increase of $20 million, about 13 per cent, and that in 1964 the total for all levels grew to $200 million, or by about 14 per cent (Alexander, works cited above).

[12] Under the terms of the federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, as amended, only associations, organizations, or committees that operate in two or more states or that are branches or subsidiaries of national organizations are required to file reports on receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. These reports must include the name and address of each person making a contribution of $100 or more, with date and amount, as well as a list of all expenditures exceeding $10, with purpose of payment.

Various state political committees, county party committees, local clubs, independent committees, and associations also work, at least in part, for the election of the national ticket. Systematic figures on their receipts and expenditures are impossible to obtain. Their expenditures need not be reported to the Clerk of the House because they do not operate in more than one state and they usually represent themselves as independent of national organizations. Forty-three states have reporting laws, but the specific requirements vary from state to state.

Heard has observed (*The Costs of Democracy*, pp. 354–55) that the federal reporting laws have had a decentralizing effect on party organization, increasing the importance of local committees. Since each committee's outlays are limited, numerous committees are created during campaigns to reach the desired level of spending.

The federal statutes applying to campaign finance reporting are given in Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities: Federal Corrupt Practices Act; Hatch Political Activities Act* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.)

[13] Alexander, "Financing Parties and Campaigns in 1968: A Preliminary Report," a paper prepared for presentation to the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, 1969. According to the reports filed with the Clerk of the House, the Wallace campaign receipts were $6,975,000 and expenditures were $7,243,000.

[14] Cost per vote figures were first computed by Overacker on the basis of total votes cast and total direct expenditures by national campaign organizations associated with the parties, as recorded in official sources (*Money in Elections*, pp. 79–81). Heard continued to use her categories in *The Costs of Democracy* (pp. 376–77), and Alexander has followed the practice in his quadrennial Citizens' Research Foundation publications on presidential campaign financing. Although figures on contributions by labor and by miscellaneous other committees were available to the latter two scholars, they disregarded such figures in order to keep recent computations as consistent as possible with earlier ones. For a few of the middle years, Heard's figures do not include expenditures by congressional campaign committees, so

that increases between the earlier and later years are somewhat exaggerated.

The figures given in the text differ slightly from cost per vote figures used by Heard and Alexander, because of definitional variations in the expenditure series used.

[15] Heard, *The Costs of Democracy*, pp. 17–18, citing Overacker, *Money in Elections*, p. 73, and her various articles in the *American Political Science Review*.

[16] Alexander, "Financing Parties and Campaigns in 1968: A Preliminary Report," pp. 55, 66–67.

[17] Responses to questions asked in this unpublished poll are given in Kimball's *Bobby Kennedy and the New Politics*, pp. 178–79. Sixty-three per cent felt that most politicians take graft. Asked whether men in politics are dedicated public servants, 64 per cent replied that only a few are.

[18] Both the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan and George H. Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion have asked people through the years if they have contributed to a political party or candidate. The Survey Research Center found that 4 per cent reported contributing in 1952, 10 per cent in 1956, 12 per cent in 1960, and 11 per cent in 1964 (Robinson, Rusk, and Head, *Measures of Political Attitudes*, p. 603), and it estimates that 6 per cent of the population made a political contribution in 1968. Gallup's results are similar. Except for 1968, both sets of findings are presented in Alexander's *Financing the 1964 Election* (p. 69).

[19] Kennedy, "A Force That Has Changed the Political Scene," *TV Guide*, November 14, 1959.

In 1961, Kennedy created the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, under the direction of Alexander Heard, to study the problems of presidential campaign financing. Its report was published in 1962 under the title *Financing Presidential Campaigns* (Washington: Government Printing Office).

[20] See Herbert E. Alexander, *Regulating Political Finance* (Princeton and Berkeley: Citizens' Research Foundation and Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, 1966). See also note 12 for further discussion of financial reporting.

[21] *Presidential Campaign Funds*, p. 45.

[22] From Eisenhower's "The Ticklish Problem of Political Fund Raising—and Spending," *Reader's Digest*, January 1968.

[23] The issue continues to be debated by candidates and their managers, broadcasters, editorial columnists, and others concerned with political television.

Representative expressions of opinion can be found in the following: Harriet van Horne, "See How They Run," *New York Post*, August 19, 1967; G. D. Wiebe, "A New Dimension in Journalism," *Journalism Quarterly*, Autumn 1964; Jack Gould, "Candidates on TV—The Ideal and Others," *New York Times Magazine*, October 28, 1962; editorial, *New York Times*, April 21, 1966; Elmer Lower, network official, NBC News press release, June 6, 1960; William Paley, speech before the Poor Richard Club, Philadelphia, January 1953; Carmine DeSapio, *New York News* interview, May 28, 1950; *TV and Politics: A Forum*, Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, 1960, panel discussion on June 8, 1960, with Paul Butler, Senator Thruston B. Morton, former Governor W. Averell Harriman, Senator Jacob Javits, William McAndrew, and Elmo Roper. For an early skeptic's view of the role of television in campaigning, see "TV and the Voter," by Gilbert Seldes in the *Saturday Review*, December 6, 1952.

[24] Figures derived from data compiled by A. C. Nielson Co. and Leading National Advertisers. Al Gardner, an advertising agency representative who worked on a presidential candidate's unsuccessful primary bid in 1968, observed that "almost the worst prime-time 20-second spot got more audience than the best half-hour program." *Television Magazine*, August 1968.

[25] In 1968, for example, the networks especially created five-minute time slots for presidential political advertisers by having regularly scheduled programs edited down. These five-minute broadcasts had been available to political buyers since 1956, but never before had so many been offered systematically. The CBS television network sold the bulk of them, although the other two networks sold some. These slots were priced at a sixth of the cost of the half-hour rate for the time period. This was only about half as much as a one-minute "participation" (spot announcement) within a regular prime-time program because spot prices are based on the commercial value of the program in which they appear while the five-minute charge was only for time. The NBC television network accommodated candidates' demands for time by halving its prices to political buyers for whatever one-minute participations remained unsold in the network schedule and for a group of additional one-minute participations created expressly for political buyers by reducing program time in sixty- and ninety-minute evening programs. A few chains and stations offered discounts to political candidates for all time bought.

[26] Major and minor parties qualified at least twelve presidential candidates for appearance on state ballots in 1960: Democratic Party, John F. Kennedy; Republican Party, Richard M. Nixon; Socialist Labor Party, Eric Hass; Prohibition Party, Rutherford L. Decker; National States Rights Party, Orval Faubus; Socialist Workers Party, Farrell Dobbs; Constitutional Party, Charles Loten Sullivan; Conservative Party of New Jersey, Joseph Bracken Lee; Virginia Conservative Party, C. Benton Coiner; Tax Cut Party, Lar Daly; Independent Afro-American Party, Clennon King; Constitution Party, Merrit B. Curtis. In two states, parties qualified to appear on the ballot without naming presidential candidates: States Rights Party of Louisiana; Independent American Party (in Michigan).

In addition, the following were the 1960 presidential candidates of their parties, although their names appeared on no state ballots: American Vegetarian Party, Symon Gould; American Third Party, Henry Krajewski; Greenback Party, Whitney Harp Slocum; American Beat Consensus, William Lloyd Smith. There may have been others.

In 1964, at least eight major and minor parties qualified presidential candidates for appearance on State ballots: Democratic Party, Lyndon B. Johnson; Republican Party, Barry M. Goldwater; Socialist Labor Party, Eric Hass; Socialist Workers Party, Clifton DeBerry; Prohibition Party, E. Harold Munn; National States Rights Party, John Kasper; Constitution Party, Joseph B. Lightburn; Universal Party, James Hensley. Mrs. Yetta Bronstein, a Bronx housewife, campaigned with the slogan "Things'll get betta with Yetta" and called her organization the Best Party. She was an announced candidate though her name did not appear on any state ballots.

In 1968, at least nine major and minor parties qualified presidential candidates for appearance on state ballots: Democratic Party, Hubert H. Humphrey; Republican Party, Richard M. Nixon; American Independent Party, George C. Wallace; Prohibition Party, E. Harold Munn; Peace and Freedom Party, Eldridge Cleaver; Socialist Labor Party, Henning Blomen; Socialist Workers Party, Fred Halstead; New Party, Dick Gregory; Communist Party, Charlene Mitchell. Also, electors for Senator Eugene McCarthy appeared on the ballots of a few states.

[27] In 1968, for example, there were nine candidates (not all on state ballots) in addition to Nixon, Humphrey, and Wallace who would probably have been considered by the FCC to be legally qualified under Section 315(a). The list included Reverend Hensley of the Universal Party, Eric Sabastian of the National Hamiltonian Party, Eldridge Cleaver of the Peace and Freedom Party, Dick Gregory of the New Party, and Bishop Tomlinson of the Theocratic Party.

[28] Alexander, *Financing the 1960 Election*, pp. 57, 59; *Financing the 1964 Election*, pp. 59, 86.

[29] See note 18.

[30] Alexander, *Financing the 1964 Election*, pp. 70, 85.

TABLE 1.—MASS MEDIA AS SOURCES OF NEWS (ROPER POLLS)

[Percent]

A. SOURCE OF MOST NEWS

	1959	1961	1963	1964	1967	1968
Television	51	52	55	58	64	59
Newspapers	57	57	53	56	55	49
Radio	34	34	29	26	28	25
Magazines	8	9	6	8	7	7
People	4	5	4	5	4	5
Don't know; no answer	1	3	3	3	2	3

B. MOST BELIEVABLE

	1959	1961	1963	1964	1967	1968
Television	29	39	36	41	41	44
Newspapers	32	24	24	23	24	21
Magazines	10	10	10	10	8	11
Radio	12	12	12	8	7	8
Don't know; no answer	17	17	18	18	20	16

C. MAJOR SOURCE OF NEWS ABOUT CANDIDATES

	State offices		Local offices		National offices	
	1964	1968	1964	1968	1964	1968
Television	43	42	27	26	64	65
Newspapers	41	37	42	40	36	24
Radio	10	6	10	6	9	4
People	8	9	18	23	4	4
Magazines	1	1	1	1	6	5
Other	4	4	7	4	3	2

D. SOURCE GIVING CLEAREST UNDERSTANDING OF NATIONAL ISSUES AND CANDIDATES

	1964	1968
Television	51	57
Newspapers	26	23
Magazines	10	10
Radio	6	4

Source: "Burns W. Roper," A 10-Year View of Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media, 1959–68, "A Report by Roper Research Associates, Television Information Office, New York," 1969.

Note: Since multiple answers were accepted, some of the columns total more than 100 percent. The source does not explain why some columns total less than 100 percent.

TABLE 2.—CHARGES[1] FOR BROADCASTS, GENERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, BY PARTY 1956-68

[In thousands of dollars]

	1956	1960	1964	1968
A. TELEVISION				
Networks:				
Republicans	1,733	1,820	1,912	4,189
Democrats	1,197	1,107	1,895	2,501
Other				672
Total	2,931	2,927	3,807	7,362
Stations:				
Republicans	2,004	3,611	7,519	10,994
Democrats	1,549	3,308	5,820	7,923
Other	152	206	350	808
Total	3,705	7,125	13,689	19,725

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—CHARGES [1] FOR BROADCASTS, GENERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, BY PARTY 1956–68—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1956	1960	1964	1968
A. TELEVISION—Con.				
Television, total:				
Republicans	3,737	5,431	9,431	15,183
Democrats	2,746	4,415	7,715	10,424
Other	152	206	350	1,480
Total	6,636	10,052	17,496	27,087
B. RADIO				
Networks:				
Republicans	145	45	89	469
Democrats	176	34	31	178
Other				16
Total	321	79	119	663
Stations:				
Republicans	1,500	2,083	3,513	6,853
Democrats	1,198	1,756	3,267	4,846
Other	164	225	209	954
Total	2,861	4,064	6,988	12,654
Radio, total:				
Republicans	1,645	2,128	3,602	7,322
Democrats	1,374	1,790	3,298	5,024
Other	164	225	209	970
Total	3,182	4,143	7,108	13,316
C. TOTAL BROADCASTING				
Republicans	5,382	7,559	13,033	22,505
Democrats	4,121	6,205	11,013	15,448
Other	316	431	559	2,450
Total	9,818	14,195	24,604	40,403

[1] Before discounts but after commissions.

Source: 1956, "1956 General Election Campaigns," 85th Cong., 1st session, 1960, 1964, and 1968, FCC, Survey of Political Broadcasting.

TABLE 3.—CHARGES [1] FOR BROADCASTS, TO PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL ASPIRANTS, PRIMARIES AND GENERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, 1964 AND 1968

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964	1968
A. Television:		
Networks:		
Primaries:		
Republicans	257	1,008
Democrats		511
Other		
Subtotal	257	1,519
General campaigns:		
Republicans	1,912	4,189
Democrats	1,895	2,501
Other		672
Subtotal	3,807	7,362
Networks, total:		
Republicans	2,168	5,197
Democrats	1,895	3,012
Other		672
Subtotal	4,064	8,881
Stations:		
Primaries:		
Republicans	637	1,514
Democrats	245	2,887
Other	64	267
Subtotal	946	4,668
General campaigns:		
Republicans	3,205	4,818
Democrats	1,870	1,974
Other	13	484
Subtotal	5,089	7,276
Stations, total:		
Republicans	3,842	6,332
Democrats	2,115	4,861
Other	78	751
Subtotal	6,035	11,944

TABLE 3.—CHARGES FOR BROADCASTS, TO PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL ASPIRANTS, PRIMARIES AND GENERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, 1964 AND 1968—Con.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964	1968
A. Television—Continued		
Television, total:		
Republicans	6,010	11,529
Democrats	4,010	7,873
Other	78	1,423
Total	10,099	20,825
B. Radio:		
Networks:		
Primaries:		
Republicans	2	29
Democrats		
Other		
Subtotal	2	29
General campaigns:		
Republicans	89	469
Democrats	31	178
Other		16
Subtotal	119	663
Networks, total:		
Republicans	91	498
Democrats	31	178
Other		16
Subtotal	122	692
Stations:		
Primaries:		
Republicans	355	436
Democrats	166	1,392
Other	22	73
Subtotal	543	1,901
General campaigns:		
Republicans	1,164	3,122
Democrats	878	1,491
Other	25	463
Subtotal	2,067	5,076
Stations, total:		
Republicans	1,519	3,558
Democrats	1,043	2,883
Other	48	536
Subtotal	2,610	6,977
Radio, total:		
Republicans	1,610	4,056
Democrats	1,074	3,061
Other	48	552
Total	2,732	7,669
C. Total, broadcasting:		
Republicans	7,620	15,585
Democrats	5,084	10,934
Other	126	1,975
Total	12,830	28,494

[1] Before discounts but after commissions.

Source: FCC, Survey of Political Broadcasting.

TABLE 4.—DIRECT CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES BY NATIONAL-LEVEL COMMITTEES, 1912–68 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Amount
1912	2.9
1916	4.7
1920	6.9
1924	6.4
1928	11.6
1932	5.1
1936	14.1
1940	7.8
1944	7.7
1948	7.8
1952	11.6
1956	12.9
1960	19.9
1964	24.8
1968	44.2

[1] Direct expenditures exclude transfers to candidates and committees. Expenditures by national-level committees are primarily for presidential and vice-presidential candidates; they do not, however, include expenditures at State and local levels in behalf of national candidates.

Source: Citizens' Research Foundation.

TABLE 5.—CONTRIBUTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS TO NATIONAL-LEVEL COMMITTEES AND PERCENT FROM LARGE CONTRIBUTORS, DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES, 1952–68 [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

	Total	$500 or more	
		Amount	Percent
1952:			
Republicans	$4,329	$2,944	68
Democrats	3,466	2,184	63
Total	7,795	5,128	66
1956:			
Republicans	3,837	2,839	74
Democrats	3,508	1,104	44
Total	6,345	3,943	62
1960:			
Republicans	6,214	3,603	58
Democrats	3,376	1,992	59
Total	9,590	5,595	58
1964:			
Republicans	12,610	3,475	28
Democrats	7,034	4,859	69
Total	19,644	8,335	42
1968:			
Republicans	22,885	10,662	47
Democrats	11,237	8,911	79
Total	34,121	19,573	57

[1] The number of committees involved in these computations varies from year to year.

Sources: 1952 and 1956 derived from Alexander Heard, "The Costs of Democracy" (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960), pp. 48, 51. 1960 from Herbert E. Alexander, "Financing the 1960 Election" (Citizens' Research Foundation, Princeton, N.J.), p. 58. 1964 from Alexander, "Financing the 1964 Election," p. 85. 1968 estimated on the basis of preliminary data.

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on September 29, 1969, and I thought it would be of interest to the Members:

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE

President Nixon asked for increased public support for his efforts to settle the Vietnamese war, and immediately got a response.

But it wasn't the response he asked for, and it certainly wasn't the kind of response that will help wind the war down to an honorable conclusion.

Immediately after the President's news conference on Friday, a group of 24 congressional Democrats embarked on a campaign to "escalate the pressure" for what amounts in truth to an unblushing bug-out.

Led by Sen. Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma, the Democratic national chairman, the legislators announced that they have agreed in general to ally themselves with some of the more vociferous antiwar demonstrators.

The senators and representatives will take an active part, in Congress and out of it, in the Vietnam "moratorium" and other antiwar experiences planned for October.

Thus the lawmakers are allying themselves formally with the street people, the groups and individuals responsible for so much of the violence and disruption that has threatened to tear the nation apart.

It is an act of political irresponsibility unworthy of the high offices these men hold. Perhaps some of the violent insanities that will be perpetrated during the October dem-

onstrations will further educate the moderate majority of Americans on the dangers inherent in the unholy alliance of violent extremists and demagogic "peace" politicians.

BEN JENSEN, POLITICAL WARHORSE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we all remember with affection our former colleague, Congressman Ben Jensen, of Iowa. I thought the Members of the House might be interested in reading this piece about him which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on Sunday, September 28, 1969:

BEN JENSEN, POLITICAL WARHORSE WON'T BE PASTURED

(By Art Johnson)

EXIRA, Iowa—It's difficult to put Benjamin Franklin Jensen into one story.

For instance, the 76-year-old veteran of World War I, business man, congressman for 26 years, who insists he "will never retire," has:

Written two books he hopes to have published.

Expanded his home museum to devote separate rooms to George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

Maintained a keen interest in the Audubon County Museum on Exira's main street, which he helped organize.

Kept up and added to his large home, which has an ex-congressman's study, vegetable garden and decorative handmade deer.

Invented a golf-type game for senior citizens.

But for Ben F. Jensen politics is never hidden or forgotten.

The theme which helped him win election as Seventh District Republican congressman the first time, in 1938, seems stronger than ever to him as he insists that the United States should "avoid foreign entanglements" mentioned by George Washington, and "reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine" to limit our war efforts to the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

VIETNAM DISGRACE

Also, his strong conservatism pours out in opposition to heavy federal spending as he says:

"The history of the world tells us that any nation which spends more than 35 percent of its total income in federal, state and local taxes is doomed. We're now on the ragged edge of runaway inflation."

In answer to a suggestion that the Monroe Doctrine may be outdated, Jensen said:

"Recent developments have made no difference. It is more apropos today than ever before." He emphasized that the doctrine kept the United States at peace from 1823 until 1917, with the exception of the Spanish-American War.

As for Vietnam, "the money we spend there is a disgraceful thing," he said. "The day after they end the war the Chinese Commies will begin building forces to strike again—maybe in Chili and Peru where they have lots of followers, or Bolivia, which is controlled by Commies. That's all the more reason for reaffirming the Monroe Doctrine."

An opponent of foreign aid while in Congress, Jensen today maintains the same attitude. In his book, "Get Out and Stay Out," Jensen writes:

"The irony of it all is that today Uncle Sam has less friends abroad than he had in 1948. . . . At least 95 percent of the nations to whom these billions have been given are giving us no help in money or men in the Vietnam war; many of these nations are selling the Communists shiploads of commodities of most every nature, including materials of war."

IKE WAS BEST

Of the five presidents he served under, Jensen labeled Franklin D. Roosevelt and Lyndon Johnson as "men who would not listen to advice;" Truman was a "real nice guy," and John Kennedy a hard worker. His ideal was Dwight Eisenhower, whom he considered a great president and general.

"I loved Ike, but I only voted with him on budgets 64 percent of the time," Jensen said.

In his "Get Out" book, he criticizes the courtpacking practices of FDR, asserting that "two of our three branches of government, the legislative and judicial, have been so weakened by degrees . . . leaving in the hands of the presidents since 1933 dictatorial powers never intended by our founding fathers."

He added that after World War I "the destroyers of peace and freedom began their well-planned schemes to change our system of government which brought about this entangled mess in which we find ourselves today.

"It was planned that way by the worldwide Communist conspiracy, in cooperation with socialistic planners here as willing tools to front for them."

The longtime foe of federal spending said that the late Senator Everett Dirksen was "one reason I became a conservative. He was a conservative-plus."

Jensen recalled that he served with Dirksen on the Appropriations Committee when both were House members. "When Dirksen went to the Senate he became a midle-of-the roader," Jensen added.

Jensen's other book, an autobiography, is entitled "A Ditchdigger's Son Goes to Congress." In it he tells of his own ditchdigging experiences as a youth.

"IN MEMORY OF HAMBURGER HILL"—BY PFC. ALBERT COLLETTO

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, every one of us in this Chamber has received letters from parents of boys killed in Vietnam. But few here have received more tragic messages than the one I received recently from Mrs. Albert Colletto, Jr., the mother of Albert Colletto, one of those brave young men who will not be coming home.

In addition to the letter, I also received a prayer card from Albert Colletto's aunt. On the back of the card was a poem that Albert Colletto wrote after he fought in the battle of Hamburger Hill and shortly before he was killed somewhere in the jungles of Vietnam.

Private First Class Colletto's poem, "In Memory of Hamburger Hill," captures the anguish and despair of men at war.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce Albert Colletto's poem into the RECORD now for the edification of my colleagues:

IN MEMORY OF HAMBURGER HILL

(By Pfc. Albert V. Colletto, Jr., U.S. 52–859–565, 101 A. B. Inf.—Co. C 1/506—Died 1969)

As I lie here among the trees,
the smell of the dying is in the breeze.
A Soldier cried out, Come to me please,
there was no need, he ceased to breathe.

The wounded laid dying, and the dead already gone,
a Sergeant yelled, get up, drive on.
With the lead flying in from every way,
I didn't expect to last the day.

We fought hard trying to win,
but at last we stopped, as night set in.
Dig in deep was the word,
to those who were left it didn't seem absurd

They called our assault Hamburger Hill,
a name well put, but will you remember it,
as always I will.

Ask the lame,
they can tell you it wasn't a game.
You can ask the dead,
but remember their aim.

Peace is golden and may be achieved,
if men would learn to love,
the burden of war would be relieved.
This is a true story, it is no lie,
give credit to the dead, because of the hill they died.

ELKS FOR LAW AND ORDER

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of crime, riots, violence, and disorders of many kinds. They no longer wish to sit back and deplore the chaos that grows out of disrespect for the rights of others. The people are now speaking out and demanding action against those who defy our laws and disrupt the peace of their communities.

I was impressed by a recent resolution adopted in convention assembled in Dallas by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America. It sums up the concern not only of their organization but also of the great majority of Americans.

The resolution follows:

Whereas, the members of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, numbering a million and a half American gentlemen who believe in God and revere our country's flag and realize the necessity to preserve the Constitution of the United States of America and the Bill of Rights, which have served to establish the finest system of government in the world, and

Whereas, we deplore the presence of crime in our streets, violence and disorder on our campuses, and lack of respect by a minority of our people for our Country's flag and the rights of others, and

Whereas, we abhor the anarchy and chaos in our schools and communities with a continuance of riots, demonstrations, and disorders which bring about malicious destruction of property and danger to the personal safety of our people, and

Whereas, we and all other loyal Americans, having displayed much patience and forbearance, are angered, dismayed and disgusted with the illegal acts of radicals, extremists, trained agitators and militants, and

Whereas, we desire to express our concern for the future of our society and particularly our youth, the majority of whom are decent and law-abiding.

Be it hereby resolved, that we stand for discipline of those who defy our laws, with the knowledge that public order is essential to achieve a solution to our domestic problems;

That we call for the full support of our membership for our law enforcement agencies and courts, and full cooperation in the enforcement of their duties in the prosecution of those who have caused, instigated or aided violations of our laws and disorder in our schools and communities;

That we favor intelligent dissent, properly used and presented, but not as an excuse for violence or destruction;

That we demand the arrest and prosecution of those dissidents, radicals and militants who engage in criminal acts of riot, disorder and rebellion against the laws of our Country;

That we demand the expulsion from school of those participating in violent demonstrations, riots or the disruption of classes and the operation of schools, colleges or universities, public or private, whether on or near the school premises, and we demand the revocation of scholarships, grants or other monetary aids of a public nature extended to those participating in such acts.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be distributed to all Lodges of our Order where it is to be read on the floor of the Lodge at an appropriate session, posted in a prominent place in the Lodge quarters, reproduced in the Lodge bulletin and given publicity through the local news media so that not only the members of our Order but also all the citizens of our Country will know that the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America respects the laws of our land and supports those charged with their enforcement.

Adopted by the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks in Convention assembled in Dallas, Texas on July 14, 1969.

EDWARD W. MCCABE,
Grand Exalted Ruler.
FRANKLIN J. FITZPATRICK,
Grand Secretary.

MAHATMA GANDHI

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1969]

MAHATMA (MAHA: GREAT; ATMAN: SOUL)

(By Colman McCarthy)

One hundred years ago yesterday, in a small house in the small state of Porbandar overlooking the Arabian Sea in western India, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born, the fourth and last child of his father's fourth and last marriage. Before he was to walk into a New Delhi prayer ground 77 years later and be assassinated by a Hindu madman who bowed in reverence to the Mahatma before firing three bullets, Ghandi was to lead a realized life of prayer, political action, non-violence, self-control, compassion, simplicity and wisdom. The Indian poet Tagore called his friend Gandhi, "the Great Soul in beggar's, garb," but for himself Gandhi preferred to unite his life with the self-claimed term, *satyagraha*, literally, "holding onto the truth."

Although the effectiveness of his politics was perhaps the major reason for Gandhi's world prominence, the strength of his political victories has been gradually weakened in the 21 years since his death; freedom for India has not meant freedom *in* India. Not since independence in 1947 has there been as much death and blood in India as in recent weeks, much of it in Gujurat, the saint's home state.

Gandhi understood the lack of vision and spine in not only the British politicians from whom he helped liberate India, but also as it appeared in the Indian government. "Our statesmen," he wrote angrily, "have for over two generations declaimed against the heavy expenditure on armaments under the British regime, but now that freedom from political serfdom has come, our military expenditure has increased and still threatens to increase, and of this we are proud. There is not a voice raised against it in our legislative chambers."

For Gandhi, this joining of the arms race, even 21 years ago, was "a death dance" that sickened him; morally, Gandhi called it "a mad imitation of the tinsel of the West."

Although Gandhi had a childhood, he had no boyhood. At 13, he was married in a parentally arranged union to another 13-year-old, a girl in Porbandar who was a stranger to him. "Oh, that first night," Gandhi humorously wrote years later about his wedding. "Two innocent children all unwittingly hurled themselves into the ocean of life. My brother's wife had thoroughly coached me about my behavior on the first night." But the child newlyweds apparently believed they had lived before in an earlier incarnation, and thus were not nervous. "No coaching is really necessary in such matters," said Gandhi. "The impressions of the former birth are potent enough to make all coaching superfluous." To be sure. The marriage lasted 62 years.

At 18, Gandhi went to England to pursue a law degree, but not until after taking three vows: to avoid women, wine and meat. The solemnity he gave to the vows and their observance indicates that already Gandhi took seriously the Hindu asceticisms of self-control and self-renunciation. He was to take many other vows later in life, including *brahmacharya* (celibacy), even though he continued to live with his wife. Gandhi's style of self-discipline was not the spiritual push-ups that the professionally pious sweat through to keep their souls in shape. Instead, it was a life force by which action was sanctified because the person acting was undergoing sanctification.

In the preface to the New Directions paperback, "Gandhi on Non-Violence," Thomas Merton wrote that the spirit behind Gandhi's vows is "fundamentally necessary if man is to recover his right mind." A mind that is right for Gandhi personally meant one that is in accord with the *Bhagavad Gita*, the sacred Hindu poem that stresses self-realization and union with God through action. Gandhi did not wish to become the realized self of the Vedanta way, which is meditative and withdrawn, but to do so through service to the poor and selfless action without regard for its fruits. When Gandhi established his famous *ashram* (religious community) at Sabarmati, it was intentional that a leper lived in the hut next to the Mahatma's. It was through action—whether cleaning the wounds of a leper or rousing the conscience of a nation—that Gandhi sought to become fully realized.

Gandhi's social protest began in South Africa where he had gone at 23 to practice law and was an immediate victim of anti-Indian racism. In an incident similar to the 1956 Montgomery, Ala., bus boycott, Gandhi was touched off by being denied a first class seat on a South African train. Soon after, he gathered a group of his countrymen "to present them a picture of their condition." His anger with the South African government then is similar to the anger of many American blacks with the United States government now: "for feeding the prejudice by legalizing it." Gandhi, who came to South Africa for a few months, stayed 20 years, fighting for Indians' civil rights.

As he went further along in politics, Gandhi went further into religion. Knowing that a basic need of spiritual men is community, he gathered a few followers and founded "a sort of cooperative commonwealth" on a small scale where civil resisters, pacifists and their families "would be trained to live a new and simple life in harmony with one another."

Gandhi called his commune The Tolstoy Farm, after the Russian novelist and mystic with whom he had corresponded. On 1,100 acres 21 miles outside of Johannesburg, the Mahatma and his community of about 40 raised their own crops, baked their bread, built their homes and taught their children about God and the world.

By this time in his life, his mid-40s, when he was to return to India to fight the injustices of British rule, Gandhi was confirmed in the way of *ahimsa*, non-violence. "I claim to be a passionate seeker after the truth, which is but another name for God. In the course of that search the discovery of non-violence came to me. Its spread is my life mission. I have no interest in living except for . . . that mission."

Knowing that throwing himself into politics would mean being thrown into jails, Gandhi combined sanctity and patriotism as few ever did. "The real road to happiness lies in going to jail and undergoing sufferings and privations there in the interest of one's country and religion."

It is not accidental that in the present antiwar and civil rights movements in the United States, Gandhi is often the patron saint of those imprisoned for civil disobedience. Dorothy Day, Martin Luther King, Cesar Chavez, Daniel and Philip Berrigan and countless pacifists hauled off to places like the Lewisburg, Pa., prison have put their lives on the same line Gandhi put his. "It is the law of love that rules mankind," he wrote. "Had violence, i.e., hate ruled us, we should have become extinct long ago. And yet the tragedy of it is that the so-called civilized men and nations conduct themselves as if the basis of society was violence."

It is awkward to assess Gandhi's place in history. The pictures of the small, round-headed old man, wearing granny glasses and with stubble hair on his chest like tufts of worn brillo radiate quaintness more than power. So does his autobiography; it is filled with touching accounts about his vegetarianism, how he learned to cut his own hair, his love of the *Gita*, his hatred of brute force, his thoughts on educating children.

Perhaps Gandhi has no place in history, which is dead and abstract, because he has taken his place in the hearts and minds of living men. His power was in what he yearned. More than that. His power is alive today because yearning is alive today, among men who seek peace, realization and, like Gandhi, seek each other.

LT. ANDREW F. O'SULLIVAN, U.S. MARINE, CORPS AWARDED SILVER STAR

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word of the gallant actions in combat of Marine Lt.

Andrew F. O'Sullivan, the son of my good friends of long standing, Mr. and Mrs. Denis O'Sullivan. Lieutenant O'Sullivan was awarded the Silver Star for what the Marine Corps terms his "superb leadership and indominable fighting spirit." He was seriously wounded in action in Landing Zone Argonne in Vietnam but I am happy to report that he is now fully recovered and will be on his way home shortly. Having known the O'Sullivan family for many years I do not find it surprising that Lieutenant O'Sullivan thought first not of himself but of his men and fellow officers even though he himself was wounded. We should all thank God that we have young men like Andrew O'Sullivan—and parents such as he has.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent I include an article from the Brooklyn Heights Press describing the action for which Lieutenant O'Sullivan was awarded the Silver Star:

COBBLE HILL MARINE LIEUTENANT AWARDED SILVER STAR

Marine Lieutenant Andrew F. O'Sullivan of Cobble Hill, wounded in heavy fighting in Vietnam in March, has been awarded the Silver Star, one of the highest honors in the armed forces, for remaining at his post despite his wounds.

Now completely recovered from his wounds, Lt. O'Sullivan, 25, was in the first wave of assault helicopters to hit Landing Zone Argonne. His unit immediately came under heavy fire from entrenched North Vietnamese equipped with rocket grenades and automatic weapons.

He quickly set up an artillery coordinating center and then ran across the bullet-swept terrain to forward points where he could direct the artillerymen better. His directions brought direct fire on the enemy posts and soon allowed medical evacuation copters to remove wounded.

Lt. O'Sullivan kept his position through the night and into the morning when the North Vietnamese began hitting the Marine position with mortar fire. Moving out of his covered position, Lt. O'Sullivan took over an open mortar when one of his platoon commanders was wounded. Although inexperienced with mortars, he fired round after round at the enemy while shouting artillery directions to his radio operator.

Midway through the morning battle, he was wounded but kept going while also taking over direction of a recoilless rifle crew.

When his turn came for helicopter evacuation, he refused because other key officers had been wounded and were out of action. He remained throughout the battle and agreed to evacuation only after the landing zone was secure.

The citation for his Silver Star reads: "His superb leadership and indominable fighting spirit inspired all who observed him and contributed significantly to securing of the vital landing zone."

Lt. O'Sullivan's roots are solidly in Cobble Hill. He was born at Long Island College Hospital where his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Denis O'Sullivan of Amity St. met 32 years ago and still work.

He attended St. Charles Borromeo Elementary School, St. Francis Prep, and then St. Francis College, where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in industrial management in 1967.

Soon after graduating from St. Francis he joined the Marines and entered Officer Candidate School, emerging as an artillery lieutenant.

While in the Marines, Lt. O'Sullivan married the former Marie Habib, who also grew up in Cobble Hill.

He was assigned to Vietnam in October 1968 and is due back in early November.

Mrs. O'Sullivan, his wife, said "We're very, very proud but we wish he didn't have to go through it just to get it."

TIME TO TELL DIVERSIFIED METALS—WHAT REALLY IS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, many of our contemporaries are of the opinion that the primary reason for high unemployment is the lack of initiative on the part of the unemployed and his unwillingness to work.

Recently, the Diversified Metals Corp., a company in St. Louis, Mo., ran full page advertisements in local papers emphasizing their inability to get employees and accusing the unemployed of being lazy. Even more distasteful was their attempt to blame the Government for what Diversified called the handout program.

I am submitting to my colleagues an article written by Harold Antoine, deputy general manager of the St. Louis Human Development Corp. His comments adequately refute the laments of an apparent labor exploiter:

GENTLEMEN: Diversified Metals Corporation, in the press and in their advertisements, has recently blamed their employment difficulties on the "laziness" of the unemployed who, they say, are not willing to work as long as they can get government handouts. They further say that they have received little help from the public employment agencies. In all these complaints, they say they are "telling it like it is."

They are not telling it like it is, and they are certainly not telling all of it. As the representative of one of the public agencies they refer to, the Human Development Corporation, let me outline our experience with this company.

One of our employment programs, the Comprehensive Manpower Program, has referred over two hundred job applicant's to Diversified Metals during the past year. One hundred of these were hired. Other agencies, too, such as Missouri State Employment Service, have also referred many clients.

Virtually all of these jobs have been entry-level factory laboring jobs, paying, until recently, a good deal less that a hundred dollars a week. The turnover rate has been very high, and our counselors and job developers have thoroughly investigated the situation to find out why.

This is what we found. The entry-level factory jobs are, as Diversified admits, hard, hot, and heavy, involving the sorting, carrying, and feeding of scrap metal into various reclamation processes. In addition, there is high pressure from production supervisors, including a good deal of racist insult. The attitude of management is hostile, as evidenced by spy cameras and other practices. General working conditions are poor and there is no adequate provision for food service. On some jobs, lunch breaks and rest periods are not regular, but depend on machine shutdown.

Willingness aside, not many people are physically and mentally able to do this kind of work, under these conditions. Those who are can work at a regular foundry or steel company, and make far more money than Diversified offers, in better conditions.

There are other minor difficulties. Night shifts are not possible without private transportation, since there is no night bus service between the city and Diversified's location north of the airport. Police records, which Diversified says they will accept in some cases, must be provided by the applicant himself prior to employment. This poses a great difficulty for many.

Diversified's reputation has now spread throughout the community. As a result, most of the city's unemployed are indeed not willing to work—at Diversified Metals.

We appreciate the company's problem. Scrap salvage is a low-value product, and to make it economically feasible costs must be kept low. Technological improvement is one way to accomplish this; exploitive labor practice is another. Evidently Diversified has chosen the latter.

Since this is 1969, not 1869, exploitation of cheap labor is self-limiting. They have worn it out, and now choose to blame others for their difficulty.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, next week the House of Representatives will vote on appropriations for water pollution control.

I am proud to be one of the signers of the pledge circulated by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, and the distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, with whom I have the honor to serve on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This pledge commits its signers to vote the full $1 billion authorized by the Public Works Committee for the construction of waste water treatment facilities.

In my weekly column, written for newspapers in my congressional district, I discussed the importance of full funding for water pollution control. I include the column in the RECORD at this point:

NEWS RELEASE FOR THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 6–11, 1969

(By James G. O'Hara)

In a number of cities across the nation, drinking water drawn from the tap has high levels of bacteria, says the U.S. Environmental Health Service. The cities are taking polluted water out of lakes and rivers and pumping it through inadequate purification treatment facilities.

In Cleveland, a river polluted with oily sludge was jokingly referred to as "the only body of water that's a fire hazard." Then flames seared the water's surface.

On the bank of the Potomac River below Washington's beautiful Mount Vernon there is a sign warning against swimming because of pollution.

True, all our rivers have not yet reached the pollution point of Cleveland's Cuyahoga ("If you fall in," Clevelanders say grimly, "you won't drown—you'll decay.") And few lakes are in the condition of Lake Erie, which some call a huge cesspool (65 percent of the wastes in the lake come from Detroit).

And by and large the water we drink is safe, although guaranteeing a safe drinking supply is becoming more expensive.

But few would deny that the water we depend on for life and recreation is deteriorating in quality.

This week the House of Representatives will vote on money for water pollution control. That vote will determine whether we will make headway in the fight against water pollution or try to tread water and inevitably slip downstream in the muck.

At this writing, prospects are excellent that the House will approve enough money to make some gains in cleaning up our water.

It won't be cheap: we're fighting for a $1 billion appropriation.

But then, pollution isn't cheap either.

The city of Chicago found that it had to dump about one-third more chlorine into its drinking water supply in order to make it potable. That raised the cost of processing drinking water from 73 cents per million gallons to $1.18 per million and the consumer pays for it.

Or consider the costs of building swimming pools when a lake or river is too dirty to swim in.

But the greatest costs are impossible to calculate. How do you assess the financial loss to the people of a river, once beautiful—and useable—turned into a stinking eyesore?

Someone aptly called ours the effluent society. We are pouring sewage and the liquid wastes of industry into our rivers, streams and lakes in ever great amounts.

At the same time we are not building nearly enough sewage treatment plants to capture and cleanse at least a part of this waste before it goes into our water.

Thus man fouls the water faster than he cleans it up.

That's the reason for the current drive for the $1 billion clean water appropriation. The funds will be used to help cities build waste water treatment facilities.

Supported by conservation groups and such organizations as the National Leagues of Cities, some 222 members of the House at last count have pledged to vote for the full water pollution control funding.

The Administration asked only $214 million for water pollution control, less than one-quarter of the amount authorized by the Congress. The House Appropriations Committee has approved spending $600 million.

But with more than half the members of the House in favor of the full appropriation, we are hopeful that the vote will be solidly in favor of a Congressional commitment to provide the funds to really begin cleaning up our water.

A victory in the House this week will be good news to everyone who drinks, swims in, sails on, or merely looks at, water.

Everyone else can afford to be neutral.

A GROUP OF BLACK MILITANTS VISIT CHURCH

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a group of black militants, members of the so-called Black United Front of Washington, joined a much smaller group of militants in Arlington, Va., to visit my church, disrupt services there, and demand "reparations" from the congregation for wrongs they claim have been done them by white men.

While I was not in church on the occasion, I received literally hundreds of letters from outraged constituents who protested the attempt of this group to use the fact of my membership in a particular congregation as an excuse to interrupt services there and threaten the members.

Undoubtedly the most effective summarization of the problem we are faced with this militancy is contained in a letter I received from Dr. V. W. Sears, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Annandale, Va. As I believe all who read this RECORD should have benefit of Dr. Sears' observations, I am inserting his letter in full at this point in the RECORD:

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Annandale, Va., September 11, 1969.

Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I've been thinking I ought to write you for some time but health circumstances have interfered somewhat.

I just wanted to pass on a word of encouragement for the excellent job I feel you are doing for us. I admire your conviction and courage in these very tumultuous times we're experiencing. Then when this group tried to get at you through your church last Sunday I was greatly disturbed. I was in the hospital at the time but determined to write you at the first opportunity.

I have been a pastor, primarily in the South, for thirty-two years and I strongly feel that today many of our churches and pastors have gotten off the track of their main purpose and reason for existence.

The church should be ministering to the spiritual needs of our country, which in turn, will inspire and strengthen their members to live the Christian life out in the everyday give and take of the market place. All of society will benefit from any person governing his actions as a citizen by Christian principles. This will be slow and will take longer than some of our impatient friends want, but it will build solidly a society that will stand in any adversity.

Messrs. Williams, Cox and Brown and all such like-minded have a right to work with all their might to solve our social ills. But when they barge in on a worship service (with plenty of reporters and television people around), I think they are trying to make the church an instrument of their social, political, and economic ideas but actually result in prostituting the church from its God-given basic purpose. It seems that many of our news media hold nothing sacred, even the worship of God. I feel they are wrong, and if our churches get much further away from their God-given task, which is the same in every age and in all sorts of conditions, God help us.

It looks as though the whole world has forgotten there is such a thing as personal and individual moral responsibility. I would to God that somebody with some influence in high circles would begin to proclaim it far and wide, that personal responsibility starts for every man first with himself. People differ in capabilities and we do have problems, but most of them would lessen remarkably, and some would disappear, if we could somehow get this principle of individual responsibility popularized so that every man would put his own shoulder under the load of making our nation better. I realize there are exceptions, but if these were all we had to take care of, it would be as nothing.

We have many individuals, groups, and even movements today who have their own subjective ideas about how to straighten out the world. They have finally come around to accusing the churches of being responsible for their assumed ills and have decided to tap the till and make the churches pay the bill. It almost sickens me that so many "church" leaders acquiesce to this. It results, I feel, from a misconception of the churches' responsibility. The church is on the spot. It always has been. It has a responsibility to the landlord and the tenant and strangely enough it is the same to both—to help them become Christians and then act like it.

We have many self-styled moralists, self-appointed managers of society who know all about how the country and world ought to be run. And now they have begun to hawk their wares in our churches.

We have our work cut out for us, but I hope you will keep on with your courageous work in the political area as a Christian statesman. I'll do what I can in my small place to try to help my people get the spiritual food, strength and courage they need in today's world.

With every good wish and prayer, I am

Sincerely,

V. W. SEARS.

RALPH NADER VIEWS ON PROPOSED ANTITRUST SUIT CONSENT DECREE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Author-Attorney Ralph Nader, who has done more for the American consumer in the past few years than any private citizen in history, has submitted his views to the court regarding the Justice Department's proposal that a consent decree be issued in the antitrust suit filed against the major automobile manufacturers and the Automobile Manufacturers Association.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Nader's statement, which incisively points out why an open trial related to the conspiracy—involving agreements to restrain the development of smog control devices on automobiles—should be carried out. The statement follows:

RALPH NADER, SUBMISSION OF VIEWS REGARDING PROPOSED CONSENT DECREE, UNITED STATES AGAINST AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL., CIVIL ACTION NO. 69–75–JWC

What the domestic auto companies conspired over a period of at least 16 years to do—restrain the development and marketing of auto exhaust control systems—is a crime under the Sherman Act. Collusive, anti-competitive agreements which result in seriously jeopardizing the capacity of citizens to breathe air without carcinogenic and other lethal and violent pollutants would, under the most normal of expectations, be prosecuted by the Division as a crime. That course of enforcement was indeed initiated by Mr. McLaren's predecessors in the Antitrust Division, Donald Turner and Edward Zimmerman, in mid-1966. Grand Jury proceedings for 18 months resulted in the Division's trial attorney's request to Mr. Turner for permission to ask the Grand Jury to return an indictment. The Grand Jury was even willing to return an indictment regardless of what instructions were forwarded from Washington—so convinced was it of the criminality of the behavior detailed during these 18 months. Mr. Turner dropped the criminal case, without any public explanation, and had the Grand Jury discharged. One year later, in January 1969, a civil complaint was filed. Nine months after that, the civil complaint was in effect dropped in favor of a porous, proposed consent decree, stripped to the minimum of what the legitimate impact of the law should have been.

Is this where five years of Antitrust Division involvement and expenditure of numerous man-years is to end? I should like to detail some reasons why the answer to this question must be "no."

Over the years, a large proportion of the civil actions brought by the Antitrust Division have been terminated by consent decrees. The criteria employed have rarely been made clear. However, it is known that scarce manpower and judicial delay are important factors. Year after year, those who have led and supervised the Antitrust Division have undermined or weakened antitrust enforcement by simply referring to those two conditions. At the same time, there has been no sustained effort to obtain more funds for the Division or to develop procedures (with the exception of the CID development earlier in this decade) which will accelerate any judicial recourse or at least improve the bargaining power of the government that more expeditious trial reflects.

It seems to be relevant to suggest a number of questions which should be asked in the automobile smog case before a consent judgment is considered or approved:

1. Are there important and unresolved issues of law which merit judicial determination?

2. Are there important rights of public and private institutions and citizens which can be eroded or erased by a consent judgment as proposed?

3. Does the seriousness of the antitrust violation in this case argue for the greater deterrent and public educational purposes achieved by a civil trial or the resumption of the Division's criminal action?

4. Does the proposed consent decree achieve the announced objective of Attorney General John N. Mitchell who described it last week as representing "strong federal action to encourage widespread competitive research and marketing of more effective auto antipollution devices?"

Matters of fact and law point to clearly affirmative responses to questions (1) (2) & (3) and a negative response to question (4).

The present case offers an excellent opportunity for the Antitrust Division to establish judicially two important principles which would have enormous replicative value over the behavior of modern industry striving to restrain the rate of innovation to the detriment of competition and human welfare. The Department's complaint of January 10, 1969 requested that the defendants be restrained from making joint responses to government regulatory agencies concerned with air pollution control. For years the Automobile Manufacturers Association has been the instrument of precise collusion by the auto companies to develop common positions on questions of pollution and safety and to head off or suppress any potential diversity of response. Even after the Department commenced its investigation into this conspiracy, the AMA was developing and using a stock speech on air pollution—a speech which was given, for example, both by Dr. Fred W. Bowditch, Chief Engineer for General Motors and Mr. Donald A. Jensen, Ford's executive engineer in charge of vehicle emissions. (*Detroit News*, December 1, 1968). Collusive trade associations activity continues to be a prime anti-competitive practice in this country. Such activity is long overdue for authoritative judicial resolution and the emergence of judge-made law that would give pause to other trade associations which exert similar, if not greater control, over their members and enforce the dominant firm(s)' policy over smaller industry firms. The proposed consent decree loses this opportunity.

The second principle requiring case law development relates to "product fixing." The automobile industry has restrained competition among manufacturers in the area of product quality. The consumer movement can produce numerous instances of such lowest common denominator quality throughout an industry. The auto companies' activities in the motor vehicle emissions field are in this sense symptomatic of a disease which affects wide areas of the economy. By not moving against this sort of collusion, the Division has relinquished an opportunity to formulate a crucial, new precedent that is rooted in old antitrust doctrine. The instant case is ripe for this determination and the Division has the benefit of five years of investigation as well.

Because the antitrust laws recognize the rights of persons or groups to initiate private antitrust actions, the Division is in a trusteeship position thereto. Any decision made must take into some account how the final resolution will affect the rights of private and public parties under the antitrust laws. In this case, municipal and other public bodies have displayed a strong interest in antitrust enforcement vs. the auto conspiracy as well as recovering in separate actions damages which they have incurred as a result of auto pollution. The possibility that local governmental bodies, business firms and individual citizens may wish to adjudicate their rights is severely limited by the proposed consent decree. Section 5 of the Clayton Act provides that consent judgments, unlike other final judgments in cases brought by the United States, shall not be considered prima facie evidence against the defendant in a treble-damage suit. The practical effect of this provision is that potential treble-damage plaintiffs would have to duplicate the investigative process which took the Department several years and several hundreds of thousands of dollars even with its extraordinary discovery powers. Los Angeles County already has filed a one hundred million dollar suit against the automobile manufacturers, seeking to recoup some of the loss to the County resulting from this corporate conspiracy to hold back on pollution controls. Further, the California Attorney General, acting on behalf of the State, has been denied access to the Justice Department's information about the auto pollution case. The evidence of the conspiracy exists in the Justice Department's possession and the Department seems determined not to have any of it surface in a public trial. In a critical treatment of the Department's consent decree program ten years ago, the House Antitrust Subcommittee described precisely this effect:

"The almost inevitable consequence of the acceptance of a consent decree by the Department of Justice . . . is to deprive suitors, who have been injured by the unlawful conduct, of their statutory remedies under the antitrust laws."[1]

The Department's complaint charges the auto industry with collusive behavior having devastating consequences for the peoples' health in this country. At least 50% of the nation's air pollution comes from the motor vehicles' internal combustion engines. Medical and other epidemiological studies have linked these pollutants with diseases ranging from cancer to emphysema. Property damage from corrosive pollutants is estimated at $13 billion annually by federal officials. Half of this amount is a very substantial cost inflicted on this nation by the auto industry's intransigent refusal to innovate over the past generation. Can anyone deny the need and benefit for the public to learn about the nature and depth of this colossal corporate crime? The citizens of this country, who are the customers of this industry, have a right to know the extent which the auto companies are deliberately responsible for the enormous health, economic and aesthetic damages caused by the internal combustion engine. One of the purposes of a public trial is deterrence; the Division has chosen to lose a grand opportunity to bring these companies and their harmful practices into the public arena of a courtroom. This aspect of the Division's case alone would have a greater deterrent effect than the tightest of consent judgments. Since it is not any longer the practice of antitrust enforcement to pierce the corporate veil and hold the culpable officials responsible, a public trial would at the least have shown that such corporate officials are holding far greater power over citizens in this country than they can exercise responsibly or even legally.

What of the proposed consent decree? The proposal can hardly be stronger than the complaint which itself is the result of a process of enforcement erosion which began with an intended criminal prosecution and ended with a meek request for injunctive relief. The complaint did not even contain a request for the imposition of civil damages pursuant to the antitrust laws. (Like the drug cases, the federal government has incurred damage to its property and personnel from this conspiracy). The process of secret, ex parte type negotiations with representatives of corporate defendants discourages confidence in antitrust enforcement and facilitates sloppy or political decisionmaking. When decisions can be made without prior citizen access or without criteria publicly displayed on which such decisions are rendered or without adequate explanation, abuses, distortions and laceration of the public interest can occur with greater frequency than would be the case otherwise.

The following weaknesses can be cited in the proposed consent decree:

1. There is no provision requiring the keeping of records by the defendants. For example, the Department has no assurance that minutes or transcripts will be kept of AMA committee meetings on pollution matters or that there will be records kept of informal discussions between executives and representatives of various auto companies. The section of the proposed decree requires written reports concerning any matters contained in the decree, but only "upon the written request of the Attorney General or the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division . . ." If the Department is serious about its surveillance responsibilities over the consent judgment, why doesn't the proposed decree place an affirmative responsibility on the companies to make periodic reports concerning the matters covered by the decree? Why, for instance, are not the companies required to report the terms of all licenses granted and purchased? Why are there no reports on the status of research relating to motor vehicle emissions?

Why is there no ban on the destruction of corporate or AMA documents relating to the conspiracy? The task of surveillance, effective surveillance, is so formidable that it raises a question whether the Division is even less equipped to monitor compliance with the decree than it is to engage in complicated litigation which would permit other parties to have the information on which to base their vigilance against antitrust violations by the auto industry. Certainly the terms of the decree proposed last week do not facilitate surveillance. Neither does the fact that the Divisions Judgment Section is composed of only 12 professional personnel with no more than half that number having the burden of trying to see that the many hundreds of consent decrees are being complied with. Judged on any basis—cost-benefit, importance of the case etc., the resources which the Division can devote to litigation are greater than those devoted to compliance.

2. Section VI(A) (3) of the proposed decree requires defendant AMA to make avail-

[1] (House Antitrust Subcommittee, *Department of Justice Consent Decree Program*, 1959).

able for copying or for examination by any person the technical reports in its possession or control prepared or exchanged by defendants pursuant to said cross-license within two years prior to the entry of this Final Judgment. Why only *two years* when the Department alleges the conspiracy to have begun at least in 1953 and when the Department alleges specific conspiracies to delay installations in 1961, 1962–63 and 1964? There is also an onerous additional proviso that any person who requests such information agrees to offer each signatory party to the AMA cross-licensing agreement of July 1, 1955, as amended, and any subsidiary thereof, nonexclusive license rights with respect to any patents or patent applications based upon information obtained from AMA or its members who are defendants in this case. This proviso can vitiate the purpose of the aforementioned section VI(A) (3) since it requires firms or individuals to become entangled in a serious risk of harassing litigation where the richest firm wins. What small firm is going to take the risk? Consequently, the purpose of this section to encourage proliferation of information collusively obtained or possessed so as to promote competition fails.

3. Two provisions which the Department emphasized in its September 11, 1969 press release were the restraint against exchanging confidential information (IV A 2 a) and the restraint against filing joint statements (IV A 2 g) to regulatory agencies on matters pertaining to pollution or automotive safety are scheduled to expire quietly in ten years under Section IX of the proposed decree unless the Department applies for a continuation after nine years. Why, if these two practices are considered anticompetitive—and indeed they go to the base of the conspiracy—will they be any less anticompetitive in ten years?

In the case of the proposed restraint on joint statements, the qualifications make the restraint mere paper in impact. These exemptions to the ban on joint statements via the AMA are: statements relating to (i) the authority of the agency involved; (ii) the draftsmanship of or the scientific need for standards or regulations, (iii) test procedures or test data relevant to standards or regulations, or (iv) the general engineering requirements of standards or regulations based upon publicly available information. In addition, the proposed decree (IV (A) (1) (g)) permits joint filing on the critical point of ability to comply with a particular standard or regulation if there is a written agency authorization for such a joint statement. What kind of naivete or incompetence does this draftsmanship reveal on the part of the public's representatives in the Division? Defendants have probably already drafted a formal request to the various agencies on behalf of the AMA to take advantage of just that blatant loophole, and will approach the agencies at the appropriate time.

4. Equally as disturbing is the effect of the four exceptions noted above on section IV (A) (2) (a)—the section restraining defendants from exchanging restricted information. Under the four exemptions, defendants are permitted to file joint statements relating to the draftsmanship of or the scientific needs for standards or regulations (ii) or the test procedures or test data relevant to standards or regulations (iii). The defendants have no doubt already prepared the legal memoranda explaining how these two exceptions permit the exchange of confidential information when that exchange is directed toward the filing of joint statements before regulatory bodies.

Both the process of negotiating this decree without public input and scrutiny as well as the weak provisions of the decree itself indicate that the Department has abnegated its obligation to enhance the deterrent spirit of the treble damage provisions of Section 4 of the Clayton Act. In at least two cases, the Department has itself acknowledged its responsibilities to treble damage litigants. in *United States v. Standard Ultramarine and Color Co.*, 137 F. Supp. 167 (1955) and *United States v. American Radiator and Standard Sanitary Corp.*, 288 F. Supp. 696 (1968), the Department resisted proposed nolo contendre pleas by the defendants on the ground that it had a duty to third party litigants whose task would be made more difficult because of the application of Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act.

In his consideration of this issue in the *Standard Ultramarine* case, Judge Weinfeld discussed the legislative history and purpose of Section 4 of the Clayton Act (137 F. Supp. 167, at 171–72, footnotes omitted, emphasis added):

"Congress, to secure effective enforcement of the antitrust laws, provided both criminal and civil sanctions through governmental agencies. But it was not content to rely solely upon official action. It sought to encourage individuals to aid in the policing. And to help achieve the broad objectives of the Act the treble damage action was authorized in favor of those who had been injured by the condemned conduct. Its purpose was not only the redress of private wrong but also the protection of the public interest. And 'Congress intended to use private self-interest as a means of enforcement * * * when it gave to any injured party a private cause of action * * *.' Another purpose in permitting an injured party to recover threefold his actual damage was that substantial verdicts against the wrongdoer would constitute punitive sanctions—to act as a deterrent against a repetition of the offense and to serve as a warning to potential violators.

"But even this auxiliary policing method did not altogether fulfill its purpose. The years that followed the enactment of the treble damage provision revealed that few private litigants had the resources or staying power to conduct a protracted and difficult antitrust case. And those who were able and willing to assume the staggering cost of litigation were frequently worn out by their opponents by sheer attrition. The disparate situation between victim and violator was sharply pointed out by President Wilson when he urged Congress; to enact what ultimately became § 5 of the Clayton Act. A reading of the interesting debates which followed shows that the unmistakable purpose of the Congress in enacting § 5 in response to the Presidential message was 'to minimize the burdens of litigation for injured private suitors by making available to them all matters previously established by the Government in antitrust actions.' *The defendants urge that there is no obligation upon the Government to assist or encourage litigants. But a fair reading of the debates and the Committee Reports indicates that such was the very purpose of the clause. It was fashioned as a powerful weapon to aid private litigants in their suits against antitrust violators by reducing the almost prohibitive costs and staggering burdens of such litigation in making available to him the results of the Government's successful action, whether an equity suit or a criminal prosecution.* And the hoped for byproduct of the benefit to a plaintiff was increased law enforcement."

There are basically three ways in which the Justice Department may dispose of the case in a manner consistent with its obligation to protect the rights of third parties. The first and best way is through an open trial. A full public trial of the issues involved would provide the basis for follow up treble-damage suits by establishing a public record containing all the evidence collected by the Justice Department. In addition, it would put one of the most public relations conscious industries in the United States on notice that it could not engage in anti-social conspiracies without running the risk of adverse public reaction stemming from full disclosure. The House Subcommittee report of 1959 recognized the salutory effect of such disclosures: "consent settlement procedures," said the subcommittee, "also diminish the deterrent effect of the antitrust laws because they permit defendants to avoid much of the unfavorable publicity that usually attends antitrust litigation." (See also *Standard Ultramarine, Supra,* at 169).

The Department has justified its agreement to the proposed consent decree on the ground that it has achieved all that was requested in the complaint and that the expenditure involved in litigation has been avoided. But, in view of the major weaknesses of the proposed decree outlined above, in view of the major expenditure already incurred by the Department in its long investigation, and in view of the earlier decision of the Department to initially seek a criminal indictment, the Court's treatment of this argument in *Standard Ultramarine, supra,* at 171, is apposite here (Footnotes omitted):

"We need not tarry long on the issue of the elimination of expense to the Government. It has already been put to great expense in the investigation and preparation of the matter to date. The fact that it was presented to a grand jury suggests the violations charged were deemed by the Attorney General to be of a 'flagrant' nature. The suggestion that the Government forgo its right, and indeed its duty, to uphold the integrity of our laws because the heavy cost of prosecution falls of its own weight. Cost of enforcement in terms of manpower and money is of little consequence when necessary to assure decent respect for, and compliance with, our laws."

After a consideration by the Court of the infirmities of the proposed consent decree and an examination of the process of negotiation which caused the Department to move from an initial stance of presenting the case to a Grand Jury for a criminal indictment to the position of agreeing to a meek consent decree, it is respectfully suggested that the ends of Justice would be best served by requiring the Defendants to answer the charges against them in open court.

A second, although somewhat less desirable alternative is that the Justice Department demand inclusion in the decree of a provision popularly called the "asphalt clause." Under such a provision, which was included in the consent decrees in the 1960 Asphalt Cases, injured governmental bodies suing to recoup their damages would have the benefit of *prima facie* evidence of the antitrust violation just as they would have following trials won by the United States pursuant to Section 5–A of the Clayton Act. A typical provision taken from one of the consent decrees in those cases reads as follows: (*United States* v. *Allied Chemical Corp.* (D.C. Mass. 1960) 1961 CCH Trade Cas. Pat. 69, 923):

That on the basis of said limited admission the defendants signatory hereto have engaged in an unlawful combination and conspiracy in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act as charged in said complaint, this adjudication being for the sole purpose of establishing the *prima facie* effect of this Final Judgement, in the suits specified below and for no other purpose;

Each defendant is enjoined and restrained from denying that this Final Judgement has such *prima facie* effect in any such suit; provided, however, that this section shall not be deemed to prohibit any such defendant from rebutting such *prima facie* evidence or from asserting any defense with respect to damages or other defenses available to it.

The third possibility is that the Depart-

ment agree to a provision in the consent decree requiring that the evidence collected by it shall be available to private litigants. The Department recently resisted such a provision in the 1967 Library Book Cases. In those cases, publishers had been charged with conspiring to fix the prices of library books. The case was settled by consent decree. The applicants for intervention in the case—municipalities, states, and local school boards—sought preservation and custody of the documents collected by the Department. Although they did not prevail—there was no such order in the final judgment—there was a separate order of the court which provided that the evidence be impounded in the custody of the Chicago office of the Department's antitrust division. The applicants then subsequently applied for access to the documents and were permitted by the court to examine these records. This access facilitated a number of successful treble damage suits on behalf of these public bodies.

BOLIVIAN TRIBUTE TO PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER, SANDRA SMITH

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we all know how appreciative those of us in the United States are of the brave work of the Peace Corps volunteer, but, unfortunately, very infrequently do we see evidence that our foreign friends also applaud the efforts of our Peace Corps workers. A truly moving experience to be shared with all Members occurred recently in a Bolivian village on the outskirts of the capital, La Paz. Sandra Smith, a talented and industrious young woman, was 22 years of age when she first arrived in Bolivia. Her efforts for the Indians with whom she worked illustrated well her untiring devotion to the people to whom she would devote her brief life. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article that appeared in the September 16 issue of the Miami News:

"ANGEL" SANDRA GAVE PEASANTS HOPE OF ESCAPE

(By Ian Glass)

Sandra Smith, whose most obvious physical attributes were flowing blonde hair and a winning smile, was just one of 200 Peace Corps workers assigned to Bolivia.

For 13 months, she ran a one-room school in the El Alto slum on the outskirts of the mountaintop capital of La Paz. She taught Indians how to read and write.

When Sandra died last month at the age of 23 of a brain hemorrhage, the ragged and normally unemotional Indians with whom she lived wept.

"She was an angel," said Juan Mamani, who sent his child to Sandra's school.

In a letter to Sandra's parents—Mr. and Mrs. Preston L. Taplin, who live at 13725 NW 1st Ave., Miami—a pastor wrote:

"The sight of her flowing hair thrilled and excited the young, dark-haired youngsters with whom she worked."

Robert Hill, pastor of the La Paz Community Church, added, "She was a flame on El Alto. She has touched lives that will never forget her. Because of her, some lives will have been changed for the better."

Even Bolivian newspapermen were touched by the passing of Sandra.

"Dear little gringo," wrote a columnist in La Paz's El Diario, "You had an ideal in your heart, you lived by it, and you died for it."

Sandra grew up in Clarence, N.Y. At the University of Rochester, she met and married Frederick Smith, a graduate in chemistry, who is also 23.

Last year, they were assigned to Bolivia. On the way, they stopped with a couple of dozen other Peace Corps volunteers—to visit her parents in Miami, who had moved here from Clarence the year before. Her father has a radio business.

In La Paz, while Fred taught masonry at a nearby trade school, Sandra coached 27 Indian children in reading and writing in a 12-foot-by-26-foot room. She also gave their mothers advice on cooking and elementary sanitation.

"She scrounged things for them they had never seen before, like crayons and paper," Mrs. Taplin said.

The death rate among Peace Corps workers is comparatively high, mostly because they work in remote, uncivilized areas, far from medical attention.

Sandra died on her second wedding anniversary. Her parents do not yet know what was the cause. "It could have been encephalitis or a brain tumor; we just don't know," Mrs. Taplin said.

When her coffin was flown out of La Paz for burial in Clarence, Indians trudged to the airport with small gifts for her husband, an unsual tribute from people who are generally taciturn and withdrawn.

"She was constantly thinking of the school and how to improve it," said Rosa Pelaez, Sandra's 24-year-old assistant. Barely literate herself, she is now trying to run the school alone while waiting for the Peace Corps to decide whether a new volunteer will be sent into the project.

Meanwhile, the residents of El Alto have petitioned to have the little school, whose furniture consists of lumber and bricks, named after Sandra Smith.

"You were truly working for the liberation of the Indian peasant," one editorial in a La Paz newspaper said, "because you taught him to read, and that is where the true redemption will come from."

CONGRESSMAN JOHN D. DINGELL

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to share with my colleagues two recent articles concerning Michigan Congressman, JOHN D. DINGELL. Congressman DINGELL entered Congress 15 years ago as the then youngest Congressman. It was always a slight shock to show off this "baby" who was more than 6 feet tall. He was a brash, impetuous "infant." As the senior Member from Michigan, I am happy to point out that his ability and enthusiasm have been used for all of the people and to have you note with me his acclaim by the press:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 28, 1969]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE MOVING INTO SPOTLIGHT

(By Richard D. Lyons)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 27—In every Congress for the last quarter of a century a Michigan Representative named Dingell has introduced a bill calling for sweeping changes in the nation's medical care system.

Initially running to several hundred pages, the bill over the years has shrunk drastically as the programs that were originally labeled "visionary," "socialistic," "utopian" and worse have become law, such as:

Federal support for medical research, grants for hospital construction, support of maternal and child health programs, aid to the disabled, money for rural health plans, and financial help for student doctors and nurses.

H.R. 24, the current Dingell bill, now contains only one proposal: the establishment of a national health insurance program.

Universal health insurance plans such as the Dingell one and others that would extend a Medicare type of program to Americans of all ages have suddenly and unexpectedly gained the serious attention of members of the Nixon Administration, Congressmen of both parties, and most of the nation's Governors.

It is more than possible that even Mr. Nixon, who opposed the national health insurance concept during last year's Presidential campaign, may have had second thoughts recently.

UNION'S INTEREST RISES

In addition, the interest of labor unions and health lobbies, which over the last generation have given lackluster support to the national medical insurance programs that they knew never stood a chance of enactment, has perked up and their dreams of social change have brightened.

Even the American Medical Association, an arch foe of Medicare for two decades, has endorsed a nationwide health insurance program, an idea the doctors supported half a century ago, then abruptly turned against.

"The association's proposal embodied in bills now before both houses of Congress, calls for inducing Americans to take out health insurance polices through tax credits, and the payment with Federal funds of premiums on such insurance for those persons unable to afford them. Money for the program would come from employers, employes and the Federal Government under other proposals such as the Dingell bill.

"There is nothing as powerful as an idea whose hour has come," said Representative John D. Dingell, a Dearborn Democrat, during an interview recently.

BACKED BY MANY GROUPS

During this month alone developments on the national insurance idea included: Over whelming endorsement of the concept by the National Governors Conference in Colorado Springs; the start of a study of various proposals by the powerful American Hospital Association, which represents 7,000 inhabitants; a directive by Robert H. Finch, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, that a Federal panel surveying health care look into national insurance ideas, and an announcement by aides of Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York, that he would introduce a "benchmark" health insurance bill in a month or two.

Wilbur J. Cohen, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare who is the architect of Medicare, is helping to write the Javits bill, which is said to be far more detailed and definitive than the original Dingell bill, which Mr. Cohen also helped to draft.

The first Dingell bill was put before Congress in 1943 by the late John D. Dingell Sr., the father of the present Congressman, who at that time was a page in the House.

The elder Representative Dingell continued to introduce the bill until his death in 1955, when his son ran for and won his father's seat. The younger Mr. Dingell has over the years continued to introduce a bill he knew stood no chance of success through, as he said, "respect for the principles of my father."

NO MONEY FOR ANTITOXIN

"Dad's fierce interest in health legislation stemmed from the death of a sister when he was a small boy," the lanky legislator said. "My father's family was extremely poor and one of his sisters died because there wasn't enough money in the house to buy the diphtheria antitoxin needed to save her life."

"My father knew what it was to be both sick and poor," Mr. Dingell continued. "When he was a young man he was sent West to a union sanitarium in Colorado because he had been considered so incurably ill that he would almost certainly die."

During the elder Mr. Dingell's 12 terms in Congress he gained a national reputation for his unsuccessful fight for national health insurance during which, as his son recounted, "my father continued to point out that the United States is the only major industrial nation that does not have such a program."

The first compulsory national health insurance law with comprehensive benefits was enacted in Prussia in 1854 and was extended throughout the German nation in 1883 after it was unified by Otto van Bismarck. The idea spread to the neighboring Austro-Hungarian Empire at the turn of the century and gained international attention after its incorporation in the British national health insurance program in 1911.

PROGRESSIVE PARTY PLANK

In the United States the following year the idea became a plank in the platform of the Progressive party, which nominated Theodore Roosevelt for President.

A campaign for national insurance led by a private reform group, the American Association for Labor Legislation, had by 1917 attained widespread support, including that of a social insurance committee of the American Medical Association. But attention waned with the start of World War I, then rose again when peace came. Again it flickered out as labor lobbies concentrated their attention on unemployment and old age insurance, rather than protection against health costs.

During the Depression, national health insurance again attracted interest and the idea almost became part of the Social Security Act in 1935. In 1943, after President Franklin D. Roosevelt called for social insurance "from the cradle to the grave," Senators Robert F. Wagner, Democrat of New York, and James E. Murray, Democrat of Montana, together with Mr. Dingell, introduced the health insurance bill.

In more recent years interest in health insurance, however halfhearted, has been kept going mainly by labor unions. National health insurance has long been a goal of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, which has made it part of union policy.

BACKED BY AUTO WORKERS

The United Automobile Workers union also supports the idea and its president, Walter P. Reuther, is chairman of the Committee for National Health Insurance, which was founded last year. The vice chairman of the committee, which has almost 100 members in business, labor, government and Medicare, are Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, the heart surgeon; Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, who is influential in health affairs, and Whitney M. Young, Jr., director of the National Urban League.

"A tremendous amount of money is paying for a variety of programs, public and private, which should be gathered under one umbrella," said Max Fine, the committee's director, during an interview in its expanded new offices here. "We think a national program could do a better job, and do it cheaper."

Mr. Fine said some private health insurers, but not the Blue Cross, Blue Shield and other mass plans, return less than half the premium money collected as benefits. His contention is supported by statistics on file with the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

"Why not take the millions of dollars that are going to insurance companies as profits and expenses and put them back in the health care system where they belong?" he asked.

According to Mr. Fine, a national health insurance plan to which employers and employees would contribute, while Federal funds paid the premiums of the poor, would cost about the same amount as the Federal, state and local governments now are spending on Medicare, Medicaid and other medical and health care programs.

AMA ENDORSES BILLS

Bills supported by the American Medical Association that have been introduced in Congress by Senator Paul J. Fannin, Republican of Arizona, and Representative Richard Fulton, Democrat of Tennessee, would give tax credits on up to $400 worth of health insurance preminums. For those families paying less than $400 in Federal taxes yearly, the Federal Government would pay the premiums. Even families with incomes of more than $10,000 a year would receive a tax credit of $100.

To Mr. Cohen, the financing question is much more complicated.

"We're trying to find an equitable way to share it between those covered, their employers and the Federal Government," he said in an interview.

Mr. Cohen advocates caution in drawing up such insurance legislation so that its effect on the standards of care and the whole welfare structure may be examined.

One of his ideas, which may be introduced by Senator Javits, would be to convert the major insurers such as Blue Cross into "public utilities that are oriented toward the consumer, rather than doctors and hospitals."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Sept. 26, 1969]

A CONGRESSMAN WHO CONTINUES TO GROW

(By Will Muller)

In times when cynicism becomes the hallmark of statesmanship, it's good to encounter Rep. John D. Dingell.

If anyone has had exposure to disillusionment in representative government, it's Dingell. His father served the old 15th District in Detroit from 1933 until his death in 1955. The present John Dingell took up from there and is in his eighth term, currently representing the revised 16th District comprising Detroit and a long list of down river communities.

His enthusiasm is unjaded, his industry uncurbed and his interest undiminished. The multiplicity of his congressional projects grows with the years and his record shows no mean yield of accomplishments.

"This is the greatest job ever," Dingell effervesces to any who listen, "and 1969 is the best year I've had in Congress."

He was just splashing down in Detroit from a 17,000 mile orbit about Alaska and a study of development projects there which could peril the environment.

He was en route back to Congress where he is recruiting support for a $1 billion clean water appropriation in which Detroit and the rest of Michigan have heavy stakes. He and six colleague have pledged more than 200 House members to support that amount to fund the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act.

The act provides federal aid for improvements to water treatment facilities by local governments. It affects an estimated 4,600 local projects.

"The biggest problem of mankind in this generation is the preservation of man's natural environment from pollution, spoilage, exploitation and destruction," runs Dingell's dialog.

"It's going to take patience, a little compromise, tough legislation, an awakening of federal departments and everlasting persistence. We've got to win or life will become impossible or, at the very least, not worth living."

Dingell talks like a lawmaker impatient with his days only because they have too few hours. He's tall, angular, physically energetic and puts a sort of body English behind his sentences. He spurts statistics like a computer and ranges over congressional issues with a catholicity of information that belies his national recognition only as the House's most active conservationist.

He's an initiator of a proposal for a commission on the study of natural environment which now has widespread endorsement among senators and representatives. It would alert conservationists in advance of the infringement of federally projected airports, dams, highways and nuclear testing in national refuges, parks and wilderness areas.

Though conservation is forte, Dingell's impact on government is effective on other areas. He is chairman of a House small business committee turning the spotlight on advertising lotteries and giveaways. A member of the House Commerce Committee and likely some day to be its chairman, he heads a committee trying to reduce the complexities of the Federal Communications Commission.

He is fighting the unsolicited mailing of credit cards. He is a foe of paid television, He never forgets his home district. Recently he was urging that the new Transportation Department set up its auto testing facilities in Dearborn.

In all of this, the faculty of Dingell that shines through more than anything else is his absolute conviction that all of his colleagues are right-minded men and that Congress is a going concern that in due time will get around to adjusting most of our major troubles.

From a man who has lived with Congress through two generations, such conviction is reassuring at a time the country is told from other quarters the only solution is revolution.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE URGED BY A. A. SMYSER, SPEAKING AT SITE OF AMERICA'S FALLEN HEROES

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to establish a new Federal Department of Peace is gaining considerable support within as well as outside the Halls of Congress. It was my great privilege, coming as I do from a State whose citizens have borne more than their share of the burdens and the sorrow of the armed conflicts in which this Nation has been engaged, to introduce this legislation on the opening day of the 91st Congress.

Recently, this quest for peace was given added impetus by the editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, A. A. Smyser, who spoke at the 100th Infantry Battalion memorial services at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Honolulu, Hawaii. The services honored the World War II dead of the highly decorated unit, which was made up almost in its entirety of Hawaii citizens of Japanese ancestry. The services are held every year at the cemetery in Punchbowl or Puowaina, which, literally translated, means "Hill of Sacrifice." Finally, the services mark the day, September 29,

1943, when the first member of the 100th Infantry Battalion—Sgt. Shigeo Joseph Takata—was killed in combat in Europe.

In his deeply moving speech, Mr. Smyser noted:

We simply cannot let the world go on escalating into greater conflicts. We need to know all we can about when and why conflicts occur in the hope that this knowledge can lead to prevention.

Mr. Speaker, in order that others may have the opportunity to ponder the ideas set forth in the Smyser speech, I would like to submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as a newspaper report of the 1969 Punchbowl services and an editorial entitled "Quest for Peace" from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29, 1969:

MEMORIAL SERVICE—100TH INFANTRY BATTALION, PUNCHBOWL CRATER, SEPTEMBER 28, 1969

Honored Guests: Here inside this crater—no matter how often we may visit—we find ourselves thinking long and sober thoughts.

Nature built this crater in a violent volcanic steam eruption thousands of years ago.

The ancient Hawaiians used it as a hill of sacrifice.

The heiau of Kanelaau lay outside the crater, makai, and was the temple of Punchbowl. At Kewalo near the site of McKinley high school is believed to have been the residence of the heiau's priests.

When a human sacrifice was required, the priests drowned the victim in the waters of Kewalo by their home.

That the sacrifice might be unblemished, he was urged not to struggle, lest he injure himself and a member of the family be required to take his place.

"E moe malie i ka wai o ko alii."—"Lie quietly in the waters of your chief!" was the command.

Following a ceremony at the heiau, a band of white-robed priests, without pausing to rest, bore the body of the unfortunate one up the hill, and placed it on the altar.

Clad all in white, their heads bound with white bands of tapa, the priests made a ghostly procession.

Though some reports have suggested that the sacrifices and though there were tabu fires, burning human sacrifices was not the usual Hawaiian custom.

Rather, it is believed that those brought here in the morning remained until sunset on the alter, after which relatives could claim their bones for preservation.

Those brought in the afternoon could not be removed until about midnight or early morning of the following day.

In the last century, Kings Kamehameha I and III installed gun batteries up here to command the harbor. In 1875, acting personally and more peacefully, King Kalakaua personally planted trees here with the idea of making Punchbowl a tourist and scenic attraction.

In 1926, 2,000 students from McKinley High School followed an ancient Hawaiian custom used in heiau building to erect a modern memorial on this hill of sacrifice.

They formed a human chain a mile long to pass stones from the McKinley campus up to the crest of this crater and there built a memorial marker on the lookout point still used today.

In 66 minutes 100 rocks were passed hand-to-hand from McKinley to the lookout. It is interesting to note that the Army, which controlled this site in 1926, required that the marker be no more than 30 inches high so it would not be a landmark in case of enemy attack.

After World War II, Punchbowl became what it is today—the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific.

Brought back from Avellino, Italy, for reburial in plot D–142 were the remains of the man who died 26 years ago tomorrow—Sgt. Shigeo Joseph Takata, the first Hawaii Nisei soldier to die in combat.

It is Sgt. Takata and his comrades-in-arms, many of whom lie with him here in this beautiful cemetery, that we honor here today. With them in death is the great American combat correspondent of World War II, Ernie Pyle.

After seeing many men in action, Pyle wrote that if he died in war he wanted to be buried among the Nisei, whom he had come to admire so greatly. (He survived Europe but fell victim to a sniper on Ie Shima island in the battle for Okinawa and now rests in grave D–109, not far from Sgt. Takata.

Men buried in this crater served in every war since the Spanish American. Twenty of them won the Congressional Medal of Honor. The names of 2,919 of them are known only to God.

Some of these for sure are among the 26,280 missing—men whose bodies were never recovered—whose names are memorialized on the marble tablets flanking these steps.

Not far from us, at Pearl Harbor, the Arizona Memorial carries a giant plaque bearing 1177 names of men buried inside that hull.

These are large numbers.

One of the long thoughts I think is of the night 25 years after the Pearl Harbor attack when the attack leader, Capt. Mitsuo Fuchida, came to my house to dinner and we had a long and friendly discussion. He is a sensitive and talented man.

Another of my thoughts at this site is of even longer lists of names elsewhere.

Just two weeks ago I was in Hiroshima. In the cenotaph at Peace Park, directly under the spot where the atomic bomb burst on Aug. 6, 1945, are the names of 62,000 known dead from that one explosion, but the true death figure is believed to be over 200,000.

Before going to Hiroshima, I had been in Naha, Okinawa. In 1945 that city ceased to exist as completely as Hiroshima even though only conventional weapons were used against it.

I also was in Tokyo, where more people died from fire bombings than died at Hiroshima.

And then I went to Panmunjon, Korea, where fighting officially stopped 16 years ago—but where 151 miles of chain fence, barbed wire and stakes still divide a country in two—and where men still fight and die, though in smaller numbers.

Two years ago I was in Vietnam. There the fighting still rages and tens of thousands of humans are dying every year it goes on.

These indeed are the occasions and places to inspire long thoughts.

Our students have thought about them perhaps more fully than we—and with a new perspective.

The voice of the student protest movement that we hear around the world is not, I am convinced, primarily the voice of cowardice.

Rather it is the voice that Prof. George Wald of Harvard University described in a memorable speech this year as the voice of "a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future."

This young generation owes much to Sgt. Takata and his comrades-in-arms. It owes much to the men now fighting in Vietnam, for they are fighting for order in the world and for a stable society just as much as any predecessor in battle.

But if the young generation owes much to the past, the older generations certainly owe the young one a right to a future.

To ask that there be a future is not to ask too much—yet this is by no means assured in an age when nuclear fall-out can poison the world and all upon its face. We owe it to honesty to recognize that the doubts of young people are honest doubts—well-founded in the light of Pearl Harbor, Okinawa, Tokyo, Hiroshima, Korea, Vietnam, the Middle East.

We owe it to honesty, too, to admit that we have not done much that can be said to have changed the pattern of acceleration into ever more cataclysmic confrontations.

It should be a source of pride then that in the Congress of the United States there is a member who is looking at this problem in a positive way and that he is an ex-comrade-in-arms of Sgt. Takata—Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga of the 100th Infantry Battalion.

Congressman Matsunaga is the sponsor of a bill to create a Peace Department with a place in the President's Cabinet and to establish an International Peace Institute.

Candor forces acknowledgment that the bill so far has not gone anywhere or gained much support.

There are some compelling objections to the proposal for a Peace Department. A principal one is that peace is indeed the proper goal of the State Department and that to create a separate department would be improper.

I find this persuasive, though there does appear to be an opportunity for better coordination of such peace-related agencies as the Disarmament Agency, the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development.

The most provocative part of Congressman Matsunaga's bill is the proposal to charter and finance an International Peace Institute. This would do for research directed toward achieving a more peaceful world what other great foundations now do for cancer and other health research, what the so-called "think tanks" like RAND corporation now do for military projects and planning.

The case against such a foundation seems to be little more than a feeling that the budget is tight and this is no time to start new projects with no certainty of pay-off.

Yet the case for such a foundation is so strong it should override most other priorities.

We spend billions of dollars each year on weapons research and on defense.

Yet the investigation of national behavior patterns that lead to conflict gets only two or three million nationwide.

To pursue such investigations is neither a leftist gimmick nor pie in the sky.

We simply can't let the world go on escalating into greater and greater conflicts. We need to know all we can about when and why conflicts occur in the hope that this knowledge can lead to prevention. If it is urgent to mobilize to conquer cancer it is many times more urgent to mobilize to conquer war.

And this should not be an exercise left entirely to the politicians and the generals. They may move from the best of intentions and yet still get into situations where war becomes their only reasonable alternative.

Good men can get into circumstances where they do terrible things. Captain Fuchida, who led the attack on Pearl Harbor, was intelligent, gentle, sensitive and a patriot.

I don't happen to know the men who dropped nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki but I am sure we would like and respect them if we did know them.

How do we keep good men out of such bad situations?

Another point of pride for us here today is that one of the very largest U.S. peace research projects is already in progress at the University of Hawaii, and I am glad to report it is funded with a Defense Department grant.

But less than two dozen people are involved and its director, Prof. R. J. Rummel, esti-

mates that less than 3,000 people are involved in peace research worldwide.

Their work is under-funded and ill-coordinated.

It is not too far-fetched to think of national behavior as we might personal behavior, and to think of international relations as we might think of relationships between people.

We can look at our own selves and our own families to see the fighting instinct in every youngster—to recognize how powerful emotion is in our actions as compared to reason—to acknowledge the important role of training—to recognize the impact of love, fear, hate, pride, courage, jealousy, selfishness and infinite combinations of these and other factors.

Nations have these same problems and perhaps with greater complexity.

The peace studies at the University of Hawaii are directed toward analyzing with the aid of computers the background patterns within and between nations that lead them to conflict. This is one major area of peace research. The other is to study alternatives to war. Both need to be pursued more vigorously.

The International Peace Institute proposed by Congressman Matsunaga would make this possible. It would provide coordination, funding, and a basis for long-term planning of such research, all elements that are deficient now.

Since we can no longer afford war, either financially or in its human toll, we obviously need to learn to avoid situations where such decisions are forced upon national leaders.

We must learn to structure international conduct so that the rational answer to a problem or conflict is never war.

This is the ultimate goal of peace research—in perhaps the same way that control of the weather is the ultimate goal of meteorology or control of volcanoes is the ultimate goal of volcanology.

Whether control of war is as remote as control of the weather or of volcanoes is something we can't know now. The science is a new and tiny one. But it needs to be pursued with all the vigor of weapons research or cancer research.

Mayor Setsuo Yamada of our sister city of Hiroshima is an internationalist. It may be that this is the direction in which peace research will lead us.

His predecessor, the late Mayor Hamai, once told me: "World War II started in your city and ended in ours. Let us work together for peace." Mayor Yamada sees mankind as a unity, one and inseparable. He sees the Apollo 11 moon landing as more than a triumph of knowledge. He sees it as a triumph of intelligence and asks that such intelligence be directed toward peace.

It is time now to make the fullest possible commitment toward addressing our intelligence toward the conquest of war just as we address it to the conquest of cancer. Here indeed is a field to challenge our dissident young.

It has been said the war is too important to be left to the generals. Perhaps by the same token peace is too important to be left to the politicians.

Peace study programs today—the serious academic kind as opposed to the propagandistic kind—draw an investment of only a few million a year while armaments get world-wide spending on the order of $200 billion—that's billions as opposed to millions.

Congressman Matsunaga's proposal to bring order to this kind of research and elevate it to the status of a national research foundation is on the right track.

By following the direction he points we will be doing great honor to Sergeant Takata and his fallen comrades and potentially great service to the generation that is by no means sure that it has a future.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 29, 1969]

EDITOR PROPOSES MORE EMPHASIS ON PEACE STUDIES

The nation and the world badly need more organized scientific and academic peace research, a World War II memorial gathering was told yesterday.

Speaking in Punchbowl crater at Club 100's annual memorial to its war dead, A. A. Smyser, editor of the Star-Bulletin, gave strong endorsement to a bill now before Congress to create an International Peace Institute.

Smyser said it is an honor to the war dead of the 100th Infantry Battalion that the bill's sponsor is one of their comrades-in-arms, Rep. Spark M. Matsunaga, D-Hawaii.

The editor contrasted the few millions now spent on peace research (including a project at the University of Hawaii) with the billions invested in weapons research and armaments.

He said that such research is neither pie-in-the-sky nor a leftist gimmick but can investigate international behavior much as we now investigate the weather or volcanic activity.

He equated international behavior with human behavior but suggested the former is even more complex.

He said that despite aggressive drives, almost all families have learned to settle internal disputes without resort to murder and said the same must become true in the family of nations.

Decrying the present small investment in peace research, Smyser suggested the conquest of war is more important to humanity than the conquest of cancer.

The Matsunaga-proposed International Peace Institute, he said, would be a Federally sponsored and chartered activity that could provide coordination, funding and a basis for long-term planning in a field that is deficient in all these areas despite its importance.

Smyser said peace research falls into two principal areas—investigation of background characteristics and behavior in nations that lead to conflict, and a study of the alternatives to war. A University of Hawaii project headed by Prof. R. J. Rummel is focusing on the background studies.

The annual Club 100 services mark the day, Sept. 29, 1943, when the first member of the 100th Infantry Battalion was killed in combat in Europe. About 300 people attended the Sunday services in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 29, 1969]

QUEST FOR PEACE

"It's the first time, so I'm going first," Sgt. Shigeo (Joe) Takata told his comrades-in-arms of the 100th Infantry Battalion 26 years ago today.

Takata then moved out against a German position that was harassing a road and the 100th's northward advance in Italy.

Shrapnel hit him in the head and he died—the first Hawaii Nisei soldier killed in World War II.

Men and families of the 100th gathered, according to their annual custom, at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific yesterday to pay tribute to Sergeant Takata and those who followed him in death.

It was an occasion for many thoughts—not all concerning the 100th.

The crater of Punchbowl contains dead of wars from the Spanish-American through Vietnam. It is the grave site for 20 Congressional Medal of Honor winners. The cemetery's Garden of the Missing bears the names of 26,280 war dead whose bodies have never been identified.

Great as these numbers are, there are even longer lists of dead elsewhere.

In Hiroshima, Japan, one of Honolulu's sister cities, the cenotaph erected under the center of the Aug. 6, 1945, bomb explosion bears 62,000 names of known dead from that blast. Official figures set the toll at 200,000.

(Cenotaph, by definition, "is a tomb or a monument erected in honor of a person whose body is elsewhere.")

Naha, Okinawa, was obliterated as completely as Hiroshima, although by conventional weapons. Tokyo suffered more dead.

Vietnam's total dead are in the hundreds of thousands as were Korea's.

In this light, a bill offered in Congress by one of Sergeant Takata's comrades-in-arms is significant.

Rep. Spark M. Matsunaga is proposing the creation of an International Peace Institute.

It would be federally chartered to research national backgrounds and national behavior to learn how international conflicts come about and thus avoid them.

We have tended to think that peace is the responsibility of the diplomats and the statesmen. But circumstances have overwhelmed them too often and led them into situations that appeared to have no recourse but to build more awesome weapons and sooner or later to put them to use.

The aim of serious peace research is neither leftist nor foolish. It is to determine scientifically what can be learned of the background patterns that lead nations to conflict and to study alternatives to war as a means of solving international disputes.

A look at our own conflicting drives, training, pride, love, hate, fear, suspicion, jealousy—and many other pressures that drive all of us—can suggest that an analysis of national motivations could be useful.

Most human families solve their disputes, however bitter, without resorting to murder? Could a family of nations?

One of the places where questions such as these are being examined systematically and scientifically is the University of Hawaii. A peace research project there is one of the largest in the nation, although it involves less than two dozen people.

Professor Rudolph J. Rummel, in charge of the University research, estimates that less than 3,000 people worldwide are engaged in similar work. This represents an investment of a few millions of dollars, compared to the billions poured into weapons research and military spending.

Even health research commands far greater investment, yet the conquest of war is far more important to the world than the conquest of cancer and heart disease.

The Matsunaga bill deserves much more attention than it is getting in Congress.

A federally chartered and financed institute to study peace could do wonders.

It could provide leadership, coordination, financing and long-term program planning. Present programs are deficient in all these areas.

Professor Rummel likens his studies to the science of meteorology: Studying peace is like studying the weather—and control of storms may be as remote in peace research as it is in meteorology.

Yet such a limited achievement as better prediction of national behavior would be immensely helpful. And the value of avoiding or controlling conflict is so self-evident as to need no elaboration.

The cause is one that should be attractive to today's dissident youth, the leaders of a generation unsure of its future.

Congressman Matsunaga's bill should be moved into the active category. It is a fitting memorial to Sergeant Takata, his comrades-in-arms and all the victims of all wars everywhere.

The world can no longer afford either the money cost or the human cost of war. Given our research-mindedness, the wonder is that we have delayed so long in putting more emphasis on peace research.

AMCHITKA TEST EFFECTS BELIE FEARS OF OBJECTORS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, by now the whole world knows that the Atomic Energy Commmission yesterday afternoon conducted a nuclear weapon test underground at Amchitka Island in the Aleutians. In light of the widespread scare stories which were circulated before the test, predicting massive earthquakes, tidal waves and other disasters, I think it is important to report what actually happened.

And what happened is precisely what the Atomic Energy Commission scientists said would happen.

The test registered 6.5 on the Richter scale, which is exactly what the AEC forecast of September 24 predicted. There were no damaging earthquakes. In fact, the aftershock activity was less than expected. AEC scientists had to turn up to gain on their seismic detection instruments in order to be able to read the aftershock activity.

Temporary buildings at ground zero show some external damage, but they are still standing. No radioactivity escaped, either to the atmosphere or to the sea. No unusual wave activity was reported at any tide station.

As far as ecological effects go, preliminary observations made within 0.6 miles from ground zero have failed to disclose any. The sea otters penned in an experimental group at a distance of 4,500 feet from ground zero are alive and healthy.

Technical personnel and newsmen returned to the island within 3 hours after the shot, called Milrow, was detonated.

The AEC points out that all data from this test will be extensively analyzed and the knowledge gained from these analyses wil be carefully studied before any determination is made regarding further testing on the island.

Recently, I compiled a document comparing the preshot horror stories about the Project Rulison underground test in Colorado with the actual results. Rulison was part of the AEC's Plowshare program, designed to develop peaceful uses of nuclear explosives.

Opponents of the project charged all sorts of evil would befall Colorado and the entire Rocky Mountain region if this test were permitted. After a legal battle which reached all the way to an appeal court, the device was fired without incident.

My survey showing the preshot allegations and the actual results in the Rulison project appears on the accompanying table. It is too early to produce a similar detailed table for the Amchitka shot.

PRINCIPAL ALLEGATIONS MADE RELATING TO THE EFFECTS OF PROJECT RULISON

PRINCIPAL ALLEGATIONS	AEC PREDICTIONS	OBSERVED EFFECTS
1. That prompt venting of radioactive material through a fracture caused by the blast might occur, possibly causing contamination of the atmosphere, surface water, plants and milk. This charge was made by a number of individuals at various public meetings concerning Project Rulison and was reported in a number of clippings.	The depth of burial for this device is six times that which has been utilized successfully at the NTS to contain underground nuclear detonations. The geologic structure in the vicinity of the detonation has been studied and no major displacements or traces of surface faulting were found, therefore, the probability of release of radioactivity to the atmosphere by fissures is small.	As of Sptember 16, 1969, no radiation levels above background have been detected. Nine Eberline Instrument Corporation radiation telemetry units were emplaced for this event. One of the units was emplaced near Surface Ground Zero (SGZ) with the remaining eight units located on an approximate circle of radius 300 to 328 feet centered on SGZ.
2. That ground water might be contaminated as a result of the experiment. This allegation was made by The Colorado Committee for Environmental Information and appeared in the complaint for temporary injunction and permanent injunction filed against Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg in U.S. District Court, Colorado, on August 22, 1969. It also was made at a number of public meetings on Project Rulison.	Hydrologic tests made in the exploratory hole (R–EX) indicated that there was little or no fluid entry from the Mesaverde formation to the bore hole (therefore, little or no fluid movement through the formation). Ion exchange and radioactivity half-life calculations of possible ground water contamination (based on conservative but reasonable assumptions) indicate that even if mobile water were present the probability of transmission of levels of radioactivity in excess of established guides to any known use point is extremely remote.	Springs and wells in the vicinity of the Rulison site were sampled by the U.S. Geological Survey before the event. Corresponding postshot samples have not yet shown radioactivity.
3. That ground motion caused by the experiment might have adverse effects, including causing earthquakes and rockfalls, the failure of dams and activating volcanoes. This allegation was made at several of the Rulison meetings.	No significant damage is expected from ground motion outside the Rulison site area. However, some hazard from rockfalls exists along roadways and canyon walls. Surface motion from Rulison will be measured at various locations on and off the site by the U.S. Coast & Geodetic Survey which will set up seismometers and recording equipment around the Rulison site. In addition, mines out to a radius of about 40 miles have been located. Seismic predictions indicate only a low probability of rockfall in the nearest mines will be caused by the Rulison detonation. The condition of gas wells and pipelines within a radius of a few miles of Rulison surface ground zero will be surveyed both before and after the detonation. Damage to existing wells and related facilities surrounding the site appears to be unlikely in view of past experience.	Seismic measurements indicate that effects from the detonation were generally as anticipated. Motions measured at the observation point were approximately 5.5 centimeters per second and 0.15 "G" and at Colibran about 4 centimeters per second. No reports of mine damage have been encountered. No significant rockfalls or damage were reported on highways in the area. A total of 172 property damage complaints have been received as of September 19. All property damage reported to date have been of minor nature such as cracked walls and ceiling plaster, cracked and broken brick chimneys, broken windows, knick-knacks, and lamps.
4. That the release of radioactive materials incident to deliberate flaring of gas from the chimney would have adverse effects upon the health of the population downwind of the flaring operations. This allegation figured prominently in the complaint for temporary injunction and permanent injunction filed against Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg in U.S. District Court, Colorado, on August 22, 1969. It was also made by the Citizens Concerned About Rulison and by the Colorado Committee for Environmental Information.	It is expected that a few hundred million standard cubic feet of gas will be produced over an 8 to 10 month time period from the chimney and virgin reservoir formation. All gas tested will be disposed of under safe conditions observing applicable radiation protection guides. The testing is not scheduled to commence until at least 6 months after the explosion by which time short half-life radioactivity will have disappeared.	No gas has been released from the cavity.

AP AND UPI REPORT POSSIBILITY OF NEW ADMINISTRATION MARIJUANA APPROACH

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the United Press International and the Associated Press services yesterday reported that the Nixon administration is preparing more flexible laws dealing with marijuana users—perhaps aimed at treating them more as a medical problem than a criminal one. An aide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was quoted as stating:

We want to provide penalties for marijuana use and possession more in line with the dangers of the drug.

He also revealed that Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, the Government's top health officer and an advocate of less stringent marijuana laws, has been meeting with Justice Department officials, including Attorney General John N. Mitchell to hammer out a new approach.

One possible new law, the aide said, was lesser penalties for use of the drug, along with rehabilitation and treatment of some offenders. This is along the line of my bill presently before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee entitled the "Comprehensive Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Care and Control Act of 1969." Present Federal law for marijuana possession provides for 2 to 10 years imprisonment for a first offense, 5 to 20 years for a second offense, and 10 to 40 years for further offenses.

The administration approach to the problem to date could be classified as being a law-enforcement, get-tough policy. I have opposed the increased penalties aspect of proposed bills in this area. Rather, I have recommended increased research and educational activities as well as construction of treatment facilities, training of personnel and better coordination between State, local, Federal and private organizations. Division within the administration, exemplified by the fight between Department of Justice officials and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare aides, must be resolved. With recent National Institute of Mental Health surveys indicating that between 5 and 10 million Americans have experimented with marijuana and that, according to an NIMH poll, at least one in five college students admitted marijuana use, the AP and UPI stories regarding a possible change in the administration's rigid and I feel unrealistic handling of the issue was most welcome. Let us hope that we see the adoption of the recommendations that were made by two Presidential Commissions on Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse—in 1963 and 1967—to the extent that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is given primary responsibility for providing answers to the problem with the Justice Department coordinating efforts with him. Time means lives in this sector and I urge the expeditious achievement of a coordinated, informed and enlightened attack on the drug problem in the United States.

WHO STABBED OUR SOLDIERS IN THE BACK?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Green Beret debacle, having served the purpose of those who would weaken the fabric of our Armed Forces, should not be allowed to go quietly to rest.

I do not have reference to the individuals who were involved. The incident has had its effect on them, whether for good or bad, and cannot be undone. I speak of the responsibility of the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and of the Congress, as the source of laws governing their operation.

The reasons for which we should make appropriate inquiry, and the course of action which we should take, are succinctly set forth by Mr. William Loeb in one of his incisive editorials in the Manchester Union Leader, which I incorporate as part of my remarks, together with a pertinent news clipping:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Oct. 1, 1969]

GREEN BERET MYSTERY

(By William Loeb)

Thank heaven that at last someone in the Nixon administration had the decency and common sense to drop the alleged "case" against the Green Berets.

What needs investigation in the Green Beret case is not the Green Berets but who is responsible and how this assault against the Green Berets started originally. There is a very strange, sinister smell about this whole business.

First of all, killing is unfortunately the essence of war. From time immemorial spies have been shot and killed, frequently without trials.

The question, therefore, arises as to why, suddenly, the death of an alleged double-agent in wartime is made into a terrific case and the Green Berets and certain officers are smeared in the process.

You will want to remember several things. Our enemy—and when we say "our enemy" we are not talking solely about the Communists abroad; we are talking about the Communists, Marxists and other sympathizers inside this nation—have as one of their objectives the destruction of any pride in the armed services, especially in such elite branches of the service as the Green Berets or the Marines. That is why the John Wayne movie which had such a success all over the United States, and which depicted the Green Berets in heroic fashion, was viciously attacked by left-wing news magazine and newspaper reviewers.

Obviously one objective of the proposed Green Beret trial was to try to injure the Green Berets and their favorable image in the U.S. public's mind.

But, in the estimation of this newspaper, the plot did not stop there.

The Communists gained a great point at the end of the World War II by bringing about the vindictive conduct of the Nuremberg trials which imprisoned or ordered the execution of certain high members of the Nazi German government. The late Senator Taft, along with this newspaper, objected to that procedure, not because this newspaper did not want to see the Nazis killed or eliminated, but because it was very easy, for those who looked ahead, to see what the Communists were up to. They wanted to create a precedent by which the leaders of all defeated nations could be tried as war criminals—whether or not they were war criminals or simply had lost a war.

Likewise, much of the Communist propaganda in this country is directed towards attempting to make the U.S. forces in Vietnam appears as war criminals in the eyes of public opinion at home and throughout the world.

Into this drive to try to make our people look like war criminals, the attack on the Green Berets fitted so neatly as to affirm the conviction in the minds of the editors of this newspaper that behind the attack on the Green Berets you will find, if you look far enough, the Communist apparatus in this country.

The Communists may possibly have taken advantage of service jealousies. They may have induced perfectly honest generals and authorities into taking this action and to have done it so subtly that their stooges didn't even know what they were being goaded into.

So serious has been the damage done to the image of the U.S. armed forces by this absolutely irresponsible, ridiculous performance in connection with the charges against the Green Berets that the matter should NOT be dropped here. A complete investigation should be made to find out who was at the bottom of this vicious and uncalled for attack on the Green Berets—an attack that has caused this nation so much damage.

Furthermore, even though the charges have been dropped, the men involved in the Green Beret case are still under a cloud.

They should be cleared completely. The best way to clear them completely is to reveal the evil basis of their persecution and who was responsible for it.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 28, 1969]

BERET DEFENSE SET "TO LITIGATE WAR"

SAIGON.—The Green Beret slaying case will provide the forum for searching questions into the entire American involvement in the Vietnam war.

Attorneys for six Special Forces officers, accused of murdering a Vietnamese interpreter, plan, in effect, to put the military command here on trial for the manner in which American forces have been fighting in Vietnam for the past five years.

"We will litigate the war," said Army Capt. John S. Berry, one of the military defense attorneys. "We intend for everything to come out."

"Everything," Berry repeated when asked whether he meant attorneys would call witnesses to testify on the killing, accidental or not, of Vietnamese civilians by American troops in hundreds of incidents throughout the war.

"There is nothing that will be immune," Berry continued, declaring that he and other attorneys planned to question not only the conduct of this war but "the entire historical concept of war and the customs of warfare."

Unless the trials are postponed, Berry will begin to raise these issues in a few weeks when a court-martial convenes to consider testimony against three of the officers, Leland J. Brumley, Robert F. Marasco and Budge E. Williams, all captains and all 27 years old.

Berry will defend Brumley whom the Army has accused of both helping to carry the alleged victim, Thai Khac Chuyen, to a boat and then knocking him out with an injection of morphine.

The Army has charged that Marasco actually killed Chuyen by shooting him with a pistol.

In messages to his wife and parents in New Jersey yesterday, Marasco said the charges "do not constitute the truth."

"I am not a criminal," he wrote, "and anything I have done was done with the most

patriotic and purest of motives. And anything I have done was done with the approval of my superiors. I am not trying to lose faith in these principles for which I am devoting my life."

DEATH DATE SET AS JUNE 20

All six officers were assigned to the Special Forces headquarters at Nha Trang, where the Army claims Chuyen was murdered on June 20.

Among the accused is Col. Robert B. Rheault (pronounced Roe), who commanded all Special Forces in Vietnam until the day after his arrest on July 20.

Capt. Berry discussed plans for the case in a hotel suite reserved by the defense as an office for all of them. The suite's main occupant, until his departure yesterday, was Henry Rothblatt, a prominent New York attorney hired as co-counsel in the defense of three of the officers, including Brumley.

Rothblatt, author of several books on criminal law, filed seven different motions during the past week, including one addressed to President Nixon demanding dismissal of the case or at least a new preliminary investigation.

The military attorneys, most of them recent law school graduates, listened respectfully while Rothblatt summarized the basic defense.

QUESTIONS ON CONDUCT

"How does the government expect soldiers in battle to wage war?" asked Rothblatt. "How are men supposed to do their duty? Who passes on it? Can you classify patriotic soldiers as criminals because they intend to try to do their jobs? When you volunteer to fight a war, what is your responsibility?"

Before getting into such questions as these, however, Rothblatt made clear he would go through every conceivable motion in an attempt to keep the Army from court-martialing the officers.

Rothblatt indicated he would file several more motions to delay or dismiss the case before finally attempting to get the trial moved to the United States, from Long Binh, the Army base 20 miles northeast of here.

The Army has turned down Rothblatt's motion demanding the right of the accused officers to talk to newsmen and has also rejected his request to return CWO Edward M. Boyle to the United States since his one-year tour in Vietnam has ended.

BOYLE OFFERED IMMUNITY

Boyle, one of Rothblatt's three clients, has not been ordered to stand trial with the others. The Army hopes that Boyle, accused of having helped Brumley in carrying Chuyen to the boat, will testify against the other officers in exchange for immunity.

The case, besides raising serious issues about the war, also may turn into a trial of the entire process of military justice.

"We will question basic concepts of military law," said Capt. Berry. "Eventually it will become a matter for federal as well as military courts."

"Basically," said Berry, "we're asking, 'What's going on here?' That's what we want to know. We will hit them on two things: Military law and the entire war. As long as the Army insists on trying these men, it will have to face severe questions on both these issues."

COLUMNIST DREADING EULOGIES TO HO

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the failure of North Vietnam to permit the International Red Cross, or any other neutral body, to visit prisoners of war and exchange information concerning their welfare, is inexcusable. It condemns Ho Chi Minh and his successors more than any other act in the war, with the exception of their atrocities against civilian populations.

It was with great interest, then, that I read an item from London concerning the eulogies for Ho Chi Minh. I concur with the thoughts that were expressed, and include the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Tampa Tribune, Sept. 5, 1969]

COLUMNIST DREADING EULOGIES TO HO

LONDON.—Columnist Bernard Levin wrote in the Daily Mail yesterday that he dreaded the outpouring of eulogies for North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh.

"The plain truth," he wrote, "is that Ho Chi Minh was a ruthless and bloody tyrant. His first action on completing the conquest of North Vietnam was to slaughter in cold blood some 50,000 men and women who might have opposed his rule.

"When his campaign to take over South Vietnam began it was waged with a policy of deliberate atrocity, as an instrument of terror, the like of which had not been seen in the modern world.

"From the cases of children literally chopped to pieces before their parents' eyes, in villages temporarily seized by the Viet Cong, to the hundreds of men, women and children who had been clubbed to death and whose bodies were discovered after the Tet offensive, the story was the same—the grossest atrocities, committed not in the heat of battle or the blood-lust of revenge, but as a calculated and important part of gentle, witty Uncle Ho's policies."

POSTAL REFORM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of the "postal reform" legislative proposals recommended by the President which must be passed so that Postmaster General Blount would be able to cope with the growing problems in the postal department, I was impressed with a press release issued by the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform.

Since I have no way of knowing whether this press release received the coverage which I believe it merits, I am inserting it into the RECORD.

The public interest clearly requires action by the Congress on legitimate postal reform which should include the proposal for a Government Postal Corporation to replace the present Post Office Department. The best interest of the public, all mail users, and all Post Office employees is at stake as we struggle for the long overdue reform of the postal department.

The press release follows:

NEWS FROM CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR POSTAL REFORM

The Citizens Committee for Postal Reform demanded today that a full, public apology be made to its co-chairmen, former Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien and former Senator Thruston B. Morton, following an allegation that they had "hoodwinked" high public officials into becoming directors of the non-profit organization.

"This fallacious and irresponsible accusation against the integrity of two of the most dedicated and respected public servants in the nation will not be tolerated," the statement which was issued by James J. Marshall, the Committee's Public Affairs Director, declared.

The statement recalled that Mr. O'Brien had served as "the trusted friend and adviser of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson" and that Senator Morton, as former chairman of the Republican National Committee, had received that honor in the light of "18 years of congressional service to his country, his party, and Presidents Eisenhower and Nixon."

"Nothing less than an unqualified public apology can amend this atrocious demonstration of recklessness," it affirmed.

The statement was issued in reply to a charge made by Patrick J. Nilan, legislative director of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, who said yesterday that the two Committee leaders had "hoodwinked" "scores of mayors and governors" into joining the bipartisan Committee and supporting President Nixon's Postal Service Act of 1969.

The Act, which is now being debated by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would transform the nation's debt-riddled Post Office Department into a self-supporting Postal Corporation free from all outside pressures.

In refuting Nilan's charge, the Committee observed that the Corporation concept was strongly advocated more than a year ago by the Kappel Commission, the unbiased blue-ribbon panel appointed by President Johnson to investigate the country's postal problems and make in-depth recommendations.

The statement also noted that the Corporation plan was endorsed by the former President in his final State of the Union message in January and is the major feature of the bill (H.R. 11750) that President Nixon sent to Congress on May 26.

"In addition to being completely false and highly insulting, therefore," the Committee stated, "Mr. Nilan's assertion is also patently ridiculous—when you consider the time factor. Our invitation to the governors and mayors to join ranks with us wasn't issued until June 18. This was long after the Corporation plan had become public knowledge in every state in the Union.

"That's why it is so incredible that Mr. O'Brien and Senator Morton should be accused now of deceiving anyone—much less, highly knowledgeable and responsible public officials."

In discussing the accusation, Mr. Marshall asserted that Nilan owes an additional apology to the more than 20 governors, more than 60 mayors, six former Cabinet officials, and hundreds upon hundreds of taxpayers who make up the Committee's membership roster.

"When you sit down and think about this preposterous charge," he said, "you realize that it's actually calling many of our most distinguished public figures and vitally concerned private citizens uninformed on a matter that's been well-publicized in the papers, on TV, and on radio for well over a year."

He said that, in view of the misrepresentations being made to public officials by people like Nilan, it is "nothing less than astounding that we are continuing to add new members every day."

In addition, Mr. Marshall stated, a public apology is also due to "three quarters of a million loyal and hard-working postal employees" who have been rendered "a distinct disservice" by the allegation.

He explained that, if because of the charge, Congress fails to enact total postal reform as envisioned in H.R. 11750, workers will be denied the opportunity for real collective bargaining discussions with management and career opportunities based on individual merit alone.

"This is a serious matter," he said. "It

will gravely damage the personal future of 750,000 men and women, and every member of their families."

He then went on to express disbelief concerning some of the other "curious thoughts" contained in the Nilan statement. He referred specifically to a Nilan description of Governor Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine as "a Republican."

Governor Curtis, in fact, was elected to his State's highest elective office in 1966—as a Democrat.

"I suppose I shouldn't really be too surprised by a ludicrous gaffe like this," he said. "Lord knows it's right on target as far as squaring with all the other misinformation contained in his so-called press release."

GREECE: THE CARAMANLIS STATEMENT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, this week there was a significant new development in the Greek political situation. I refer to the statement of Constantine Caramanlis, the former Prime Minister who served his nation and the free world during the 1950's and early 1960's.

The New York Times editorial has called him "the most respected and effective leader of post-war Greece." He has been long known as one of the most pro-American statesmen in Europe. Mr. Caramanlis is still vigorous and relatively young, only 62, and he is perhaps the only man who would be suitable to serve in the interim period after the end of the Greek dictatorship.

While the critical question remains as to who will bell the cat, there is now a clearer, democratic alternative, the so called "Caramanlis solution." This solution has the support of the leadership of the two biggest parties in Greece which accounted for nearly 90% of the vote in the 1964 election.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit an editorial from the New York Times of October 1, 1969; a London dispatch from Alvin Shuster; and an important article from the October 3 Monitor, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1969]

CARAMANLIS FIGHTS THE JUNTA

At long last the most respected and effective leader of postwar Greece has plunged wholeheartedly into the expanding effort to rid his country of a brutal and incompetent military dictatorship. Constantine Caramanlis waited a long time from his self-imposed exile in Paris to commit his enormous prestige to the fight against the colonels, but his savage, detailed indictment of them yesterday removes all doubts about where he stands.

Mr. Caramanlis goes beyond appeals to Greece's armed forces to throw out Colonel Papadoupoulos and his henchmen; he offers, in effect, to lead an interim Government that would prepare the way for Greece's return to constitutional democracy. This is exactly what nearly every Greek democratic leader of stature, at home or in exile, has hoped and worked for.

It is exactly the formula agreed on in July—and made public abroad at considerable risk—by the leaders inside Greece of the two biggest parties, Panayotis Canellopoulos of Mr. Caramanlis's National Radical Union and George Mavros of the late George Papandreou's Center Union. Even before this agreement, Greek democratic forces had been prepared to bury old differences and unite behind the leadership of Mr. Caramanlis to oust the colonels.

The junta will doubtless pull out all stops in a desperate effort to discredit Mr. Caramanlis. On the only other occasion when he spoke out—to brand the colonels "putschists" and "imbeciles" in December 1967—the junta tried clumsily to link his stand with that of Communists.

But the Greek people know Mr. Caramanlis as an impeccable conservative, who gave their country its greatest period of stability and economic growth of the postwar period. They also know, despite the barrage of junta propaganda, that he has spoken the truth in charging the colonels with isolating Greece politically, and morally, demoralizing the armed forces, undermining the economy and creating a highly explosive climate in the country.

The Caramanlis statement presents the Nixon Administration with its moment of truth about Greece. The State Department must face the fact that its policy for Greece—of trying to flatter and nudge the colonels along the road to constitutional Government and elections—is bankrupt. Not one political leader of stature has been willing to join forces with the colonels even temporarily.

United States influence at this critical juncture could be decisive. That influence must be exercised to uphold the principles of democracy and freedom for which this country involved itself with Greece under the Truman Doctrine twenty-two years ago.

CARAMANLIS URGES OVERTHROW OF GREEK REGIME—FORMER PREMIER, IN EXILE IN PARIS, ENDS LONG SILENCE—APPEALS TO MILITARY TO OUST THE FORMER COLONELS

(By Alvin Shuster)

LONDON, September 30.—Constantine Caramanlis, the former Premier of Greece now in self-imposed exile, ended nearly two years of silence today and appealed to his country's military forces to help overthrow the army-backed regime. He offered, in effect, to lead a new government.

Denouncing the present Government as a tyrannical failure, the 62-year-old founder of the right-wing National Radical Union said arbitrary rule had now become entrenched and the despair of Greeks had reached new depths.

He accused the regime of deception in pledging to restore democracy and said it intended to remain in power indefinitely by terrorizing the people and hoodwinking international public opinion.

If the present Government headed by Premier George Papadopoulos fails to retire voluntarily, he said, it is up to those officers who joined it in good faith to bring about a change.

SUPPORT HAS INCREASED

"But, beyond them, the whole of the country's armed forces must undertake the task," he continued. "It is they who, having their origins among the mass of the people, bear the grave responsibility, on behalf of the nation, of protecting its freedom, security and independence."

Since the army seized power in Greece on April 21, 1967, support for Mr. Caramanlis as an alternative has increased within the country. At present, he is generally regarded by opponents within Greece as perhaps the only man able to rally the nation behind him in any new government.

In a 1,000-word statement, Mr. Caramanlis charged that the former colonels heading the regime had disrupted the armed forces by dismissing hundreds of high-ranking and battle-experienced officers, had undermined the economic future of the country, and had isolated Greece politically and morally from the family of free nations.

AN EXPLOSIVE SITUATION

"Finally, by their tyrannical rule, their idle boasting and their hit-or-miss methods, they have created an explosive situation in Greece and deprived Greece of international repute," he said.

Mr. Caramanlis, whose statement was made available in London and Paris, led Greece from 1955 to 1963, achieving the longest period of stability in Greece's turbulent post-war politics. After his defeat six years ago by the Center Union, headed by the late George Papandreou, he moved to Paris where he lives on the top floor of a luxury apartment house.

Unlike the left-of-center Andreas Papandreou, the son of the former Premier, who has often been outspoken in trying to mobilize opposition to the regime from his exile in Sweden, Mr. Caramanlis had remained quiet.

Accordingly, Mr. Caramanlis's followers had become increasingly concerned about his silence, fearing his support would begin to dwindle unless he took a strong new stand against the regime. They felt that time was running out on efforts to push the regime from power, and that opposition elements, wondering about his views, needed a unifying focus.

Friends attributed his long silence to a feeling by Mr. Caramanlis that he did not want to speak unless he felt a statement would have some impact in bringing about a change in government.

The former Premier had kept his silence since Nov. 28, 1967, when in an interview published by the Paris newspaper Le Monde he called for the quick departure of the "putschist" rulers. The interview was Mr. Caramanlis's first outright condemnation of the regime—he had previously deplored "tragic" developments in his country at the time of the coup.

EFFECT IS UNCERTAIN

What effect his statement today will have remains to be seen. The Greek Government leaders seem to have a firm grip on the country, although there are indications of certain unhappy elements within the army.

Mr. Caramanlis said his statement—which will reach Greece in the foreign press and on Greek-language and foreign-language broadcasts—was issued to mark the first anniversary of the approval of the Constitution drafted by the regime. Many of its provisions on basic rights remain in suspension because of martial law imposed when the army took power.

The statement, however, was viewed as part of an effort by Mr. Caramanlis to give the impression, particularly to the United States, that chaos and anarchy would not follow the demise of the present Government and to encourage new pressures on the former colonels.

CALLS FOR REFORMS

Mr. Caramanlis, for example, alluded to the "demagogic policies" of the regime's predecessors and said that basic reforms were needed in Greek politics to prevent a return to the political turmoil that prompted the military takeover.

"It is time," he said, "that the military men in power realized that the geopolitical position of Greece and the character of our people do not lend themselves to dictatorship of any kind; and it is time that the political forces of Greece realized that a return to the habits and political formations of the past would not be a restoration of normality, but only another kind of abnormality."

A TRANSITORY GOVERNMENT

Mr. Caramanlis, who tried and failed to bring about constitutional and political reforms when in power, apparently sees his role as the leader of a strong transitory gov-

ernment that would take immediate control, initiate major constitutional changes and organize free elections. He himself would undoubtedly then be a candidate.

Although Mr. Caramanlis has had differences with the monarchy and believes its political powers should be curbed, it is understood he has been in touch with King Constantine, who fled to Rome in December of 1967 after attempting a countercoup against the present Government.

By offering himself as the alternative to the present regime, Mr. Caramanlis was also trying to calm those fearful that a left-wing government would follow the colonels. In short, he was saying that a right-wing dictatorship would be replaced by a right-wing democratic government.

"I must take this opportunity also," he said, "of assuring those who are anxious about the future that I would not have broken silence if I did not believe that the country can be restored without danger to conditions of normalcy, and if I were not prepared to make my personal contribution, if need be, towards that end."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 3, 1969]

CARAMANLIS: REMARKS IMPRESS GREEKS

ATHENS.—Former Premier Constantine Caramanlis's indictment of Greece's present rulers and his appeal to them to step down apparently made a tremendous impression on those Greeks who heard it first over foreign radio stations.

But it will be some time before the full impact of the statement can be assessed.

Although the appeal was moderate in tone the former Premier urged the country's armed forces to take appropriate action should the present government refuse to bow out peacefully.

"It is their responsibility and mission," he said, "to protect the people's liberty, security, and independence."

He indicated that he himself would be ready to participate in a new transitional government which would have the task of restoring the country to normalcy.

Mr. Caramanlis, a moderate conservative, is one of the few Greek politicians with high prestige and untarnished image.

He has been living in voluntary exile in Paris since 1963. His statement was issued in Paris and London.

The Greek Government at first refused to allow its publication here. But two Athens dailies suspended publication for a day rather than print only the government's answer to Mr. Caramanlis without also carrying the former Premier's statement.

The newspapers won the day when the government finally consented to publication of the full caramanlis text.

TWO PATHS TO DEMOCRACY

Mr. Caramanlis's last published statement was made on Nov. 29, 1967, during the Greek-Turkish crisis, when he urged the quick departure of the leaders of the Greek coup of April that year.

Taking the position that he can no longer remain silent since the military insists on perpetuating itself in power. Mr. Caramanlis now argues that democracy can be restored in Greece through one of two ways: either through voluntary withdrawal of the present government, or through its toppling by force.

Conceding that the first alternative could be safe and also constructive, Mr. Caramanlis warned that the second alternative might be provoked by uncontrolled powers which could put the country through trials.

This was interpreted as meaning that the Communists would eventually take an active part in the toppling of the military regime when it suited them.

In other parts of his statement Mr. Caramanlis accused the military government protagonists of "lacking the courage to directly admit that they aim at perpetuating themselves in power."

Instead, he continued, "they have created a contradictory and tyrannical regime without any ideological orientation which has committed many mistakes."

Mr. Caramanlis then specifically blamed the regime for disintegration of the armed forces through "sovietization" and cashiering or retirement of battle-tested high-ranking officers, for a poor economic policy which had dangerously increased the balance-of-payments deficit, and for the moral and political isolation of the country.

Mr. Caramanlis maintained that the regime in power could not cover up its shortcomings through "theocratic ideas" reminiscent of the Dark Ages or such slogans as "Greece of Greek Christians," not, at any rate, when the regime's methods had not been very Christian.

Many here interpreted this as an indirect attack on the military rulers for their arbitrary arrests, and persecutions and tortures alleged to have occurred.

UNSUITABLE FOR DICTATORSHIP

Mr. Caramanlis alluded to a previous recommendation of his for the transfer of power to a government, generally accepted and vested with extraordinary powers, which could in due time prepare the country for a safe return to normality.

Lest he be misunderstood, he served notice to both the military in power and the politicians.

He told the military that Greece, by virtue of its geographical position and the idiosyncrasy of its people, was not suitable for any form of dictatorship. He warned the politicians that "a return to the schemes and the habits of the past would not mean a return to normality but only a different form of anomaly."

In closing Mr. Caramanlis assured all that he would not speak out unless he felt the country could safely return to normality. He expressed his willingness personally to contribute toward that end, if need be.

Mr. Caramanlis cannot easily be discredited by the regime in view of his prestige and untarnished record.

As Premier from 1955 to 1963, he was one of the main architects of Greece's postwar recovery and development.

Mr. Caramanlis also has established himself as a moderate statesman. He chose to go into self-exile rather than openly attack the crown as an institution when a crisis erupted between him and Queen Frederika in 1963.

He tacitly admits that the country's political situation was chaotic before the 1967 coup and he wants to look toward the future and not the past.

The military rulers, therefore, will have to be careful in what they say about him. As a veteran politician put it, "Caramanlis's statement is so self-evidently true."

Some think that leading politicians and other elements now will come out in favor of Mr. Caramanlis.

Already former Premier Panayiotis Kanellopoulos has told foreign correspondents that he is in full agreement with the Caramanlis statement.

It is reported that George Mavros of the Center Union and Demitrios Papaspyrou, President of the last Parliament, will make similar statements shortly.

WE HATE WAR

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. T. Harding Jones, who is currently at Princeton University. He is one of many fine young Americans who is trying in his own way to combat the disproportionate publicity which some media give to the radical student movement.

The majority of American youth cannot afford college education. Yet, a minority of radical students who are fortunate enough to either have scholarships or afford the tuition are disrupting the education of the majority of students who go to college and universities to learn rather than "teach" elders.

Harding Jones is not one of these individuals. He and a group of students are coordinating a movement on their campus to combat the upcoming October 15 Moratorium on Vietnam. They are not swept in by the rhetoric of these radicals who claim that the only way to peace is to immediately and unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam, ignoring both the issue of who the aggressor is, as well as the consequences of such irresponsible action.

Harding Jones and his associates are examples of fine upstanding men with a real cause to support. Thank goodness for these students. They are refreshing in a day when it appears that many of our students are irresponsible publicity seekers.

Mr. Speaker, I include the statement in the RECORD at this time, so that others may benefit from this gentleman's timely and pertinent remarks:

WE HATE WAR

We want the war in Vietnam to end.

We believe our government leaders are in the best position to find an end to the war. They have the knowledge, the experience and the intelligence reports needed to make the decisions which will bring peace.

We believe all students must attend classes on October 15th to support the United States because:

Demonstrations such as the militants plan on October 15 will lengthen the war—not shorten it.

A call by youth to "pull out" only tells Hanoi: "Hang on baby, you might win it all."

Hanoi has not relented its position since peace talks began and will not as long as dissension in America is so widely publicized.

Our Government has shown its determination to find peace as early as possible by:

a. Initiating orderly troop withdrawals.

b. Eliminating November and December draft calls.

c. By demobilizing 60,000 men, from various military units.

The precious "right to protest" was preserved by our fathers who fought Nazism in Europe and hard line Communism in Asia. No one can contend that Hanoi symbolizes freedom of expression or freedom to protest.

An academic society calls for thought and analysis. We therefore challenge the Moratorium Committee to debate the issues at 8:00 PM, Tuesday, October 14th.

A JUBILANT WELCOME HOME FOR MARASCO

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 29, the charges against the Green Berets were dropped largely because of the unfaultering efforts of the dean of the New Jersey delegation, PETER

RODINO, to obtain justice for these men. I want to express my appreciation and admiration for his able leadership. And, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues two articles which appeared in the Star-Ledger on October 2, 1969:

A JUBILANT WELCOME HOME FOR MARASCO

(By Gordon Bishop)

A taut but grateful smile on his lean face, Special Forces Capt. Robert F. Marasco of Bloomfield stepped off a jet at Newark Airport yesterday to an applauding crowd that stared at him as if he were a mysterious celebrity.

It was the same Marasco who had been charged by the Army in the alleged slaying of a Vietnamese double-agent.

He told the throng of greeters swarming around him:

"I never worried about ultimately getting here. It was just a question of when. The beautiful people of the United States have written to me, expressing their support."

He summed up his Army career this way:

"I want to get a release from active duty as soon as possible. It's obvious why."

Asked if he would like to have a trial to prove his innocence once and for all, he said, his head lowered humbly:

"I don't want to go through a trial. I don't want to put my family through a trial. It's a nasty business."

His family stood proudly beside him, his father and mother beaming happily as tears raced down their cheeks.

His sister Anita, 24, also was there. But his wife, Denise, wasn't. She wasn't at the Marasco home Monday night either when the family learned that the captain had been cleared of all charges.

A relative said that the ordeal had left Mrs. Marasco "completely exhausted."

In answer to the accusation that he was the Green Beret who pulled the trigger on the spy, Marasco shot out curtly: "That's ridiculous!"

Hugging her son, Mrs. Marasco cried out joyously, "He's a hero, this man!"

She embraced and kissed her son several times, saying "He looks terrific . . . He looks as handsome as ever."

Joining the jubilant reunion were Rep. Peter W. Rodino Jr. (D-10th), who led the successful fight to free the eight Green Berets involved in the case, and Robert A. McKinley of Newark, the captain's attorney.

While waiting for their son's arrival, the Marascos sat in the airport's Newarker Restaurant, sipping cocktails, unable to eat, chatting with Rodino and hoping that everything would turn out all right for all concerned.

Marasco's tour of duty in Vietnam was to have ended July 28, but the case altered his life.

Rodino now wants to know why the Green Berets were kept in confinement for a month in violation of the military code.

"The whole case was kept a secret for over a month, I want to know why?" Rodino said angrily. "If this could happen, what are we coming to?"

The congressman said his office received some 500 letters expressing outrage over what had happened to the Green Berets. Only two letters, he added, did not support the officers' case.

Rodino said he had heard the incident happened because someone "was out to get Col. Rheault and to discredit the Green Berets."

Col. Robert B. Rheault was commander of all Green Berets in Vietnam before the case broke.

Marasco saw a year-and-a-half of combat in Vietnam and was decorated with three Bronze Stars for displaying bravery and courage in action. His four-year hitch would have been over in about six months, but he feels he'll be released before then.

There was no big brass band or banners to welcome "Bob" home. His mother said he was "too conservative" for that kind of fanfare.

When the American Airlines plane touched down at Newark Airport at 3:50 p.m., the crowd had come to catch a glimpse of a soldier caught in the middle of a messy intrigue.

LAST PERSON

Marasco was the last person to step out of the plane and onto the ramp. He wore his familiar Green Beret, his khaki short-sleeved shirt displaying many decorations. His eyes were shielded with rust-colored sunglasses.

With his mother and father beside him, he braved a barrage of questions during a brief but furious interview, then headed for a car which took him home to Bloomfield.

When he got there, his mother showed him the more than 350 letters and 50 telegrams the family had received in the last couple of weeks. Mrs. Marasco said that singer Connie Francis, formerly of Bloomfield, and now of nearby Essex Fells, had telephoned Wednesday morning to express her congratulations that the men were freed. It was one of hundreds of phone calls since the good news Monday.

The Marascos broke open bottles of champagne for the scores who showed up to celebrate the captain's homecoming.

After his release, Marasco plans to resume his career in the insurance business.

Before enlisting, he was a salesman for John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Marasco and his wife will be living in an apartment in Rutherford.

TOO TIRED FOR OWN PARTY

Green Beret Capt. Robert F. Marasco missed his "Welcome Home" party at his parents' Bloomfield home last night as a result of a battering at the hands of TV newsmen on his arrival earlier at Newark Airport.

Frank Marasco, father of the 27-year-old captain, said his son was so overcome with exhaustion that "his head almost dropped onto the table during dinner and he told us, 'Its too much, I've had it, I have to sleep.'"

The elder Marasco said his son hadn't slept for 56 hours and had been "very upset" by questions from TV newsmen at the airport who tried to pin down if the captain actually was the triggerman in the Green Beret murder case, as alleged.

"We will let him sleep until he wakes up," the father said. "If it's two days, we're not going to bother him."

The party, with some 50 friends and relatives jamming the Marasco's small two-story brick home at 25 Mountain Ave., quickly turned into a celebration for Rep. Peter W. Rodino Jr. when he arrived.

Mrs. Marasco, nearly overcome with emotion, stepped outside the house to greet the congressman. She repeatedly hugged Rodino, who was given a standing ovation by guests in the house and the crowd outside.

Rodino led the congressional fight against the Army's handling of the case that led to the release of Capt. Marasco and seven other accused Green Berets.

"The whole thing is just beyond belief," said the elder Marasco. "I don't think it could have happened without Congressman Rodino."

LET THE SELLER BEWARE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the field of consumer protection there have been, in recent years, a number of sound proposals that have been limited to narrow objectives. The drive to have the Government release information on products that it has tested is an example of this kind of proposal. The recent move to include electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards in the Child Protection Act is another important step toward protection of the unwary consumer. My chief regret about these proposals, and about so much of our consumer legislation is that they are not broad enough in scope. The whole history of our efforts in this field has been characterized by ad hoc efforts often prompted by some particular outrage or series of outrages. There has been little comprehensive legislation, only piecemeal bills and administrative actions.

Today, I am introducing the Trade Quality and Consumer Information Act of 1969, which I believe represents a comprehensive approach. I consider this proposal, which is based on the British Trade Descriptions Act, 1968, to be sufficiently sweeping to change the old maxim "Let the buyer beware," to "Let the seller beware." If this be "consumerism" which Secretary Stans deplored the other day, then so be it. I plead guilty to the charge of being more concerned with the consumer than I am with business, because the consumer is less able to protect himself.

This bill which I am introducing will not only tend to protect the consumer's physical safety, but also his pocketbook.

My bill would provide, for the first time in this country, except in the field of food, drugs, and cosmetics, for criminal prosecution for substantial misdescription of goods and services, whether in advertising, labeling, or in verbal statements made during the course of sale. The bill would extend, for example, to information about previous ownership and treatment of used cars, the relative newness and source of second-hand goods, the actual contents of any relative newness and source of second-hand goods, the actual contents of any product, and to any statements about services, such as those provided by travel agents and service stations.

Let me outline the main points of the bill:

First, there would be Federal criminal penalties for using any false trade description, whether in advertising, labeling, or in the course of sale, or for any false statement about goods or services in interstate commerce. The penalties would apply only to the concern that is responsible for the misinformation.

The first offense would be a misdemeanor. Subsequent offenses would be punishable by up to 3 years in prison. It is my belief that this provision would be a substantial deterrent to unscrupulous businesses who, at present, know that, no matter how falsely they tout their products, the most that can happen is that they are told to cease and desist by the FTC.

Enforcement would be by the Department of Justice, through the U.S. attorneys. A special section should be set up for this purpose.

Second, the appropriate regulatory agency—either the Federal Trade Com-

mission or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, depending on the product or service—will be given certain powers:

First, to assign definite meanings, that must be adhered to, to business expressions and terms. For example, a term like "reconditioned" when applied to an electric appliance could be assigned a definite meaning.

Second, the regulatory agency could require that the manufacturer or seller provide any information that it thought necessary to enable the consumer to make informed choices in the marketplace. This provision would enable the agency to require such information as the ignition point of a fabric or the performance and safety data of mechanical products—including, for example, automobiles, without the strain that the Federal Highway Administration has gone through recently in requiring certain safety information to be made available.

Third, the regulatory agency would be empowered to require that a manufacturer or seller verify any trade description, and could undertake tests to verify the trade description. Under this provision, a detergent manufacturer could be required to produce actual test data showing that their detergent did not, say, redden hands. If the agency were not satisfied with the manufacturer's data, then it could conduct its own tests.

This section of the bill would also empower the relevant agency to disseminate information about the tests. The agency would also be required to make its findings available for possible criminal prosecutions under the first section of the bill.

CONGRESSMAN VANIK CONTINUES BATTLE FOR TAX REFORM

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, during this year's consideration of tax reform in the House, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK, of Ohio, has consistently stood up for tax relief for average American taxpayers, while fighting to close those tax loopholes which have enabled many to escape their fair share of taxes. I am pleased to note that Congressman VANIK's constructive role in the development of the House-passed bill has been recognized by so many of the Nation's news media.

Today, Congressman VANIK testified before the Senate Finance Committee, which is now considering the tax reform bill. I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point Congressman VANIK's statement. He is to be commended for his continuing struggle to bring tax justice to America.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK

Mr. Chairman, after six trying months of effort on the Tax Reform proposal, I can fully appreciate the difficult problem which confronts your Committee. The work of the House Ways and Means Committee and the House of Representatives is not perfect, but I believe you will agree that our deliberations were extensive, exhaustive, and well-intentioned. Most of our decisions in Committee were arrived at after extensive discussion. Section by section, we approved most of the language by almost unanimous vote. As you can determine by the Report on the Bill, there was, overall, very little dissension on major provisions of the Bill.

With this in mind, I endorse the principal provisions of the House Bill. Our decisions were made calmly and deliberately and in substantial response to the overwhelming mandate which each of us has clearly received from our constituencies. To my knowledge, that pressure has not diminished one iota.

Neither the House of Representatives nor the Ways and Means Committee initiated the drive for tax reform. We were pushed into it by angry taxpayers. The disclosure of abuses of the tax code ignited the bonfire. Taxpayer indignation at the escape from taxation of the super-rich, added fuel to the fire. The alternative to tax reform is open tax revolt.

There are some who would prefer to keep reform in suspension as a political issue—I would rather see a fair and reasonable proposal written into law. This reform proposal is in many instances only a soft touch on tax privilege instead of the heavy hand that I would like to see. It deals with no citizen unfairly. It is a step we must take toward tax justice.

Those who criticize our efforts to impose a minimum tax on the wealthy must find some other way of accomplishing this necessary goal. But that goal must be reached. The American public demands it.

Much has been said about our treatment of the oil depletion allowance. Considering what could have happened, the small reduction in the depletion allowance enacted by the House was the minimum the taxpayer would accept. There can be no Tax Reform Bill without some reduction of oil-tax privileges. Nothing was done about intangible drilling costs, accounting procedures, and several other devices to spare oil taxation. The oil industry should be able to assume this taxation without threats to increase consumer prices. Blackmail will not work on the Congress or the consumer.

Domestic oil prices are artificially controlled by two state commissions working in unison toward price stability through production controls. Foreign oil import controls further prop up domestic oil prices at a consumer cost of billions of dollars. The authenticity of reports of depleted reserves must be questioned, in light of the advantages inherent in suppressing reported reserves in an effort to shelter these reserves from taxation.

In one afternoon before the Ways and Means Committee, I dispelled the myth of natural gas shortages and the threat of a natural gas crisis. That information is in the House record.

Although the Administration has finally agreed to accept the Ways and Means Committee and the House recommendations for a reduction in the oil depletion allowance to 20 per cent, they favor retaining the foreign oil depletion allowance which was completely eliminated by the House.

There is no rational legislative reason for extending the privilege of the depletion allowance to foreign produced oil. The combination of the depletion allowance and the foreign tax credit have made most of these profits tax free.

These tax-free profits of American investment in foreign oil have corrupted and misdirected American foreign policy in many oil-rich countries. This has resulted in American policies of costly military assistance in support of temporary rulers who will undoubtedly be removed when their people find out what is going on. There is no reason for the American taxpayer to subsidize these activities.

In some of the provisions of the Reform Bill, there may be room for improvement, particularly with respect to the language on charitable giving. I also hope that your Committee will consider providing taxpayer relief by way of increased exemptions. From projections of tax receipts which I have seen, it would seem very feasible to increase exemptions at the rate of $100 per year, per dependent for the next four years until the dependency allowance reaches $1,000 per dependent. Every taxpayer relates the dependency exemption to the actual present day costs of support. To the taxpayer, his is far more meaningful than increased standard deductions which disregards family size.

In considering a taxpayer's fair share of taxation, it is important to know how a taxpayer must divide his available income among his dependents. This is hardly a boon to a wealthy taxpayer whose expense in supporting dependents escalates with his station in life. Poverty and large families are synoymous. Increased exemptions are the only method to relate the need for tax relief to family size.

One major objective of tax reform in the House which was not achieved is the critical need for simplification of tax returns and payment procedures. For the individual taxpayer, there is need for a simplified appeal procedure. As it stands now, the Tax Court procedure is a court for the rich. Less than one per cent of all challenged cases reach the Appellate Division of the Internal Revenue Service. Some lawyers argue that it is not feasible to take up a tax dispute unless the tax claim is upwards of $10,000.

What would be wrong with a system of small tax claims referees who could establish essential facts in small tax claims and provide a necessary and humane service for the average taxpayer.

In these days of high interest, it appears that the Internal Revenue Service is used as a bank by tax delinquents who pay 6 per cent interest on taxes owed the Federal government, using tax money for other purposes.

According to the latest Internal Revenue Service figures provided to my office, interest on delinquent taxes owed to the United States Treasury by individuals and corporations in Fiscal Year 1969 amounted to over $567 million. This amount of interest would indicate a $9.5 billion tax delinquency in Fiscal Year 1969! At this rate, the tax delinquency will increase in Fiscal Year 1970 by 12 per cent—over $11 billion.

There is no joy to the Treasury collection of this interest at a 6 per cent rate. Who can get money cheaper than that? The delinquent taxpayer can invest these funds in absolute security at 8 per cent or 12 per cent. The delinquent taxpayer can profit by arbitrage at the expense of all other taxpayers who pay their bills.

It is incredible—but the delinquent taxpayer has another useful gimmick. He can get a tax write-off against his current taxes for the interest he pays the Internal Revenue Service on his delinquent tax bill. This reward for delinquency adds a cruel insult to the average eaxpayer who has to pay his tax bill before it is due.

It seems to me that the Tax Reform proposal should be amended to raise the interest rate for delinquency and to eliminate the deduction for interest paid on delinquent taxes.

I know that your Committee is critically pressed for time in your deliberations. But there is a sense of urgency about tax reform which should prompt us to make difficult and responsible decisions this year.

PARKINSON'S DISEASE BREAKTHROUGH AT THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the lesser known but most important activities of the Atomic Energy Commission is medical research. The Commission along with the National Institutes of Health are probably this Nation's most valuable Federal resources in this area.

For the past several years, the Congress has been funding the biology and medicine program at the Commission at a level of about $90 million per year.

One of the most striking evidences that this money is well spent is the development at the AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratory of a new drug which is making dramatic progress in the control of Parkinson's disease.

The drug is called L-Dopa. Its discovery evolved from a research program in which Dr. George C. Cotzias and Dr. Paul S. Papavasiliou and others at Brookhaven were using radioisotopes to study the role of trace elements in the body and their relationship to neurological based diseases.

In its October 6 issue, Newsweek magazine compares the development of L-Dopa with the development of penicillin in the 1940's, and tranquilizers in the 1950's. This fine article details the progress being made in the treatment of Parkinson's disease with L-Dopa and what lies ahead.

The article follows:

PROGRESS WITH L-DOPA

"Miracle" drugs that really work are almost once-in-a-decade developments: penicillin in the 1940s, the tranquilizers of the 1950s, and for the 1960s—just possibly—a new drug called L-Dopa. According to preliminary reports two years ago, L-Dopa seemed to be the most effective drug ever found for controlling the disabling tremors and muscular rigidity of Parkinson's disease, which afflicts up to 1.5 million Americans. But further careful testing of the drug was required to confirm the initial impression. At the World Congress of Neurological Sciences in New York last week, researchers conducting these trials agreed that L-Dopa had more than lived up to its promise.

The discovery of L-Dopa as a treatment for Parkinson's disease came from basic research in 1960. The disorder was known to involve the basal ganglia, small nerve structures that are located deep within the brain. And at the time, surgery to destroy parts of the basal ganglia was the most effective—though hazardous—way of relieving Parkinson's symptoms. Then Drs. H. Ehringer and O. Hornykiewicz of Vienna found the basal ganglia of patients suffering from the disease lacked a neural chemical called dopamine. They began testing ways of raising the dopamine level in the brain as a means of treating the disease. In 1967, Dr. George C. Cotzias of the Atomic Energy Commission's Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, N.Y., discovered that high doses of L-Dopa, an amino acid that is converted by the body into dopamine, had brought about improvement in his small group of patients. At last week's meeting, researchers were able to report similarly dramatic results on hundreds of additional patients.

HELP

One study—involving some 400 Parkinson's-disease sufferers—was done by the Neurological Institute of New York's Columbia-Presbyterian Hospital. In several patients, the Parkinson's-disease symptoms disappeared entirely. The same kind of findings were reported by Dr. Fletcher McDowell of New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center. McDowell cited in particular the case of a 68-year-old pianist who had become so disabled that she was unable to turn in bed without assistance. After eight weeks on L-Dopa, she was able to dress herself, walk briskly and even play the piano.

In the two years since Cotzias' report, the use of L-Dopa has been refined. At first, recalled Columbia's Dr. Melvin Yahr, the drug seemed to overcome rigidity, but didn't seem to help with the uncontrollable trembling of the arms, legs, hands and fingers. Now, neurologists report that the tremor is stilled if the drug is given long enough.

The drug must also be given at high doses to be effective. To give the patient time to adjust, the dosage starts low and is gradually increased to as much as 8 grams every day over a period of three to four weeks. In the beginning, patients often experience nausea and even vomiting, but these side effects disappear, especially if the drug is taken with meals. The most serious side effects are disturbances in the heart rhythm, nervous tension and sudden drops in blood pressure, often severe enough to cause fainting. These problems, the doctors at the meeting agreed, can usually be eliminated by decreasing the dosage.

BOOSTER

In many cases, the meeting was told, L-Dopa has replaced surgery for treating Parkinson's disease. While an operation on the basal ganglia can ease symptoms, it will not arrest the progress of the disease. Eventually, additional surgery may be required. In the opinion of Dr. Robert S. Schwab of Boston's Massachusetts General Hospital, approximately 10 per cent of Parkinson's patients will still benefit from surgery, particularly those who are 90 per cent disabled, whose disease largely affects one side of the body and who are under 65. But even these patients, he said, would need drug therapy to eliminate symptoms as the disease progresses.

The drug has not yet been approved for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration—pending proof of safety. This has limited the availability of L-Dopa. At present, Hoffman-La Roche, Inc., of Nutley, N.J., is supplying the drug free of charge for trials at major medical centers. Private physicians can obtain the drug—at a cost of about $2.50 for an average daily dose—from the three other U.S. suppliers of L-Dopa after obtaining permission from the FDA to conduct clinical trials. At the same time, neurologists are looking for ways to improve the drug. For example, they are now trying "booster" drugs which, when administered simulaneously, increase the amount of L-Dopa that reaches the brain.

THE VIETNAMESE "MIDDLE GROUND"

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a recent witness to political developments in South Vietnam, Richard A. Berliner, has written a provocative article about the approaches needed in that country to develop a new political consensus.

His article "The Vietnamese 'Middle Ground'," gives important insights into the thesis, which I support, that a new government, responsive to the political actualities, is needed before we can expect peace in Vietnam.

The article, published in a recent issue of the Ripon Forum, follows:

KEY TO POSTWAR POLITICS: THE VIETNAMESE "MIDDLE GROUND"

(By Richard A. Berliner)

(NOTE.—Richard A. Berliner served six months in Vietnam with the Committee of Responsibility from March, 1968. Prior to this position, he served from September, 1966 with the International Voluntary Service, working with youth and student groups in development problems and refugee assistance near Saigon. He is currently a student of Southeast Asian Affairs at American University.)

One of the most important and little realized facts about the internal politics of South Vietnam is that despite the years of physical and political struggle the country has seen, there exists a sizeable "middle ground" whose "heart" has been won by neither side. This swing segment remains as disaffected and unmoved as ever by the rhetoric of the Saigon regime and the National Liberation Front.

Because the military stalemate has led to increasing emphasis on the need for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, the "middle ground" has become progressively more important. In fact, it seems clear that any settlement which pretends to be permanent will have to take this element of the population into account.

The political difficulties this imposes are immense because of the make-up of the "middle ground" itself. Fragmented among religious, political and class groupings, the one cohesive force that binds this element is a desire for PEACE, *i.e.* an end to the massive destruction with anticipation of continued "in-fighting" among the Vietnamese forces.

An important element within the "middle ground" are the youth, students in the high schools and universities as well as non-students under thirty. If there is one failure that can be attributed to the Ky and then Thieu regimes, it has been their inability to attract the support of Vietnam's young people. Thieu has not mistakenly tried to organize his own youth movement like Ky's Anti-Fraud League (which had to be disbanded because of corruption over use of government money and the purchasing of draft deferments), but neither has he gotten any of the youth organizations (and there are a considerable number) to give him more than token support.

Instead he has enlarged the disaffection felt by the youth by cracking down swiftly and subtly—not with riot troops as Ky was forced to use in 1966, but with the secret police, the jails and military courts.

A Christmas concert of anti-war songs was broken up with over eighty arrested. Youth idol, Trinh Cong Son's music was banned for its advocacy of peace and a united Vietnam. New petitions for peace have been presented to the government, and new groupings have occurred to push the peace issue. Probably the most prominent of these is the "Genuine Nationalists," reportedly formed around General Duong van (Big) Minh—a popular figure who returned from exile in Thailand last fall.

Less overt in their disagreement with the Thieu regime are a growing number of Catholics (Thieu is a Catholic), both Northern and Southern. Essentially made up of intellectuals, professionals, and priests, this group has a strong conviction for the need for peace and a realization that Thieu is not focusing on this question. A feeling is developing that it may be easier to work with

the National Liberation Front and in fact necessary if peace is going to happen. This is a strong voice in face of the common belief that the "communists" would disallow the freedom to practice religion, especially for Catholics. Priests in the South know, however, that this has not been the case in the North, through communication with relatives via Paris.

One of the bright young voices among the Catholic dissidents, Father Nguyen Ngoc Lan, has been imprisoned since December.

EMINENT "HO U. ALUMNI"

What Thieu has perhaps failed to understand is the politicalization that takes place in Vietnamese jails. Writes Saigon free-lance correspondent, Don Luce (whose nine years in Vietnam give him a unique perspective). "For decades political prisoners have been sent to Con Son (a prison island). In the time of the French it became known as the University of Ho Chi Minh because so many of its 'graduates' joined the Viet Minh after imprisonment there. Today, some of Vietnam's most respected leaders including Phan Khac Suu, the Cao Dai political leader, and Dr. Phan Quang Dan, Suu's running mate in the third-place ticket in the September 1967 presidential elections, proudly list their stays at Con Son among their political assets. Conspicuously missing from this list, however, is the present Saigon government leadership."

Just how many more than official American estimates of $20,000 political prisoners sit in Vietnam's jails is difficult to say. Some estimates run into the hundreds of thousands. Very few have the luxury of being brought to trial. If more were, it could be seen clearly that not only disaffected students but also prominent religious leaders, reserve military officers and labor union organizers line the jails. The Thieu regime is very egalitarian in its attempt to silence the dissident forces.

The existence of a middle ground is not very significant unless this force is able to exercise influence over the polar contestants. President Thieu has chosen to use repressive means to silence the "middle ground." The arrest of Thich Thien Minh and Father Lan and the ban of anti-war folk singer, Trinh Cong Son, indicates that he feels threatened by Buddhists, Catholics and youth they represent. At the same time by eliminating any possibility of support from these groups, he is placing his survival in the hands of military might. This for the most part still rests with the United States.

HETEROGENEOUS BUT URBAN

Just as the GVN and the NLF can claim representation from Buddhists, Catholics and the less prominent Hoa Hao and Cao Dai sects, the "middle ground" has all of these—perhaps a majority of the devout Buddhists (which is basically a pacifistic religion) and a surprising number of Catholics. As a group it is more urban than rural based, and less likely to occupy high positions in the military or work directly with or for Americans.

It would be wrong to describe it as a "third force," however. Although Buddhists played a prominent role in overthrowing President Diem in 1963, hopes for a third force," as an independent movement died for many in the Spring of 1966, when Premier Ky decided to take care of the Buddhist "problem" with tanks and rifles in Hue and Danang. Led at the time by Thich Quang (labeled a militant Buddhist, despite adherance to essentially non-violent tactics), the Buddhists remained dormant for over a year—until the eve of the 1967 presidential elections.

While students protested against the unethical tactics employed during the presidential election, Tri Quang and adherents of the An Quang Pagoda staged a sit-in in front of Thieu's Independence Palace protesting the revocation of the Buddhist charter. The question has never been settled.

The 1968 Tet offensive further confused and scattered the Buddhists and proponents of a "third force," while bringing several of its leaders together under imprisonment "for their own protection" according to Thieu. Tri Quang, Au Truong Thanh (former Minister of Economics under Ky) and Truong Dinh Dzu (runner-up in the 1967 presidential elections) were cloistered together with several others of similar status. Each one, although non-communist, was considered a threat by the government.

A few petitions were presented, the wives of the imprisoned staged a one-day demonstration and other similar weak responses were made to protest the imprisonment. Their release came eventually, in April, 1968. Today Dzu is back in jail, apparently for the duration of the regime. Au Trung Thanh is in self-exile in Paris. And Thich Tri Quang remains more or less under house arrest.

More recently, however, there has been a new round of activism by "middle ground" elements. A ten-mile procession, advocating "peace" occurred in late December led by monks of the An Quang Pagoda. It was capped with the releasing of about 20 white doves from the Pagoda roof, as well as clusters of balloons carrying paper doves. The gathering at the end of the peaceful procession was disrupted by Saigon combat police when youths began agitating for expanding the demonstration.

CENSURE 'EM, ARREST 'EM

The censure of Thich Thien Minh, one of the most prominent of the "middle ground" monks, through a warning not to advocate "peace" in his sermons, was Thieu's response to this activity.

Thien Minh has since been arrested along with approximately fifty of his followers in the wake of the most recent Communist attacks at the end of February. He was arrested under the pretext of having NLF propaganda as well as correspondence with Ho Chi Minh in his quarters at a Buddhist dormitory as well as for harboring draft dodgers.

Although it is difficult to know if this indictment is in fact true, its public pronouncement by Thieu can only further complicate his problems. If true, it means one important element of the "middle ground" has shifted much closer to the NLF than ever before. If false, it will further alienate many Vietnamese for attempting to discredit a popular figure.

Thirty-four of the students have been released, but Thien Minh was sentenced by a military court to ten years hard labor. The An Quang Pagoda issued a statement calling the sentencing, "brutal to a degree of nonsense," and "a serious provocation against the church." Dzu, the last prominent leader to be brought before a military court, was sentenced to five years hard labor at Con Son Island after testimony and deliberation of less than two hours.

Recently, the Thieu–Ky government announced the formation of a moderate party to attract the middle ground elements, but they have done little to implement their words or lay the groundwork for any genuine political movement.

CONCILIATORY NLF STRATEGY

The National Liberation Front, on the other hand, seems to have placed more importance on the role of the "middle ground" in a peace settlement. Nor does it feel essentially threatened by it. The best example of this was the surfacing of the Alliance for National Democratic and Peace Forces, officially announced over the National Liberation Front radio late in April 1968.

Although the communique said the Alliance was consummated during a two-day meeting April 21 and 22, 1968, near Saigon, it is believed that its origins go back much further. Earlier a regional committee was set up in Hue during the 1968 Tet offensive, with the venerable Thich Don Hau named as vice-president. Don Hau was also named vice-president of the national body composed of ten leaders. All are well known in Saigon as lawyers, doctors, and professors. Only one, a woman doctor, Duong Quynh Hoa, has been suspected of having previous Communist connections.

A May 9, 1969 New York *Times* report cites a captured prisoner as dating the formation of the plan to set up an alliance as far back as mid-1967. The article also cites a United States Mission Study that dates the concept for an alliance back to 1966 (that "would broaden the appeal of the NLF among various classes in Saigon who found it difficult to cooperate clandestinely with the Viet Cong.")

Whether the alliance has been successful or not, it is difficult to discern at this point. What is important is that the NLF is making an effort to attract the middle ground and therefore recognized its political potential. The Saigon government, by repressing the middle ground is further alienating itself from the population and making its own survival almost a matter of conjecture.

BIG-TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Daytona Beach, Fla., Journal; the West Palm Beach, Fla., Palm Beach Times; the Tampa, Fla., Times; the Sarasota, Fla., Journal; and the Cocoa, Fla., Today. The editorials follow:

[From the Daytona Beach (Fla.) Journal, July 30, 1969]

THIS MENACE DIES HARD

The bill died in a committee of the Florida Legislature but it has had a rebirth in a committee of the U.S. House. Its purpose is to spawn a new breed of monsters on the nation's highways.

The bill, to permit heavier, wider and longer trucks on the nation's highways, died in a House committee last year because of public outcry against it. But quietly it is being pushed again this year through the persistence of the trucking industry.

A companion proposal, permitting wider buses that could lead to wider trucks, was lobbied by former Gov. Haydon Burns before a Florida Senate committee during this year's legislative session, but was scrapped also because of public outcry against it.

The new House bill is supposed to have some sweeteners in it, but its opponents on the committee are not impressed.

It is called a "permissive" bill, allowing the states to adopt the larger limits on interstate highways it would authorize. But state legislative history indicates that the states are quick to go along with the trucking lobbyists—the Florida committee, in fact, bowed to Burns and approved the bill he presented. The public's alarm forced it to reconsider.

Also, the bill purports to set a limit of 70 feet, but Rep. Fred Schwengel, R-Iowa, has discovered a grandfather clause in it that makes the length limit meaningless and would permit the use of triple trailer trucks 105 feet long in some states. Even if the limitation of 70 feet held up, that is longer than the length permitted in 48 states; indeed Florida's limit is now 55 feet.

And a nonsensical "sweetener" is that the bigger trucks would be limited to the interstates. But trucks do not begin or end on interstate highways; they have to reach those from city streets and linking two lane roads.

Motorists would be subjected to far greater chances of dying in accidents involving trucks than they are now, and that already is bad enough. Accident studies presented in opposition to the bill show that accidents involving cars and small pickup trucks accounted for three tenths of one percent of the fatalities per 100 persons involved. But the death rate mounts to 13.3 per 100 in car-big truck accidents, with 98 percent of the victims for the most part the car drivers or passengers.

The American Automobile Assn. calls for thorough research into the safety effects of permitting the longer lengths, widths and greater poundage of trucks before the bill is considered further.

"The lives and property of over 100 million drivers are involved in such a decision," said AAA. "Congress should not ask them to be guinea pigs by increasing the sizes and weights and then research the effects. The research should be done first."

Finally, there is the economic factor aside from the property damage and wasteful loss of life. The Bureau of Public Roads has predicted that an estimated 300,000 bigger trucks on our costly highways would require an additional $8.5 billion in repair and construction costs to the interstate system in the first 10 years.

Rep. Richard D. McCarthy, D-N.Y., another opponent of the bill, said: "8.5 billion to benefit one third of one percent of the nation's vehicles is a steal. I wouldn't believe it if I weren't here."

[From the West Palm Beach (Fla.) Palm Beach Times, July 24, 1969]

SAFETY FIRST

The trucking industry, engaged in a determined campaign for the last year or so to persuade the government to give even larger trucks the run of the nation's roads, has lately come up with a new argument to bolster its case.

Industry spokesmen asserted in congressional hearings that the size and weight hikes desired would actually contribute to highway safety. Their reasoning is that by abandoning the present weight limit—73,280 pounds—for trucks on the interstate system and adopting instead an axle-spacing formula, weight distribution would be improved. Trucks might be heavier—up to 92,500 pounds—and wider, but also better-balanced, and therefore less of a hazard to truckers, passenger car drivers, bridges and the roadways themselves.

There is no question that trucking is a vital element in the transport system of a consumption-happy society or that there are valid arguments for bringing existing regulations into line with changing needs of the industry and public, improved technology and highway facilities.

But this is one that is likely to be difficult to sell to drivers who have had white-knuckled experience maneuvering around and among present width and weight trucks, or struggled to keep a car on the road in the gale-force winds frequently created in passing or being passed by trucks.

All the advantages claimed for the public will do little for those killed or maimed when forced off the road by a rubber-tired boxcar.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times, July 23, 1969]

BIG-TRUCK ISSUE RISES AGAIN

Do you as a motorist want longer, wider and heavier trucks on the nation's highways?

If you are opposed to that, or should you desire more information before reaching a decision, you'll be wise to take serious note of legislation pending in Congress. A bill designed to ease federal restrictions on commercial vehicles is being considered by the roads subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee.

This measure would permit widening of trucks and buses from eight to eight and one-half feet and to increase the gross weight from the present limit of 73,000 pounds to as much as 108,900 pounds on a nine-axle truck. It is practically identical with the big-truck bill which died in the last congressional session. The new bill would impose a 70-foot length limit, which is higher than allowed, except under special permit, in 48 of the 50 states. Florida's length limit, for instance, is 55 feet.

Representatives of a number of fine organizations, including the American Automobile Association, the American Association of State Highway Officials and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, have testified against the measure. George F. Kachlein Jr., AAA executive vice president, quite properly called it an "anti-safety bill," warning of the increased peril the longer and wider trucks would present for ordinary motorists.

Others pointed to the incalculable sums that would be needed to strengthen existing bridges to sustain such truckloads and to rebuild roads worn out prematurely.

Although the bill as it now stands would apply only to the interstate highway system, we should keep in mind that truck trips do not begin or end on interstate highways. They must enter or leave on roads of inferior design and construction and, if anything, more congested. Thus, once Congress opens the way for more enormous truck-trailers on interstate roads, the pressure will mount on legislatures to establish similar maximum limits on state highways, thereby increasing driving risks.

Mr. Kachlein did well to emphasize that far more basic research into the accident hazards posed by larger and wider trucks is an absolute necessity. As he pointed out, "The lives and property of over 100 million drivers are involved in such a decision and we cannot ask them to be guinea pigs by increasing the sizes and weights and then researching the effects. The research should be done first."

He is so right, and we join the Florida Conference of AAA Motor Clubs in urging Florida motorists to write their congressmen to put the House bill to one side for further research and study.

[From the Sarasota (Fla.) Journal, July 23, 1969]

THE TRUCK BATTLE

The trucking industry, engaged in a determined campaign for the last year or so to persuade the government to give even larger trucks the run of the nation's roads, has lately come up with a new argument to bolster its case.

Industry spokesmen asserted in congressional hearings that the size and weight hikes desired would actually contribute to highway safety. Their reasoning is that by abandoning the present weight limit—73,280 pounds—for trucks on the interstate system and adopting instead an axle spacing formula, weight distribution would be improved. Trucks might be heavier—up to 92,500 pounds—and wider, but also better-balanced, and therefore less of a hazard to truckers, passenger car drivers, bridges and the roadways themselves.

There is no question that trucking is a vital element in the transport system of a consumption-happy society or that there are valid arguments for bringing existing regulations into line with changing needs of the industry and public, improved technology and highway facilities.

But this is one that is likely to be difficult to sell to drivers who have had white-knuckled experience maneuvering around and among present width and weight trucks, or struggled to keep a car on the road in the gale-force winds frequently created in passing or being passed by trucks.

[From the Cocoa (Fla.) Today, July 22, 1969]

WARNING BY AAA

The Florida branch of AAA believes two bills pending before Congress are a danger to Florida motorists and highways.

One, the AAA says, would permit wider buses to use federal highways. The other would allow longer and taller trucks on the Interstate system.

The AAA says such federal rules usually turn into state laws because few trucks and buses can complete their trips without leaving the superhighways.

JUVENILE CRIME IN NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now there has been general concern on the part of the administration, many of the Members of Congress, representatives of the District government, representatives of various community organizations, and citizens of the community itself with the rapidly increasing serious and violent crime being committed by juveniles in the Nation's Capital. For instance, I note that recent statistics show that in the last 6 years, robbery by 16- and 17-year-olds has increased 258 percent. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with the recognized deficiencies in existing legislation for protecting the due process rights of arrested juveniles.

The Department of Justice, in consultation with expert representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the District government, has undertaken an extensive revision of the Code of Juvenile Procedure for the District of Columbia. The administration's proposed Code of Juvenile Procedure for the District of Columbia, which is contained in this bill, is held to be a balanced and comprehensive approach to the problem of juvenile crime in the District of Columbia. It supplements the provisions of H.R. 12854, which I introduced on July 15, 1969, and which was subsequently referred to the District of Columbia Committee. H.R. 12854 provides for a comprehensive reorganization of the current court system and the judicial environment in which family problems would be handled in the District of Columbia. The restructured court of general jurisdiction, the superior court, would have a family division in which would be vested all of the jurisdiction of the now existing juvenile court of the District of Columbia and the domestic relations branch of the court of general session of the District of Columbia. It is intended that all family-related problems, such as delinquency, parent-child problems, and so forth, would come within the jurisdiction of the family division of the superior court.

In its proposed legislation, the administration has provided that those 16- and 17-year-olds who commit specified crimes of violence most dangerous to the peace of the community, such as murder, rape,

and robbery, will be ineligible for treatment as juveniles. Instead they will be prosecuted as adults with the whole panoply of correctional services available, including supervision and treatment pursuant to the Federal Youth Corrections Act. Retention within the juvenile system of these matured, sophisticated, and experienced 16- and 17-year-olds who commit such violent crimes would appear in many instances to only undermine the rehabilitative potential of other juveniles. Together with its proposed waiver provisions in H.R. 12854 and H.R. 13689, the administration has chosen to limit the benefits of juvenile treatment to those youngsters with the requisite rehabilitative potential and to exclude those who lack such potential and might adversely affect the rehabilitation of others.

The administration's proposed Code of Juvenile Procedure also incorporates and thereby codifies the requirements of due process outlined by the Supreme Court in its recent decisions. Clear notice of the charge made, provision for counsel at all critical stages, and hearings to determine probable cause for detained juveniles are among the numerous procedural protections accorded juveniles in the proposed code. In addition, the administration has carefully and wisely established different procedures for handling delinquent children, neglected children, and children in need of supervision. Mental examinations of juveniles are specifically provided for in the bill, and other procedures relating to the juvenile mentally ill are provided for in the proposed code.

By providing a fair and well delineated balance between the rights of juveniles and the protection of the public, Mr. Speaker, it is submitted that the administration has recommended a Code of Juvenile Procedure for the District of Columbia which merits prompt consideration as a measure to stem the increasing tide of serious and violent crime being committed by juveniles in the Nation's Capital.

A REPORT ON THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of questions and comments concerning the new national administration, I welcome the opportunity to discuss a few of many notable accomplishments.

Thanks to the action of President Nixon and his capable administrative management team, for the first time in 10 long years we ended fiscal year 1969 with a budget surplus of $3 billion. That accomplishment is even more noteworthy in view of the fact that L. B. J. had a deficit of $25 billion last year.

The President recently announced a cutback in all foreign service personnel and a reduction in the number of AID advisers abroad to effect an approximate saving of $75 million per year.

President Nixon has established an effective, capable Department of Justice that is letting the hopheads, thieves, crooks, and criminals understand that crime does not pay like it previously did.

As a result of President Nixon's appointments, for the first time in 13 years the Supreme Court will become independent of the activist, liberal coalition which has ruled it. This development is highly significant for the American people, long overdue, and certainly welcome. It should mark the beginning of a new era in judicial responsibility, with the Supreme Court adhering to the Constitution while exercising proper judicial restraint in carrying out its duties.

VIETNAM

Whether we wholeheartedly agree with it or not, there is a new direction in the war in Vietnam. Consider carefully the facts:

In 1960, at the end of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, there were only 793 Americans in South Vietnam, and in an advisory capacity only.

In 1963, when Johnson took over from the Kennedy administration, there were over 25,000 Americans in Vietnam, driving tanks, flying planes, and actively engaged in the conduct of the war.

In January 1969—8 long years later—when the Nixon administration assumed the reins of government, there were 549,500 Americans doing the fighting in the mud and swamps and jungles of Vietnam.

Now, after less than 9 months in office, Nixon has initiated a program of turning this war over to the South Vietnamese themselves—helping them to help themselves, to defend their own country, and fight their own battles—and the American troop level has been reduced to approximately 511,000, is reducing every day, and should be down to 484,000 by December 15.

Basically, there are three primary options in Vietnam:

First, continue the endless, winless, vacillating conflict as during the previous 8 years;

Second, utilize our air and other military superiority to win this war promptly; or

Third, turn the war over to the South Vietnamese to do their own fighting and proceed with an orderly withdrawal of our troops as rapidly as possible.

While the second alternative has been my first choice and recommendation, I will support any honest effort to end this costly, deathly, destructive conflict, and I will continue to work with the Nixon administration toward such a goal.

RESPECTABLE LEADERSHIP

Admittedly, as a responsible economic thinker, as a supporter of individual initiative and responsibility, and as one dedicated to the preservation of our basic constitutional principles, President Nixon will continue to be attacked, ridiculed, and maligned by some of the mass communication media and radical leftists—but I believe that there are millions of concerned, independent, hard-working, taxpaying, law-abiding citizens throughout this great country who do appreciate his dedicated, tireless efforts, and the difficult job he is trying to do.

Perhaps one of the greatest achievements of the new administration has been an intangible one—that of restoring public respect for the Presidency. The Nixon White House is emerging as clearly a place where standards are high; where excellence is the norm; where decency and dignity are the rule.

THE $50 BILLION POVERTY RACKET

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much of economy of late, both by the left-wing press and controlled news media, and by a vocal minority of politicians, bureaucrats, and other profiteers of our shameful system of subsidizing the parasites and drones of our society at the expense of the honest, hard-working, law-abiding American.

Cutting to the core of the problem, that Federal handouts in the name of welfare benefit certain professional demagogs as well as the professional poor, Mr. Dan Smoot points out that we can save, simply by returning to constitutional government in this area, $50 billion per year.

I include his well-reasoned argument and pertinent news clippings as part of my remarks:

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Sept. 22, 1969]

THE WELFARE QUAGMIRE

About six million Americans were on welfare in 1958; more than nine million in 1968—a 50% increase.[1] These statistics do not include more than a million people employed in tax-financed, make-work projects of the poverty war program; more than a million drawing unemployment compensation; more than 20 million drawing social security benefits.[2] During this period when national welfare rolls increased 50%, federal spending on welfare increased 210%; but the total population increased only 10%.

The most dangerous increase is in AFDC reliefers. AFDC means Aid to Families with Dependent Children, a program created by the Social Security Act of 1935. It is financed by federal and state governments on a "matching-fund" basis—the federal government putting up, on an average, about $1.8 of tax money for every $1.5 put up by state (and/or local) governments. In 1958, 2.8 million people were receiving tax money in the AFDC program; 6.1 million in 1968—a 111% increase. About 46% of all AFDC recipients are Negroes, though Negroes constitute only 12% of the total population.[1]

These enormous increases in relief rolls occurred in a period when employment opportunities were unusually abundant.

President Nixon says the federal government alone has spent more than a quarter of a trillion dollars (more than $250 billion) on social programs—just in the past five years.[3] *The Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1968* (published by the U.S. Bureau of the Census) indicates that *federal* "social welfare expenditures" totaled about $270 billion in the past five years, and that state and local government spending on social welfare totaled about $240 billion.

Some 510 billion (more than half a trillion) tax dollars have been spent on social welfare in five years.

How much good has been done by this pillaging of taxpayers? None at all! In fact, it

Footnotes at end of article.

has done more harm than good, as President Nixon says:

"Yet far from solving our problems, these expenditures . . . reaped a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration and bitter division.

"Never in human history has so much been spent by so many for such a negative result."

Here are other Nixon comments about our welfare system: [3]

"We have been on a road for a long time that is leading us to disaster."

"Millions of families . . . [are] locked into a welfare system for generations."

"A welfare system is a failure when it takes care of those who can take care of themselves . . . when it breaks up families, when it perpetuates a vicious cycle of dependency. . . .

"America's welfare system is a failure that grows worse every day. . . .

"Since 1960, welfare costs have doubled."

"[Yet] the poor have generally become poorer. . . ."

"The . . . welfare system has added to social unrest. . . .

"The situation has become intolerable."

"Whether measured by the anguish of the poor themselves, or by the drastically mounting burden on the taxpayer, the present welfare system has to be judged a colossal failure.

"Our states and cities find themselves sinking in a welfare quagmire, as caseloads increase, as costs escalate, and as the welfare system stagnates enterprise and perpetuates dependency.

"What began on a small scale in the depression 30s has become a monster in the prosperous 60s. The tragedy is not only that it is bringing states and cities to the brink of financial disaster, but also that it is failing to meet the elementary human, social, and financial needs of the poor.

"It breaks up homes. It often penalizes work. . . . And it grows."

"The most glaring inequity in the . . . welfare system is . . . [that] families headed by a non-worker often receive more from welfare than families headed by a husband working full-time."

"[We must stop] our dangerous decline into welfarism. We cannot produce productive people with the antiquated wheezing, overloaded machine we now call the welfare system. . . .

"If we merely try to patch up the system here and there, we will only be pouring good money after bad in ever-increasing amounts."

"The cost of continuing the present [welfare] system in financial as well as human terms, is staggering.

"We cannot legislate our way out of poverty; but this nation can work its way out of poverty. What America needs now is not more welfare but more workfare."

"I propose that we abolish the present welfare system and adopt in its place a new family assistance system."

All quite true—yet, President Nixon's proposals would magnify and multiply the deplorable conditions he mentioned.

Nixon's Family Assistance Program would triple or quadruple the relief rolls; and the rolls would grow faster in the future under FAP than they have been growing under AFDC.

Under Nixon's plan, "working poor" families would be put on welfare, in addition to all nonworking reliefers already on it. Nixon says there are more than 2 million "working poor" families. That is a guess. It is impossible to know the number—or size—of such families.

Government would classify a family of ten, with one or more members employed and with a total annual income of $5000, as working poor—but would not so classify a family of three with the same income. Thus, many are working poor, not because of modest income, but because they have families too large to live well on a modest income. Hence, many—if not most—families added to relief rolls as working poor will be large families. A family of six which may not be classified as working poor this year, may become a family of seven and qualify for relief next year.

Nixon (alarmed by growing relief rolls) would instantly increase the relief rolls from 9 million to perhaps 30 million. The numbers of reliefers would grow as family-size and government-caused inflation grew. One of the continuing causes of inflation would be the continuing growth of government welfare spending.

Nixon says:

"The costs of welfare benefits for families with dependent children have been rising alarmingly the past several years, increasing from $1 billion in 1960 to an estimated $3.3 billion in 1969, of which $1.8 billion is paid by the federal government. . . .

"The proposals I am making . . . will increase federal costs during the first year by an estimated $4 billion."

Nixon would decrease welfare costs by multiplying them!

The President says his plan would cost more immediately, but less in the future, because it would move people off welfare and on to workfare.

The slogan is deceptive.

The intent of the present AFDC program is to deny welfare to able-bodied adults who refuse to accept available employment.

The AFDC section in the social security law prohibits a family from getting welfare if the father lives with his family—the principle being that a man living with his family ought to work and support it. Nixon would abolish this prohibition, because it encourages fathers to desert their families. Nixon says the welfare family should be given a guaranteed annual income, but the head of the family will be denied *his portion* if he refuses "to accept . . . work or training, provided suitable jobs are available either locally or if transportation is provided." How could the government prohibit a man, who is living with his family, from sharing his family's welfare benefits?

Note, moreover, that Nixon says jobs must be suitable and conveniently located. What is a suitable job? Nixon says he means not "just any job," but a "good job." Under Nixon's scheme, a reliefer who prefers welfare to work need merely assert that no good, suitable, convenient job was offered him.

If every person, who cannot get a job he considers desirable, gets a guaranteed annual income (as Nixon plans), who will do undesirable work that *someone* must do in every society? Everyone cannot start at the top.

In a free society, the young, inexperienced, and unskilled hold less desirable jobs—which provide training (financed by employers, not taxpayers). Those with ability and willingness to work, graduate to better jobs, leaving their old ones to newcomers, who, in their time and by their own efforts, move up.

Under the present AFDC system, there is a vast army of social workers who investigate to determine whether welfare applicants are entitled to welfare—to find out how much income they have, what their needs are, whether they are refusing available work. Much of the tax money spent on welfare does not go to the poor, but to pay the costs of the welfare bureaucracy. President Nixon says that, under the present system, about 40 per cent of the welfare payroll (in one state, at least—Ohio) goes "for the purpose of filling out the federally required forms."

Such a system is, of course, monstrous and costly. But the Nixon system would be infinitely worse. Nixon would do away with investigations of welfare-applicants and reliefers. He says such investigations are "demeaning." Under his Family Assistance Program, a person could go on welfare by merely filing a certification of income. If a later spotcheck revealed that he had lied, he could be removed from welfare and prosecuted.

With some 30 million (or more) reliefers on welfare, relatively few certifications could be spotchecked.

The spotchecking itself; preliminary investigations of certifications that seemed to be fraudulent; full investigations of those which proved to be fraudulent; and prosecutions that would follow—all of this would cost taxpayers more than it would cost to leave on the welfare rolls the relatively few who would thus be exposed and removed.

We cannot even begin to get out of the welfare quagmire (as President Nixon accurately calls it, while proposing to make the morass worse), without first getting the federal government completely out of the welfare business.

The Constitution grants the federal government no power to dispense welfare, to help states pay for welfare, to regulate state and local welfare operations, or otherwise to engage in welfare activities. The first sentence of the first article of the Constitution makes it quite clear that the federal governmen has no valid powers except those specifically granted in the Constitution. And the last article of the Bill of Rights (the Tenth Amendment) says that all powers not specifically granted to the federal government are reserved to the states or to the people thereof.

Clearly, all federal activities in the welfare field are unconstitutional—illegal.

Even if we ignore the illegality of it, federal welfare makes no economic sense. The federal government has no money except what it takes away from the people. Confiscate money from the people, haul it to Washington, take a heavy percentage for extravagantly clumsy and wasteful federal administration, and send a portion back as aid?

The constitutional way to solve the welfare problem is to leave the money with the people who earned it—which would mean reducing federal taxes by the amount the federal government now spends on social programs (more than $50 billion a year, according to President Nixon).

The people who earn that $50 billion a year could then use it to take care of themselves, and have enough left over for private help to neighbors in distress, and for payment of local and state taxes to finance such public welfare programs as the people decide should be handled by local and state governments.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, Aug. 15, 1969, p. 1485.

[2] *U.S. News & World Report*, July 17, 1967, pp. 44–47.

[3] All Nixon comments on welfare, quoted or referred to herein, are taken from his August 8, 1969, TV speech on welfare reform; his August 11 Welfare Reform Message to Congress; and/or his September 1 speech to the 1969 National Governors Conference.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Sept. 29, 1969]

NIXON'S INCREDIBLE MISHMASH

President Nixon's proposal for getting the nation out of what he correctly calls the "welfare quagmire" are outlined in four documents: (1) his August 8, 1969, TV speech to the nation on converting welfare into workfare; (2) his August 11 Welfare Reform Message to Congress; (3) his August 12 Manpower Training Message to Congress; and (4) his September 1 speech to the 1969 National Conference of Governors.

In these four documents, Nixon dissects and denounces federal social programs initiated in the 1930s. He says these programs, amplified for a third of a century (in number, volume, extent, cost, and ineffectiveness), are destroying our nation. He proposes

what he calls sweeping and fundamental reforms, to reverse direction and stop our rapid descent into the morass of welfare-statism. Nixon calls his proposals the New Federalism.

But New Federalism would continue *all* and expand *most* of the social problems (which, Nixon says, are already "frozen in failure and frustration") of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, Modern Republicanism, the New Frontier, and the Great Society—and would add new and costlier programs of the same general kind.

Is President Nixon cynically trying to deceive the people, or is he deceiving himself? Maybe, both.

As a consequence of the federal government's multi-trillion-dollar social-welfare spending since the 1930s, some 40 million Americans now receive (directly) benefits, aid, or welfare from the *federal* government.

Many of these millions are totally dependent on the dole from Washington. Many are partially dependent on it. Few, if any, want to give it up. On most issues, these 40 millions of Americans have various attitudes; but on one issue (keeping their federal benefits and getting more, if possible), they are in almost unanimous agreement. On this issue, 40 million Americans tend to give bloc-support for the politican who, they think, can and will give them the most out of the federal treasury.

On the other hand, many of these same 40 millions (plus millions of others) are upset about soaring living costs, violence in the streets and on campuses, irrational and tyrannical federal guidelines and controls with regard to the operation of schools, businesses, hospitals, state and local governments.

It is apparent that many who are upset about these conditions do not realize the conditions are caused, in large part, by the federal government's "social programs." Many Americans want the social programs, but deplore the consequences of them, unaware there is any connection. They vote for a politician because he condemns federal controls, and also because he promises federal aid—never perceiving that the illegal aid produces the illegal controls. They vote for a politician because he promises federal spending on antipoverty programs, and also because he condemns riotous mob violence—not realizing that antipoverty spending has helped organize, incite, encourage, and finance a great deal of the mob violence.

President Nixon is said to be a canny politician, in the sense that he knows what to tell and promise people in order to get their votes. Perhaps, therefore, he is appealing to the millions who want federal welfare spending endlessly increased, and also to those who resent the conditions that welfare spending has produced. The President may also have been duped by his own rhetoric.

Both, it seems to me, are evident in the President's four messages on his New Federalism: with cold calculation, he tries to disguise the fact that he is proposing to multiply and magnify the very evils he condemns; but, at the same time, he seems so carried away by his own slogans and purple patches, that he almost believes he is being consistent and making sense.

The cold calculation predominates, however, President Nixon has produced a vote-buying scheme that is the envy of experts at buying votes with taxpayers' money. Speaking of Nixon's welfare plan, a man who was one of Lyndon Johnson's economic advisers said to Walter Trohan of the *Chicago Tribune:*

"I wish we had thought of it. It's a marvelous vote catcher." [1]

Whatever the motives behind them, President Nixon's four messages on the New Federalism—taken together or separately—contain an incredible mishmash of contradictions.

President Nixon says:

"A guaranteed minimum income for everyone . . . would . . . wipe out the basic economic motivation for work and place an enormous strain on the industrious to pay for the leisure of the lazy."

"During the presidential campaign last year, I opposed such a plan. I oppose it now, and will continue to oppose it. A guaranteed income would undermine the incentive to work. . . .

"There is no reason why one person should be taxed so that another can choose to live idly."

In the same New-Federalism messages where he makes the foregoing remarks, President Nixon (without even adding a *however*) says:

"We have proposed . . . a new system that for the first time would insure a minimum income for every family with dependent children."

"We propose a plan in which . . . we would assure an income foundation throughout every section of America for all parents who cannot adequately support themselves and their children. For a family of four with less than $1000 income, this payment would be $1600 a year; for a family of four with $2000 income, this payment would supplement that income by $960 a year. . . .

"In 30 states, the federal basic payment will be less than the present levels of combined federal and state payments. These states will be required to maintain the current level of benefits, but in no case will a state be required to spend more than 90 per cent of its present welfare cost. . . .

"In 20 states, the new [federal] payment would exceed the present average benefit payments . . . [and] will raise benefits levels substantially. For five years . . . [these states] will be required to continue to spend at least half of what they are now spending on welfare, to supplement the federal base.

"This national floor under incomes for working or dependent families is not a guaranteed income."

Why is President Nixon's guaranteed income not a guaranteed income? Because, the President says, *everyone* will not get it! He specifically excludes from the guaranteed income "the single adult who is not handicapped or aged" and "the married couple without children."

Thus, President Nixon (who, on other occasions, expresses deep concern about overpopulation and approves the expenditure of tax money to disseminate birth-control information and pills) would pay married couples bonuses for having babies. Have a baby, and you may get a government-guaranteed annual income, but you must not call it that.

In his New-Federalism message, President Nixon said:

"A third of a century of centralizing power and responsibility in Washington has produced a bureaucratic monstrosity, cumbersome, unresponsive, and ineffective."

"Overcentralized, overbureaucraticized, the Federal Government became unresponsive as well as inefficient.

"In their struggle to keep up, states and localities found the going increasingly difficult.

"In the space of only 10 years, state and local expenditures rose by two and a half times—from 44 billions in 1958 to 108 billions in 1968.

"States alone have had to seek more than 200 tax increases in the past eight years."

"After a third of a century of power flowing from the people and the states to Washington, it is time for a new federalism in which power, funds, and responsibility will flow from Washington to . . . the people . . . [and] to those governments that are closest to the people.

"The essence of the 'New Federalism' is to help regain control of our national destiny by returning a greater share of control to state and local governments and to the people."

Having said as much, President Nixon—virtually in the same breath—proposed increased centralization of power and responsibility in Washington.

Under the present system, state and local governments administer the distribution of tax money from Washington for welfare. Under Nixon's system, state and local governments would play no role at all—have no control or responsibility. Under Nixon's Family Assistance Program, the federal Social Security Administration would mail monthly guaranteed-income checks directly to some 30 million people classified by federal bureaucrats as qualified.

At present, state and local governments generally make some effort to investigate the eligibility of a reliefer before giving him tax money for welfare. Nixon would stop such "welfare snooping," because, he says, it is degrading to reliefers. Under Nixon's plan, anyone could get welfare by merely filing a "certification of income," asserting his eligibility.

On August 12, 1969 (the day Nixon delivered one of his New-Federalism messages about restoring states rights by letting power and responsibility return to the states), a White House official told a group of editors in Chicago the Nixon administration would, if necessary, withhold federal welfare funds "to blackjack the states" into accepting federal welfare standards.[1]

Nixon would federalize the welfare system by taking away from states such power as they now have to limit and regulate the system—leaving with the states, however, the necessity of raising part of the tax money. The basic difference (in principle) between this and the Nelson Rockefeller proposal (endorsed by the 1969 National Governors Conference) is that the Rockefeller scheme would *totally* nationalize welfare: states would have neither power to regulate welfare, nor responsibility to raise money for it; the federal government would handle it entirely.

In his New-Federalism messages, President Nixon denounced the present welfare system because it creates an incentive not to work—provides more money for idlers than many workers earn in wages. Nixon was indignant about this. He said:

"It is morally wrong for a family that is working to try to make ends meet to receive less than the family across the street on welfare. . . .

"Any system which makes it more profitable for a man not to work than to work . . . is wrong and indefensible."

He is right about all that, of course; but, under his scheme, a non-working welfare family of four in New York City would receive $5350 a year—$3750 in state and local welfare assistance, $1600 in guaranteed income from the federal government.[2] This is more than many a working man makes.

The non-working, welfare family would continue to get many fringe benefits, in addition to the $5350-a-year: federal food stamps, free medical care in the best hospitals, subsidized transportation, subsidized day-care for children, special remedial education—and so on. And it would also get, under the Nixon plan, a special $30-a-month bonus for accepting job training. Compare the situation of this non-working family, under Nixon's welfare plan, with the plight of an elderly couple, retired on social security after having worked for 30 years, both having continuously paid social security taxes and federal income taxes. After 30 years of working and paying taxes, they get a maximum of $2970 a year in social security benefits—$2480 a year less than the income of the New York City family of reliefers who never worked, never paid direct taxes, and never will.[2]

Nixon says, "We can meet individual hu-

Footnotes at end of article.

man needs without encroaching on personal freedom." He may not encroach on the freedom of the millions to whom he proposes to give welfare, but how about the millions whose money he will confiscate to pay for the welfare? Their "personal freedom" to keep and use the fruits of their own labor is quite eliminated by the pillaging of government.

Nixon says:

"The concept of voluntary action . . . of people banding together in a spirit of neighborliness to do those things which they see must be done is deeply rooted in America's character and tradition.

"As we have swept power and responsibility to Washington, we have undercut this tradition. Yet, when it comes to helping one another, Washington can never bring the heart that neighbors can. Washington can never bring the sensitivity to local conditions or the new sense of self-importance that a person feels when he finds that some one person cares enough to help him individually."

If Nixon believes that, why does he not act upon it? He need only to get Washington out of the welfare business; eliminate the $50 billion a year he says the federal government wastes on social programs; and let the people keep the money, so that they, "banding together in a spirit of neighborliness," can "do those things which they see must be done"—through private effort, or through such public programs as *the people* decide should be handled by their state and local governments.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *The Republican Battle Line,* Aug. 1969.

[2] Press release, U.S. Representative Jim Collins, *Dallas Times Herald,* Aug. 22, 1969, p. A26.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1969]

FIVE LIVING ABROAD LOSE WELFARE PAY

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.—Santa Barbara County supervisors voted yesterday to end welfare payments to five persons on relief who live abroad.

"They are perpetrating an abuse in the minds of every citizen paying welfare bills," Supervisor Curtis Tunnell said before the vote yesterday. Three of the recipients live in England, one in Canada and one in the Philippines. The five draw a total of $1,000 a month.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 17, 1969]

MAJORITY ON RELIEF ARE WHITE ON LONG ISLAND AND IN WESTCHESTER

(By Agis Salpukas)

More than half the people receiving welfare money in Nassau, Suffolk and Westchester Counties are white, many of them ironic victims of a search for a better life in the suburbs.

"It's a myth that welfare recipients in the suburbs are mostly black, living in ghettos," said Joseph Barbaro, the Commissioner of Social Services of Nassau County, in a recent interview.

The myth has been sustained, he added, because white welfare recipients generally try to hide their circumstances. They avoid protest demonstrations, surplus food centers and, in many cases, continue to live in the middle-class houses that started their financial difficulties.

Their mortgage payments are often taken care of by welfare grants—because, according to welfare officials, most of the time it is cheaper than trying to relocate a family.

Instead of trying to "keep up with the Joneses" many now struggle to keep up minimal appearances out of fear that their immediate neighbors will discover that they are on welfare.

Some white families on welfare continue to share the racial prejudices of their neighbors against the welfare system. Miss Martha Goodwin, a caseworker in the Yorktown Heights area in Westchester County, said: "They tell me, 'If I were black I would get more.' "

The white welfare problem has been illuminated in Nassau and Suffolk as a result of a nationwide Federal Government request that those applying for welfare since last Jan. 1, be broken down statistically by race.

In Nassau, during the first six months of this year, 3,789 out of 5,786 welfare applicants were white people. Mr. Barbaro noted that a survey last year indicated that 52 per cent of 37,000 persons on welfare in the county were white.

In Suffolk, during the first three months of the year, 2,017 out of the 2,650 applicants were white. Donald McKenzie, an assistant director at the county's welfare department, said that this supported a 1968 survey that indicated 70 per cent of Suffolk's welfare recipients were white.

MORE WHITE RESIDENTS

Westchester County has not yet compiled the racial composition of its welfare applicants this year.

However, the County's Welfare Commissioner, Louis P. Curtis, said he was convinced it would show no major change from the last survey taken by his department, in 1964. This indicated that 52 per cent of Westchester's welfare recipients were white.

Welfare officials note that there are, of course, many more white residents than Negro and Puerto Rican in all three counties. The latter group's population of Nassau and Suffolk is 5.2 per cent of the total; in Westchester, it is 9 per cent.

According to studies made in 1967, Negroes and Puerto Ricans constitute 29.3 per cent of New York City's total population and account for 90 per cent of its million welfare recipients.

Welfare officials in the three suburban counties said in interviews that many families who were able to meet their expenses in the city found the financial pressure too great after they moved to the suburbs.

Many were unprepared for the added expenses of maintaining a home, rising property taxes and commuting, the officials added. Most families also used up their savings in making a down payment on a home and to cover initial expenses in moving from the city. Therefore, they had no reserves to meet such emergencies as illness or job layoffs.

Mrs. Beulah Allman, an assistant director of the Department of Social Services in Suffolk, said in an interview:

"They buy a house without being aware of the cost of home ownership. They don't consider that when an appliance breaks down they have to pay to fix it. They're still used to knocking on the pipe and waiting for the 'super' to put the heat on."

Mrs. Allman, a Negro who has been a caseworker in both white and black communities, said that most white families were ashamed to seek welfare. She said that they would try to hold out as long as possible on unemployment insurance and by borrowing from neighbors, turning to welfare only when they were faced with eviction.

"By the time a white family applies it's an emergency," Mrs. Allman declared. "They are deeply in debt, the family is breaking up or the husband has already deserted."

A CASE IN POINT

According to welfare officials, the desertion of families by white husbands who suddenly find themselves heavily in debt is one of the main reasons why there are families on welfare in such well-off communities as Baldwin in Nassau, West Islip in Suffolk and Yorktown Heights in Westchester.

Mrs. Pierina Vitale, who recently applied for welfare, sat in the kitchen of her split-level home in West Islip in Suffolk the other day and explained how her husband had deserted her last March.

They had moved from Astoria, Queens, six years ago and bought a new house in a development for $17,200. Their savings were used to make a down payment on the house and to furnish it with attractive walnut furniture topped with marble.

Carpets cover the floors of the six-room house. There is a bar in the wood-paneled basement and a backyard portable swimming pool for her two children, aged 9 and 5.

She said that her husband had tried to work at two jobs to keep up with the bills but that they continued to run more deeply into debt.

"One day he just left," she said. "The police are still looking for him."

Mrs. Vitale held out for several months by selling some of her furniture and by borrowing from neighbors to pay for such essentials as food. She sought assistance from the Welfare Department only when she ran several months behind on her mortgage payments and was in danger of losing her home.

"I can face anything," she said," but I don't want to lose this house."

The Welfare Department has decided to let her stay in her home since her caseworker estimated that it would be cheaper to take over her $170-a-month mortgage payments than to relocate her to an apartment.

Apartments are scarce in all three counties and the new ones being built are usually luxury apartments with rents higher than what the welfare departments are allowed to pay under state guidelines.

The result has been that most white families that have applied for welfare in the suburbs have been allowed to remain in such middle-income communities as Levittown, which has 1,350 welfare recipients, and Baldwin, which has 500.

Although many white recipients continue to enjoy the comforts of their home and avoid the shock of having to suddenly relocate, they face other pressures in communities they can no longer afford.

Miss Goodwin, who works as caseworker in the northern part of Westchester County, including such communities as Yorktown Heights, Pleasantville and Mount Kisco, said that most "try desperately to hide the fact that they are on welfare."

CHILDREN IN DARK

Families living in $25,000 homes in Yorktown Heights ask her to park her gray county car streets away when she calls on them. Some mothers, she said, did not even tell their children that they were on welfare.

Miss Goodwin explained that white welfare recipients feared they would be ostracized by their neighbors, many of whom blame the welfare system for high property taxes.

Other officials said that in some areas neighbors had tried to force welfare families to move away by harassing them.

Fear of being discovered, these officials add, keeps many white welfare recipients from taking advantage of the distribution of surplus food and from protesting against the cuts made by the Legislature in the welfare budget this year.

The elimination of special grants for such items as telephones and clothes has hit white recipients particularly hard because of their concern with keeping up a middle-class image.

Hugh Wilson, the field director of the Nassau Welfare Tenants Coordinating Committee, which is a combination of county welfare rights groups, said in an interview that whites had called up for information on how the cuts affected them, "but they don't join the picket line."

"This only reinforces the stereotype that only black people are on welfare," he said.

Because of the docility of white recipients, most day-care centers have been set up in areas with concentrations of poor blacks and few of the communities with a large number of white welfare recipients are targets of antipoverty programs.

White welfare recipients, therefore, often

have less of a chance of taking advantage of programs that could help them get off welfare rolls.

There is also a great reluctance to participate in programs that are available. Mrs. Allman recalled that in Suffolk County last year Upward Bound, a program designed to help disadvantaged youths to attend college, attracted very few white applicants.

"Instead of hiding their identity, she said, "whites ought to use what's here for them to help themselves. They perpetuate their condition by denying their children a chance for higher education."

Mrs. Eileen Fico of Hicksville, who has been on welfare for a year, said in an interview that the lack of nearby day-care facilities had made it uneconomical for her to work.

She said that she had worked for a while as a waitress and earned $55 a week but she had to pay $30 a week to baby sitters to take care of her three daughters.

Her job earnings were not a sufficient supplement to the alimony she received from her husband. Welfare is continuing to make up the difference between her income and her living expenses.

Mrs. Fico has also had to turn down several better paying jobs because she does not own a car. The lack of mass transportation adds to the difficulties of welfare recipients in all three counties.

The migration into the suburban counties from the city has also put pressure on longtime residents. Rents and home prices have soared and the need for larger and new schools has increased taxes on homes.

Mrs. Joseph Cacciola, who applied for welfare last month, said that she and her husband had lived in Westchester County for 17 years. Three and one-half years ago they had to seek more room for their children, but they could not find an apartment for under $200.

They borrowed from relatives and bought a house in Mt. Kisco for $21,500. To meet his financial obligations, Mr. Cacciola had to work at two jobs.

"He was killing himself for us," his wife said in an interview in her home. "He would go to work at 11 at night, come home for breakfast, leave for his day job at 10:30. It's not that he didn't try."

She said that her husband could not take the pace. He quit one job and they slipped into debt. "Our family was on the verge of breaking up," she added.

Her caseworker, Mrs. Belle Ryders, said that the Welfare Department would make up the difference between what Mr. Cacciola earns and their living expenses to keep the family together.

Mrs. Cacciola said that she used to be bitterly opposed to the welfare system.

"I thought they were getting everything for free," she added. "I feel different now. You can reach a point where you can't get out by yourself."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 6, 1969]

DETROIT WELFARE OFFICES CLOSE IN "HARASSMENT"

DETROIT.—Welfare operations have been shut down "indefinitely" in sprawling Wayne County, which includes Detroit, by officials fed up with "harassment" by welfare mothers demanding more money to clothe their children.

Closing of the Department of Social Services headquarters in Detroit and its 17 branch offices has put 1,800 employes out of work and suspended service to thousands of families in the Detroit area.

Among the services halted is the distribution of food stamps to 14,000 households in the county. However, relief checks to 45,000 persons on welfare rolls will still be mailed from Lansing, where they are issued by the Michigan Department of Social Services.

The order to close the welfare centers came Friday in the midst of the fourth straight day of noisy demonstrations by mothers on welfare.

They are demanding a $75-per-year clothing allowance instead of the $22 per child authorized this year by the state. Sixty-three adults have been arrested during the demonstrations, and 34 juveniles were seized and later released.

Robert H. Harkness, a member of the three-man Wayne County Board of Social Services, ordered the shutdown after about 40 mothers marched through offices in the eight-story headquarters building singing and clapping. Later, they blocked the front entrance.

"Until there is a reasonable guarantee and assurance that we can operate without any further harassment, physical or verbal, to the employes or persons in the building, the social services system in Wayne County will remain closed," Harkness said.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 10, 1969]

WELFARE PARENTS PROTEST IN NEW YORK

NEW YORK.—Crowds seeking $100 clothing payments and free lunches for children on welfare roamed the Lower East Side tossing bottles and garbage throughout the day yesterday and a mob briefly stormed a police station.

The disorders resulted in two police riot calls and the arrest of at least seven demonstrators. Charges against two, identified as Naomi Nelson and Rafael Rivera, were reduced after demonstrators broke into a station house.

More than 300 protesting welfare mothers have been arrested in the city since demonstrations began this summer.

The welfare allotment of $100 a child for school clothing was cut this year by the state. The parents claim they cannot buy adequate school clothing for their children under the present welfare allotment of $24 a year.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 22, 1968]

THE "WELFARE" CONSPIRACY PROGRESS

We have already pointed out that New Yorks' "welfare rights" movement, which is now taking the form of a rent strike, is a fraudulent scheme perpetrated on the theory that by overthrowing the present welfare structure the poor will somehow come out better off than they are now. Just how they can find security in chaos, or how they will be protected from cleverer and greedier marauders, is never explained.

But the broader and more frightening aspect of the welfare rights movement is that it has been deliberately planned by a handful of "socialist scholars" as part of a national rebellion manifested also in peace marches, race riots, campus demonstrations, and attacks on "bourgeois morality."

Alice Widener, columnist and publisher of U.S.A. Magazine, has traced the welfare rights movement to a "Conference of Socialist Scholars" held in 1966 and attended by such luminaries as Herbert Aptheker, the communist theoretician whose daughter was a leader of the Berkeley disorders, and Herbert Marcuse, the theoretician of the new left. They and other speakers reveled in their advocacy of a victory for the Viet Cong, the sexual rebellion of youth, the abolition of the family, and revolutionary guerrilla warfare in the United States.

Among this strange but congenial assemblage were two members of the faculty of the Columbia school of social work, Prof. Richard A. Cloward and Dr. Frances Piven. They offered a joint paper on "organizing the poor." The poor, they said, are mere "supplicants" of the welfare state and can be freed from this condition of servitude only by "a major upheaval in our society." They proposed to bring about this major upheaval by putting such pressure on the welfare system that the whole structure would collapse.

So, while their colleagues were doing their respective things by leading peace marches, campus demonstrations, love-ins, and civil rights marches, Dr. Cloward and Mrs. Piven helped organize the Citywide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups in New York. They set about persuading people on relief to make every conceivable demand on the city welfare agencies, especially for additional "special grants."

In a recent issue of the Nation magazine, which is usually receptive to socialist schemes, these two architects of chaos contemplated their achievement. The welfare rights movement had pushed the cost of special grants up from 20 million dollars in 1965 to nearly 100 million now. The city reacted by shutting off all special grants and substituting flat grants of $100 a year. The welfare committee responded, in turn, by seizing welfare offices and by calling the rent strike, during which relief clients will use their rent money to buy what they would like to have bought with special grants.

Prof. Cloward and Dr. Piven noted with apparent disappointment that if the city hadn't intervened to stop the special grants, "the movement might have driven costs to the 200 million dollar mark within another year." Every step toward bankruptcy, in their view, is a step forward.

But they are not without further plans. "Recipients who have now learned to organize and fight the welfare system," they wrote in the Nation, "may not submit any longer to the preachments of case workers. Indeed, the movement may soon demand that welfare workers stay out of the ghettos and barrios, thus putting a halt to the routine invasion of recipients' homes."

Thus a uniform pattern emerges. The welfare militants, like the campus militants and the black militants, are calling, in effect, for secession. They are trying to pull the social structure apart, group by group, until it collapses in chaos—which won't help the blacks or the poor or the students but is just what the radical leaders thrive on.

FARMLAND FOR GARDENING

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday I brought to the attention of my colleagues the letter and article received from my friend, Mr. W. Clyde Greenway, relative to an idea for solving certain social problems in our country today by the use of farmland for gardening by persons on welfare and others.

Following up the so-called Greenway plan, I thought the suggestions for implementation of his initial ideas offered by Dr. John O. Eidson, president of Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Ga., also merits my colleagues' interest. I therefore call your attention to Dr. Eidson's letter which, I believe, may stimulate similar programs within your own districts:

GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE,
Statesboro, Ga., September 25, 1969.

Hon. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGAN: Your letter of July 29 has been circulated among our administrative officials here at Georgia Southern College. Dr. Hilton T. Bonniwell, our Director

of Continuing Education, is particularly interested in this. Members of our staff have talked with the Cooperative Extension Service and have sought suggestions concerning the program proposed by Mr. Clyde Greenway of the Georgia Agribusiness Council. He suggests a unique manner of using farmland for gardening by persons on welfare and by persons of the general population who live in urban areas and would enjoy and benefit from gardening.

Mr. Greenway enclosed in his letter to you an article concerning idle land that a Mr. Edenfield in Tallahassee, Florida, offered to city and public officials if they would have persons use the land for garden plots. We have checked the present regulations of the Crops Stabilization Service and also of the Soil Bank Program. The implementation of such a program as is described by the program in Tallahassee on a national level would require changing regulations to allow persons who have land in these various programs to grant the use of their land for a garden plot. Of course, this raises the question as to who would administer such a program.

In our own area we have found persons who are willing to grant the use of their idle land for young couples and families at the college who desire to raise vegetables for their own consumption; and for retired couples in the area who would enjoy raising a garden for pleasure. We are going to offer a short course in gardening this coming spring and will utilize the plots we have been offered at that time. We think the idea is an excellent one.

I will be glad to let you know how our course in gardening (for adults) turns out. Also, if members of your staff should get further information in programs such as this, I would be glad to know of it. In particular, it would be good to know whether any regulations concerning the administration of idle lands through federal programs would have to be changed to make such programs possible.

Thank you for your letter and for the information about what Mr. Greenway is doing. This is an interesting project.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. EIDSON.

DAN RYAN RAPID TRANSIT EXTENSION

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the city of Chicago demonstrated once again its leadership in the development of public programs to serve its people, when we dedicated the opening of the new Dan Ryan rapid transit line. This was a significant occasion, not only for Chicago but for the entire Nation, because the Dan Ryan line is the first operating proof that we can, if we will, develop both transit and highway transportation to complement one another, and in the same heavy traffic corridor.

We were honored to have with us, as the guest of Mayor Daley and the city, the Honorable John Volpe, Secretary of Transportation. His comments, both at the dedication ceremony itself and at the luncheon that followed, highlight what we are all seeking to achieve for our cities, and I am confident my colleagues will want to read them:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE DAN RYAN RAPID TRANSIT EXTENSION—95TH STREET STATION, CHICAGO, ILL., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1969, 10:30 A.M.

This is a great day for the people of Chicago. Everybody talks a lot about urban crisis and challenge, but the leadership of this city has mobilized a response that is equal to it.

The Dan Ryan line will carry about 95,000 passengers per day. One-third of them will come from older and less adequate transit lines. About 50,000 users will pour in from the bus feeder lines that have been spotted strategically along the route. And most important of all, this line will bring in 16,000 new riders who would never have dreamed of taking a train before. They would have driven downtown and jammed the streets of the Loop.

Chicago has shown that it believes in the future and can read the handwriting on the wall. That handwriting is in bold black letters. It says that massive and uncontrolled and unrelieved automotive traffic in our cities will cause paralysis. This nation has already lost 235 transit companies in 15 years. This trend must be reversed at once to prevent the collapse of vital public transportation in this country.

I can appreciate an effort like this because I was a builder myself. I can imagine the 131,000 cubic yards of concrete, the millions of pounds of steel, the cables and conduits required to complete this project. I know of the engineering skill necessary to bring it on-line in a matter of only three years. And as Secretary of Transportation I can tell you I see its significance in the larger scheme of things.

The Dan Ryan line is a breakthrough in transportation planning. It means a big step forward in making use of transportation corridors in which all modes will have a role. It means that transportation can make sense instead of flying off in all directions.

The people of Chicago will benefit immediately from this project. It will mean quicker access to jobs, schooling, job training and hospitals. It will help invigorate the downtown by relieving traffic congestion in the Loop. It will cut air pollution. It will help keep Chicago an enjoyable place to live in.

This project represents outstanding cooperation among all levels of government. It is imaginative. It is a tribute to the leadership of a city on the move toward tomorrow. And I am pleased to commend all those who participated.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE AT THE DAN RYAN RAPID TRANSIT DEDICATION CIVIC LUNCHEON, CRYSTAL BALLROOM, SHERATON-BLACKSTONE HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, SEPTEMBER 26, 1969, 12:15 P.M.

They say Chicago is one of those places where the shortest distance between two points is always under construction. But that's good because if ever a nation needed to replace its outworn facilities this one does. The people of Chicago are to be congratulated for the leadership which produced an integrated transportation corridor of such scope and imagination.

I think we can all be proud of the exceptional cooperation among all levels of government which has made this project a success.

You are setting an example for the nation, and such examples are sorely needed. We see about us everywhere the consequences of failure to plan balanced transportation for our expanding cities. The job is tough and some people—apparently—would rather not think about it. But we must re-think our old fashioned attitudes and above all *act* if the urban centers of America—the centers of productivity and creativity—are to be saved from traffic paralysis, pollution, ugliness and decay.

With this project you have put your money on the same table with your beliefs. And we in Washington have followed through on our own commitments in good faith.

The Dan Ryan Rapid Transit Extension is the largest passenger-carrying, federally-financed rapid transit project to go into service thus far in the United States. The Department of Transportation has invested $52 million in the Dan Ryan rapid transit line alone, and $79 million for transit throughout the Chicago area. And while we're citing figures, the entire federal commitment for transit in Chicago, including DOT and HUD funds, is $113 million. That's substantial for even a city of this size. Then, of course, you added $45 million from your own resources.

For that kind of money you have every right to expect results, and the projections say you'll be getting results. The Dan Ryan line will attract 95,000 passengers per day. About 29,000 will be lured away from other rapid transit lines, and 50,000 will come in by bus feeder lines. But 16,000 will be brand new riders—and at 1.6 persons per automobile, think of how much traffic that will lift off crowded streets in the Loop!

It would be easy at a moment like this to think of this progress in conventional terms, and for the average commuter who travels on these new lines the big advantage will seem to be a few previous minutes saved off his schedule morning and night. But that is only the obvious part of the payoff. The rapid transit line we opened this morning means much more than a fast trip into town. It symbolizes the importance of using public transportation to reshape today's cities and build the better cities that we must have tomorrow.

You all know that we have submitted a Public Transportation Assistance Act to Congress which could help us to do nation-wide what you have achieved here in Chicago.

The President and I have asked for $10 billion over a 12-year period to give this nation the mobility we must have if we are to maintain our productivity and assure a decent life for all Americans.

We have gone part of the way by building a magnificent Interstate Highway System. But highways alone are not enough. Highways can't always handle the traffic they generate. Highways *must* be supplemented by public transportation at the crucial points of overload and breakdown.

The states and cities do not have the resources for such expensive programs. They need the federal help that the new bill would provide. Our request for "contract authority"—a wholly legitimate financing device—will assure them of the continuity that they need and that has guaranteed the success of the Interstate System.

The Public Transportation Act of 1969 should get the solid support of the movers and doers in every community, large and small, because it will help every one of those communities, regardless of size. We are working steadily with mayors, congressmen, senators and governors. Support is building up. I'm confident we'll get the bill we asked for.

The time is ripe. People sense that transportation is not just either rails or rubber tires. Good transportation is the key to integrating and making effective all of our programs in education, housing, welfare, and employment. After all, what good are junior colleges and job training if you can't get to class? What good is housing that is inaccessible to jobs and shopping centers? The best opportunities in the world aren't much help if you can't get to where they're located. I'm particularly delighted that you have arranged for buses to feed into the Dan Ryan stations all along the way, thus serving patrons from lateral neighborhoods all over the South Side.

As I stood on that platform this morning I could see all about me the modes we need—

cars and trucks to one side, rails on the other. And overhead the third dimension of air travel.

I have no doubt that these modes are compatible. Over the next few years we are going to see many more examples of transportation corridors like this one. I'll go so far as to say that the intermodal corridor will become the wave of the Seventies. There just isn't any other way to achieve efficient mobility. We can't keep slicing our cities up with separate lanes for rails and highways and the newer modes that will be coming on line, like the air-cushion train and the personnel conveyor.

The ultimate reason why we must combine our corridors is that there just isn't enough land to go around. Joint planning and joint development along the rights-of-way is much cheaper than a lot of uncoordinated programs. The time will come when we shall routinely design and place apartments, schools, shopping centers and offices right alongside our transportation corridors.

Chicago leadership has taken us a step closer to that goal. The Dan Ryan line is the coming way to go.

DRAFT REFORM

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the question of draft reform is of paramount importance to the people of the United States. Following is testimony which I gave before the Subcommittee on the Draft.

Thirty-seven of my colleagues, whose names are attached, have joined me in the statement.

Also attached, Mr. Speaker, is a section-by-section analysis of the bill H.R. 7784. It was prepared by Mr. Albert Stillson, analyst in national defense, of the Library of Congress. I am indebted to Mr. Stillson and also to a number of student interns who worked all summer on the project.

My statement and the analysis of H.R. 7784 will, I hope, demonstrate the great need for comprehensive draft reform by the Congress, whose duty it is to control military service.

The following Members associate themselves with the statement of Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, of October 3, 1969, before the Special Subcommittee on the Draft:

BROCK ADAMS, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, EDWARD P. BOLAND, RICHARD BOLLING, JOHN BRADEMAS, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, HUGH L. CAREY, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, SILVIO O. CONTE, EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, JOHN H. DENT, DON EDWARDS.

WILLIAM D. FORD, CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, JACOB H. GILBERT, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, SEYMOUR HALPERN, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER, HENRY HELSTOSKI, JAMES J. HOWARD, ABNER J. MIKVA, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, ROBERT N. C. NIX.

RICHARD L. OTTINGER, RICHARDSON PREYER, OGDEN R. REID, HENRY S. REUSS, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR., JAMES H. SCHEUER, LOUIS STOKES, ROBERT O. TIERNAN, JOHN V. TUNNEY, MORRIS K. UDALL.

The material above referred to, follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR. BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DRAFT, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 3, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 14001 and H.R. 14015, bills that would strike from the Selective Service Act language which now forecloses a random selection of registrants for selection by the Armed Services.

As we know, the Administration has called upon the Congress for such action in the belief that it would add a new and more equitable dimension to the Selective Service System.

I endorse this principle of random selection. It is incorporated in H.R. 7784, a bill which pends before this Committee. I am mindful that questions have been raised as to how a "lottery" would work. While I do not presume to be an expert in the administration of the Selective Service System, I venture to think that a random selection system might work as follows.

A young man would register with the Selective Service System immediately upon his eighteenth birthday, according to rules and regulations prescribed by the President; (or upon entry into the country for a male alien admitted into this country in the status of a permanent alien). As soon as practical after registration, each and *every* registrant would be examined physically and mentally in order to determine his suitability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces. As soon as practical after this examination, the Selective Service System would classify him. After classification, the registrant would not be immediately available for induction until he has reached the age of nineteen.

At age nineteen, the registrant would enter the prime age group for a period of time not to exceed twelve months. His name would be placed in a pool of equally eligible registrants. The President could determine whether he wanted these pools created on a monthly basis, a semi-annual basis, an annual basis, or any other period of time. For example, on a monthly basis: The order of actual induction from among this prime selection group would be determined by random selection. The Director of Selective Service would publish each month a list of numbers corresponding to the days in that month. Thus, there would appear on the list the numbers 1 to 31 for January, 1 to 28 (or 29) for February, and so on. But these numbers would be arranged in a random sequence determined by a computer or some other means. The numbers for January, in this example, might read 11, 22, 7, 18, and so on until all the numbers from 1 to 31 are listed. H.R. 7784 gives the President the discretion to determine whether the monthly prime selection group should be a national, regional, area, or some other group. For the sake of illustration, let us consider regional pools.

If a regional office under this proposal had a quota of 1,000 men for January, it might have 7,000 men eligible for induction. To choose the 1,000 it would refer to the list published by the Selective Service Director for January. Under this example, the first number was 11, the second 22, the third 7, and so forth until the quota of 1,000 men had been reached. These 1,000 would then be inducted. The remaining 6,000 men would not be called, but would of course, continue to remain liable in the event of a national emergency. But they would not be called until the pool of men in the following month had been exhausted. Thus, once the selection for a given month had been made, those not selected could be reasonably certain of their status and make their plans accordingly.

A regional office might face the difficulty of choosing between different men born on the same day. This choice could be made by arranging the letters of the alphabet in a random sequence for each month and then choosing on the basis of the first letter of the last name. This list would also be published by the Selective Service System.

Under the example illustrated above, the effective eligibility of a registrant would be for one year, not the seven years that it now is. Defense Department manpower quotas are sent out on a monthly basis, and a monthly "lottery" would be perfectly capable of supplying the military the number of men they need. If the manpower pool of any one month was exhausted by an exceptionally high call, those who had not been selected the previous month would be the first to be chosen according to the rank they had received that month during their initial period of eligibility. If those not chosen the previous month were still insufficient to meet the quota, those not chosen two months earlier would be chosen according to the rank they had originally received. Under this lottery, as the registrant grows older, he becomes less likely to be drafted, and is better able to plan his future with certainty.

As was stated earlier, H.R. 7784 does not require the President to adopt a monthly lottery. If the President so chooses, he could adopt a yearly lottery. One of the criticisms of the selection system credited to the Clark Panel was that it made no provision for the monthly fluctuations in draft calls. Thomas D. Morris, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, was questioned on this point during his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee in 1967. He was discussing the military manpower needs in a post-Vietnam period: "We assume that for the purpose of the illustration we have used that the Vietnam war was over, and we had a stable force of 2.65 million. We obtained the age distribution of young men in the country for the next calendar year. And on this basis, the flow of our draft calls, as predicted, and the flow of the men coming to age 20 each month, as projected, ranges from a low of 9 percent inducted in January, to a high of 20 percent inducted in November and December." This means that under the system proposed by the Clark Panel and under a system proposed with monthly lotteries, a person born in November or December would be twice as likely to be called. Under a yearly lottery, these seasonal fluctuations would be ironed out and a person would be equally liable to serve no matter when he was born within that year.

There is a difference between these seasonal fluctuations and the yearly fluctuations that would make a yearly lottery inequitable for different years. The yearly fluctuations are almost entirely caused by unforeseen changes in our military defense posture due to unpredictable events in world politics. The seasonal variations are largely predictable and are due to the fact that Americans have babies more often in some months than in others.

The actual physical workings of a yearly lottery would be basically similar to that described earlier for the monthly lottery. A whole calendar year would be scrambled at once and the people born within that year would be ranked accordingly. A person might then be able to make an educated guess as to when he might be called up or if he would be called up at all. Draft calls would still be made on a monthly basis because of the Defense Department need for a continuous supply of men and because of the difficulty of predicting needs too distantly into the future.

Mr. Chairman, the question has been raised—Why a lottery? How does it improve upon the present selection of registrants by eldest first?

This all sounds very confusing, and perhaps an example will clarify the procedure. Joe Smith was born on April 21. When he reaches 19, he is initially inserted into the draft pool. His birthdate, the 21st, is the 13th date on the random list of dates for April. Joe

is not called up during April, May, or June. During July, his family has a serious accident and he becomes the sole support for his parents and younger brothers and sisters. He asks for and receives a hardship deferment.

Two years later in February, his parents are able to support the family and his hardship deferment ends. His draft board then waits until July to place him back in the draft pool with those registrants born in April of that year. He is placed with those whose date of birth in April is the 13th date on the random list of days for April *for that year;* for example, it may be the 3rd of April. He will continue to remain eligible with that group until March of the following year when he will have served his twelve months of eligibility.

Mr. Chairman, I am mindful that when you extended your invitation for me to testify, you stipulated my testimony was to address itself solely to the provisions of H.R. 14001 and H.R. 14015 and to no other matters.

But I would say to you in all sincerity that I do not see how it is possible for a Member of the House to address himself to this legislation, dealing as it does with one narrow aspect of the Selective Service Act, and completely ignore the many other provisions of the Act which cry out for revision

Therefore, with your permission, I would like to address myself to other areas of the Act which I would hope that the Committee would take under consideration

In responding to my June 20 request for hearings, Chairman Rivers said he "would be delighted to receive . . . specific views on this subject."

"It is therefore requested," he continued, "that you provide the Committee on Armed Services with a detailed analysis of each of the specific provisions of your bill, the intent of the language as written, and the manner in which each of those provisions would be implemented so as to eliminate alleged deficiencies in existing law."

Thus, in compliance with Chairman Rivers' ambitious request, I trust you will accept this detailed response which necessarily goes beyond the immediate subject of H.R. 14001 and H.R. 14015.

Mr. Chairman, the existence of a broad national consensus favoring—even demanding—draft-law reform is undeniable. Only—and, of course, this is a big qualification—the breadth and depth of needed selective service law changes are in contention.

The Administration's bill for the institution of a lottery induction system—clearly not a wide-ranging reform—was introduced in the House in June 1969, and in the Senate in August. A sectional analysis of this measure appears on pages 23678–79 of the August 13, 1969 *Congressional Record.* This measure complements the President's message on Selective Service Reform that was delivered to the Congress on May 13, 1969.

On September 20, 1969, the *Washington Post* reported that the Administration had announced that due to the absence of Congressional action on its draft reform measure, it would request from Congress a simple repeal of that part of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 which forbids the implementation of a lottery induction system by Presidential action. The next day, this same newspaper stated: "Chairman L. Mendel Rivers says his House Armed Services Committee will take up President Nixon's draft lottery plan by November, but indicates it will be hard to convince. 'We don't think he needs it,' Rep. Rivers said in an interview. 'But if he wants one, we'll consider it. He's my President, too. I'll try to accommodate him.' The Chairman's remarks appeared to squelch a widespread feeling that Congress would not even consider Mr. Nixon's lottery plan this year, but they left prospects for approval as doubtful as ever." One week later, on September 28, 1969, the *Washington Post* reported the scheduling of today's hearing.

While the Administration's impatience over Congressional inaction on the Selective Service reform measures outlined in the May 1969 Presidential message may be understandable, the fact that the first session of the 91st Congress has been weighted down mightily by the press of public business, a great share of which has involved fundamental national defense issues, also calls for understanding.

But, Mr. Chairman, such understanding cannot substitute for governmental action on draft law reform. A public issue as important as this reform should—and can only—be resolved not by the enactment of partial measures or by the application of administrative poultices, but by thoroughgoing legislative overhaul made by a Congress that is mindful of and accepts and exercises the full range of its Constitutional responsibilities to establish, maintain, and govern the national military establishment.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that careful note is made of my call for "thoroughgoing legislative action," not, first and foremost, for draft reform legislation. While I and many of my fellow Members of Congress are convinced that such legislation is manifestly mandatory, it is equally clear to us that such legislation must be preceded by the hearings, debate, and concomitant public reaction and evaluation that develop to their fullest extent as part of Congressional, not Executive, decision-making.

I hope further, Mr. Chairman, that this Congressional action will commence with hearings that will include careful dissection and analysis not only of the one-sentence H.R. 14001 and H.R. 14015, but also of H.R. 7784, thus indicating to the American people in concrete terms that the whole matter of Selective Service reform will be resolved as wisely as possible by their representatives sitting in the 91st Congress.

H.R. 7784, the "Selective Service Act of 1969," was introduced by myself and 15 cosponsors on February 26, 1969 and referred to the Armed Services Committee. It is identical to S. 1145, which was introduced in the Senate on February 25, 1969, by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, for himself and 8 cosponsors. Speaking for myself primarily, H.R. 7784 does not purport to be the ultimate and final word on Selective Service reform. However, I do think that it is a good bill, particularly in the sense that it affords a fairly comprehensive framework through the use of which most of the recognized, essential, and potential areas of needed draft law reform can be dissected, evaluated, and decided upon.

Since this Committee has now taken up at least the Administration's draft lottery proposal, the importance of Congress making a solid start on broad-ranging Selective Service reform during this session cannot be overstressed. I realize that in doing this the Congress will be hard-pressed for time and will add to its legislative burdens significantly. However, the cost of not making this extra effort could well be the institution of Selective Service changes that would be less sweeping than perhaps they should be; that might rest overwhelmingly on Executive orders and not benefit from the kind of national consideration to which I referred earlier; that might be weak and ineffective poultices which abrade more than heal national sores; and that could stifle or even set back the cause of general Selective Service reform.

At my direction, Mr. Chairman, the Legislative Reference Service has prepared a summary of the changes in existing law that would be effected by the enactment of H.R. 7784, and I request permission to place this summary in this Committee's hearing record. As this summary indicates, H.R. 7784 is a major and lengthy bill, and consequently I would like to set forth the rationale that underpins some of the major purposes to be served by passage of the measure. I do so to lay down fundamental reasons why the Congress should proceed forthwith to the holding of hearings, at the very least, on fundamental draft law reform, and should not and indeed cannot confine itself simply to the passing of judgment on the Administration's draft lottery plan.

Therefore, and possibly at the cost of giving a somewhat distorted overview of H.R. 7784, I will now discuss key elements of the rationale that has been incorporated into the bill. I would like to note that although the institution of a random selection system is an integral element of H.R. 7784, and although Section 205 of this bill should play an important part in Congressional evaluation of the Administration's lottery proposals—inasmuch as the two bills on which this Committee is primarily focussing would simply repeal Section 5(a)(2) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967—it seems to me to be of particular importance at this time to stress those aspects of draft law reform that are provided for in H.R. 7784.

Accordingly, the discussion that now follows focuses on those sections of H.R. 7784 pertaining to student deferments and casualty ratio; to the organization of the Selective Service System; to certain problems that have arisen from past experiences with the draft, and to the need for basic investigation into certain fundamental aspects of national military manpower policy.

1. STUDENT DEFERMENTS: CASUALTY RATIO

Section 314 of H.R. 7784 would expand student deferments to include junior college students and persons in vocational or technical training programs. Deferment would continue until registrants reach their twenty-fifth birthday or complete their course of study. Furthermore, when casualties in an armed conflict reach ten percent of the number of persons inducted during a three-month period, all student deferments would end automatically.

The Military Selective Service Act of 1967 permits the President to provide for the deferment "of persons satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning." In practice, student deferments are granted automatically only to persons pursuing a full-time course of study leading to a baccalaureate degree. H.R. 7784 would expand the definition of "student" and would allow the granting of II-S deferments not only to college students, but also to junior and community college students, persons enrolled at a vocational school, apprentice training programs, or similar occupational instruction program. Present deferment policy discriminates against the poor and the Blacks who most often can neither afford nor qualify for higher education. The educational needs of these people do not end with high school however, and in fact technical or occupational training for people at this particular age is vital to bring them into the mainstream of American society. If the goal of equity in the Selective Service is to be achieved, student deferments should be granted not only to college or university students, but also to other young men who wish to continue their education in a vocational or occupational training program, as long as these deferments cannot become exemptions.

The Marshall Commission divided over whether student deferments should be continued at all. A majority felt that no further student deferments should be granted except to students enrolled in occupational training programs. An equitable Selective Service with a random system of selection can still be achieved, even if student deferments are continued as long as two conditions are met: (a) a student deferment should not be convertible into a permanent exemption, and (b) students should not be

able to defer themselves into a "period of tranquility;" in other words, avoid a shooting war. H.R. 7784 meets both of these requirements.

First, when military casualties reach ten percent of those drafted in a given three month period, student deferments would end automatically under Section 314 (a)(1). Today, for example, the casualty ratio in Vietnam is about thirty percent of those inducted each month. If H.R. 7784 were in effect now, student deferments would not be granted to any persons 19 years of age or older. Second, assuming that other provisions of H.R. 7784 are put into effect, specifically, ending the graduate and occupational deferments, there would be no way for an able-bodied and presumably mentally qualified man to avoid a 1–A classification after he had completed his occupational course of instruction, or baccalaureate. Such a person's options at that time would be to enlist, apply for a commission as an officer, join a Reserve Unit, or accept a 1–A, allowing his name to be placed with the next prime age group to enter the lottery. In short, H.R. 7784 allows students to *postpone* their vulnerability to the draft for a period of two to three years. In no way would they be able to avoid a shooting war, under the ten percent clause, and no other kind of deferment would be available to a student after he completed his course of study that would not have been available when he was 18 or 19 years old. Thus, the requirements of equity and fairness are met, while at the same time allowing for the value placed by our society on education and acquiring vocational skills.

The granting of student deferments would pose no procedural or administrative problems to the operation of a youngest-first lottery system. Students entering the prime age group would not swell the number of persons being lotteried, and hence increasing the odds of a given person being selected since the number of students reverting to the lottery pool at the end of their II–S deferment would be roughly equal to the number of persons in the 19 year-old group being taken out of the pool under II–S deferments.

Finally, it is not likely that all students who qualify for II–S deferments under H.R. 7784 will request a II–S. Many would probably risk selection at 19, knowing that if selected, they would fulfill the military obligation before assuming added responsibilities, such as a wife, family, or job. If not selected, a relatively clear field would be open to them, and knowing that the chances of being called are relatively small, they could plan their lives and assume responsibilities, without the uncertainties they would face under the present draft system.

The student deferment provisions of H.R. 7784 allow the peacetime student a choice of when to serve the country in the armed forces, while in no way increasing the problems of manpower procurement for the military.

Because, Mr. Chairman, the Administration's draft reform proposals—or at least what we know of them—contain nothing analagous to the casualty ratio I have just outlined, and because it is very difficult to know at this juncture exactly those provisions governing student deferments that the President will lay down by Executive Order if H.R. 14001 and H.R. 14015 are enacted without substantial modification, I think it is incumbent on the Congress to take up immediate consideration of not only Section 314 of H.R. 7784, but also the several other salient features of this measure to which I shall now turn.

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

In his May 13, 1969, message to Congress, the President observed that "it is also important that we encourage a consistent administration of draft procedures by the more than 4,000 local boards around the country. I am, therefore, requesting the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to conduct a thorough review of our guidelines, standards, and procedures for deferment and exemption, and to report their findings to me by December 1, 1969." Although it is to be hoped that these reports will be made available to Congress, there appears to be no question and no dearth of information testifying to the fact that probably the outstanding problem stemming from the organization and administration of the Selective Service System as it now exists is lack of uniformity. Registrants in identical situations are in fact treated differently depending on where they lived when they were first required to register. In some areas, for example, school teachers are deferred automatically, whereas in other localities they are not, unless they happen to be teaching close to the geographical location of the local board. Those teaching in city ghettos, quite simply, are not likely to be deferred under any circumstances. Taking another example, four students from different sections of the United States went to England not too long ago to attend school for one year as part of the English-Speaking Union Youth Fellowship Exchange Program. One was classified II–S automatically. One was classified I–S(H) even though he had already graduated from high school. One was classified I–A, which upon appeal to a State Director was changed after the passage of five months to II–S, but which was not accompanied by a clear delineation of the eligibility of the registrant for a deferment to complete his senior year of college. A fourth was classified I–A, a classification he retained during his entire year abroad despite his appeals for rectification of his status.

Possible examples of the interrelationship between inequity and the absence of uniformity in the Selective Service System are legion. We cannot be surprised over this state of affairs when we realize that there are local boards which have fewer than 1,000 registrants, while others have more than 50,000. There are appeal boards which handle some 3,000 cases a year, while others may be seized of less than 60—or even 12—per year. California's Senator Alan B. Cranston reported recently that a random sample of local boards in several cities in his state revealed that not one board was aware that the policy recommended by the Director of Selective Service with respect to the drafting of law-breaking demonstrators has been ruled illegal by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

The most sensible way to attack this twin-headed problem of lack of uniformity and inequity is to enact, as is the intent of Section 201 of H.R. 7784, a restructured Selective Service System according to the 1967 recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service—the "Marshall Commission."

As thus restructured area offices would be registration and classification centers. A civil service staff, applying regulations established by the National Selective Service Headquarters, would classify each registrant within the jurisdiction of each area office in a uniform and impartial manner. The staffs of the area offices would be drawn from the cadre of able clerks who now serve local boards throughout the country and who are familiar with Selective Service machinery.

Automatic data processing equipment, to handle the vast amounts of information involved, would facilitate the operation of the system nationally. With the control available through the use of this modern equipment, registrants who change their permanent residence would, under appropriate regulations, change their registration from one area office to another.

Since fairness can be achieved only when there are ways in which an individual's relationship with a system can be personalized, a major virtue of the proposed reorganization is that it would provide facilities and avenues for such personalization. Registrants confused or intimated by the Selective Service process could visit their area offices for a more individual treatment of their registration and classification.

It is well to remember that about 90 percent of the classifications now made by a local board are automatic—such as classifications involving over-age, high school and college deferments, and reclassifications for those inducted into or discharged from the Armed Forces. These classifications can be dealt with far more economically and efficiently in centralized area offices. Problems requiring large amounts of discretion, such as hardship deferments and conscientious objector classification, would also be made at the area level. However, any registrant who is unhappy about his individual treatment could take his problem to an appeal board.

Appeal boards in the proposed structural reorganization of the Selective Service System reflect the fact that since most of the classifications that local boards now make are automatic, the time spent by local board members in presiding over each and every classification is largely wasted. But if local boards become appeal boards, as provided in H.R. 7784, the time and efforts of local board members will be much more prudently utilized, because it is in acting on appeals that their personal knowledge of registrants can be best devoted to the welfare of the individual and the nation.

More specifically, when a registrant appeals a classification given him by an area office, his appeal will be directed to the appropriate local board. As stated by the Marshall Commission on page 32 of its 1967 report: "Although the 'neighborly' character of local boards seems to exist more in theory than in fact, the prospect of a man's being able to take his case to a group of citizens divorced from the Federal system has great strength and merit. A local board composed, as are those today, of volunteer citizens, and conveniently located in the area office but independent of it, is the body to which registrants who wish to challenge their classification could do so within 30 days rather than the 10 days which are now allowed. These boards would become in effect the registrant's court of first appeal. They would have the authority to sustain or overturn classifications made in the area office." If the local board denies the registrant's request for reclassification, he would be able to appeal to a regional appeal board, which would be the second stage of the appeal process. They would be guided by the same criteria as used in the area offices. If the registrant is still dissatisfied, he could appeal to the National Appeal Board, as he is now able to do.

While I believe, Mr. Chairman, that what I have said thus far about the restructuring of the organization of the Selective Service System, that would be accomplished by Section 201 of H.R. 7784, summarizes the major thrust of the legislative intent underlying this Section of the bill, two other provisions of Section 201 perhaps deserve particular comment: a) The term of office of the National Director of Selective Service would be limited to six years, because this post is one of great sensitivity, and the incumbent of (or nominee for) the position should formally come under the periodic scrutiny of the Congress. Thus, the post could not become the political instrumentality of any President, and Congressional overview of a national public office of great importance and delicacy and, potentially, of controversy would be reinforced. b) The maximum age of local board members would be reduced from 75 to 65, thus helping to limit the terms of such members and to insure that they are more representative of the communities they serve.

3. PROBLEM AREAS THAT HAVE ARISEN IN PAST EXPERIENCE WITH CONSCRIPTION

a. Right to counsel, appearance, and information

In provisions closely related to the problems I have just outlined, Sections 303 and 324(d) of H.R. 7784 are intended to guarantee to registrants that they will receive fair and equitable treatment from and through the Selective Service System, and that they will be fully informed of the rights and procedures available to them under law. The latter purpose is served by Section 324(d), which requires the Director of Selective Service to provide each registrant, in writing, at the time of his registration and subsequently on request, with information regarding all rights and procedures available to him that pertain to classification, deferment and exemption. The former purpose is served by Section 303, which guarantees to each registrant the right to appear in person before regional offices, area offices, and local boards, and to be represented by counsel, irrespective of his ability to pay for counsel, in order to present testimony or evidence relevant to his status. The right to counsel thus provided for is particularly important, because while the registrant classified I–A or ordered to report for induction is in no wise accused of a crime, the draft nevertheless threatens a basic change in his natural life for several years. Consequently, procedural safeguards must be established to guarantee that registrants will receive fair and equitable treatment under the Selective Service System, and that their interests will be adequately represented before the System.

b. Physical and mental standards

Section 304(f) of H.R. 7784 would insure that a person who volunteers for military service and who is rejected on mental or physical grounds cannot be later inducted into the Armed Forces unless there is some subsequent mental or physical change that would make him eligible for enlistment. Current military manpower medical procurement standards apply to both enlistees and inductees, and H.R. 7784 would not alter them. Due to the Medically Remedial Enlistment Program (MREP), physical standards for enlistment are, in effect, slightly lower than for induction. Mental standards for inductees are lower than those for enlistees, in that enlistees who score between the 10–15 percentiles in the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) are ineligible, whereas such inductees are. Manifestly, it is strange indeed that certain groups of people are not permitted the opportunity of serving their country in the Armed Forces when they request to do so, but later, when they probably have settled into a regular pattern of life, can be involuntarily placed in the Armed Forces. This state of affairs should be terminated.

c. Aliens

Section 302 of H.R. 7784, together with the amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act that would be made by Section 326 in order to establish consistency with Section 302, would continue to provide for the selection of aliens who remain in the United States for over one year and who do not qualify otherwise for deferment or exemption. However, Section 302 would allow an alien who is ordered for induction to change his status to that of "nonimmigrant," thus becoming exempt from military service and at the same time permanently ineligible to become a U.S. citizen. This change is designed to grant to aliens who have no desire to reside permanently in the United States an exemption from military service. It is inherently and patently unfair to require persons who do not wish to become U.S. citizens to assume a basic duty and responsibility of American citizenship. The change that is offered would not allow aliens to "dodge" the draft, but simply present them with a choice between serving in the Armed Forces or changing their status to that of nonimmigrants, with the reduction in rights and privileges that accompany this change.

d. Exemption from training and service of certain veterans of allied countries

Section 310(b) of H.R. 7784 would simply reduce from 18 to 12 months the period of service in the armed forces of an ally that is requisite for exemption from training and service in the U.S. Armed Forces. The requirement for eighteen months of such foreign military service was established at a time when most NATO members had eighteen months of compulsory military service, and was designed primarily to protect aliens who had served in the armed forces of their native countries from being drafted into American military service. In recent years, most NATO countries have shortened their periods of required military service to sixteen months or less. Yet aliens from such countries of origin who have fulfilled their earlier military duty are still liable to induction into the U.S. military establishment for an additional two years of obligated service. This new provision of law would make U.S. Selective Service requirements consistent with those of our allies and end inequitable situations in which certain aliens are compelled to contribute twice to the cause of Western defenses.

e. Conscientious objectors

Section 315(a) of H.R. 7784 would add to existing law the statement that religious training and belief "does include a sincere and meaningful belief, which occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by an orthodox belief in God." The intent of this clause is to insert the Supreme Court's language (*U.S.* v. *Seeger;* 380 U.S. 163) into Selective Service law so as to eliminate confusion among local draft boards, and to make the guidelines for conscientious objection classifications clearer and more readily available to registrants.

In 1967, Congress decided to delete from Selective Service law the clause that defined religious training and belief "as an individual's belief in relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relationship . . ." In its report on the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, the House Committee on Armed Services stated: "The provision of existing law relating to conscientious objectors has been the subject of considerable controversy within recent months. The controversy was primarily the result of a 1964 Supreme Court decision in *U.S.* v. *Seeger* . . . The Supreme Court decision resulted in a significant broadening of the basis on which claims for conscientious objection can be made. The Director of Selective Service advised the Committee on Armed Services that in his judgment this undue expansion of the provision of the law relating to conscientious objection could very easily result in a substantial increase in the number of unjustified appeals for exemption from military service based upon this provision of law. This circumstance coupled with the Committee's awareness that the processing of conscientious objector appeals has resulted in delays exceeding two years, prompted the Committee to completely rewrite this provision of law."

On the other hand, it must be noted that the National Council of Churches has stated that "conscience is not a monopoly of Christians or of the religious traditions. Neither is there one kind of conscience that is 'religious' or another that is 'non-religious,' but only the *human* conscience, which Christians see as God's gift, whether or not every individual so understands it." Having taken this position, the National Council of Churches has defined "conscience" as a "compelling conviction which makes a person *unable to* perform the objectionable act, whatever the consequences may be." It is well to note, further, the opinion of Lawrence Speiser, Director of the Washington Office of the American Civil Liberties Union: "The individuals who should qualify as conscientious objectors are rather those who find their present participation in war to be so great a wrong that even government's command will not relieve them of responsibility for committing that wrong . . . If a man finds it wrong to yield his conscience to government's command, it is not relevant to ask whether he believes in God or whether his beliefs follow some formal religious theory."

The argument has been made, Mr. Chairman, that if too much discretion is left to the individual in the area of conscientious objection people will start to indulge in widespread civil disorder and to select the taxes which they wish to pay. This argument is invalid for three reasons. First, there is a distinct difference between asking a man to give his life for his country and asking a man to kill other men because the majority of the people in his country think that war is politically expedient or necessary at that time. Many sincere conscientious objectors are perfectly willing to risk their lives in hazardous activities such as fighting forest fires or helping the sick and wounded in Laos and Vietnam, but they are unwilling to take the life of a fellow man. Second, the number of conscientious objectors in the United States has always been very small, averaging in the 1966–69 period well below one percent of all registrants. The Department of Defense is not in desperate need of these men, and H.R. 7784 would not increase the number of conscientious objectors so as to have a significant effect on the Selective Service System. But this bill would save just a few people from going to jail because they were unaware of the Supreme Court's definition of "religious training and belief" as used in H.R. 7784. Third, conscientious objectors are in fact more likely to engage in civil disobedience under existing law, for not knowing their rights they will not find any provision of law consistent with their own beliefs and will be forced to go to jail to avoid the draft in any way possible.

The United States has an admirable record of exempting from military service those who have been conscientiously opposed to war, regardless of their religious beliefs. Over time, provisions for such exemption have been incorporated into the constitutions of several of the States—Illinois, 1818; Alabama, 1819; Pennsylvania, 1838; Iowa, 1846; Kentucky, 1850; Indiana, 1851; Kansas, 1855; and Texas, 1859. In World War I, Congress exempted those who were members of a traditionally pacifist church; those who objected for reasons of conscientious scruples, whether or not their objections were based on religious training and belief; and those who objected on religious grounds, no matter their church affiliation. Secretary of War Baker reaffirmed this decision on December 19, 1917, when he issued the following order: "The Secretary of War directs that until further instructions . . . personal scruples against war shall be considered as constituting conscientious objection, and such persons shall be treated in the same manner as other 'conscientious objectors' under the instructions contained in confidential letter from this office dated October 10, 1917."

Section 315(a) of H.R. 7784 will not open up the conscientious objector classification to those who object to a single or particular war, although many have advocated this. I believe that Congress should agree with the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service on this matter: "The majority (of the Commission) believes that the status of conscientious objection can be properly applied only to those who are opposed to all killing of human beings under any circumstances. . . . Political opposition to a particular war should be expressed through recognized democratic processes and should claim

no right of exemption from democratic decisions."

It is my opinion and that of the co-sponsors of H.R. 7784, I believe, that this bill which incorporates the language of the Supreme Court, will not allow hundreds of "draft dodgers" to escape the law. It will only permit conscientious objectors who are not members of orthodox faiths the opportunity of serving their country in a useful and constructive manner rather than in jail.

In essence, I am suggesting that the Congress and the country be guided by the words of Justice Augustus Hand in *United States* v. *Kauten:* "It is unnecessary to attempt a definition of religion; the content of the term is found in the history of the human race and it is incapable of expression in a few words. . . . It is a belief finding expression in a conscience which categorically requires the believer to disregard elementary self-interest and to accept martyrdom in preference to transgressing its tenets." And I further suggest deep and sober reflection on the words of Judge Charles Edward Wyzanski Jr., Chief Judge of the U. S. District Court in Boston, Massachusetts: "The law cannot be adequately enforced by the courts alone, or by the courts supported merely by the police and the military. The true secret of legal might lies in the habits of conscientious men discipling themselves to obey the law they respect without the necessity of judicial and administrative orders. When the law treats a reasonable, conscientious act as a crime, it subverts its own power. It invites civil disobedience. It impairs the very habits which nourish and preserve the law."

Section 315(c) of H.R. 7784 complements Section 315(a) by restoring to Selective Service law the provision deleted by the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; namely, the requirement for a hearing by the Department of Justice when a local board decision denying conscientious objector status to a registrant is appealed. The purpose of this provision is to provide the appeal board with information, obtained by an impartial agency, concerning a claimant's sincerity and "religious training and belief."

Many local boards refuse to grant I–O classifications because they consider themselves insufficiently trained to make such a judgment especially if the registrant applies for conscientious objector classification after he registers initially. The local board members often feel that the appeal board is better qualified to handle these cases and has more experience with them. Indeed, conscientious objector claims are very delicate and highly individual. Instead of applying for a deferment where the question is whether the registrant will be liable for the draft now rather than at a later time, the conscientious objector is applying for exemption from military service at any time. Both critics and supporters of the present criteria for conscientious objection admit that these criteria are complex and a matter of individual judgment. Mere membership in a pacifistic church is not sufficient to obtain such a classification. The board ought to—and must—cross-examine the registrant to test his sincerity and the depth of his convictions. When the Selective Service System was first established, the board members were likely to know the registrant personally and could make their judgments on the basis of their own personal experience with the registrant. Today, some boards serve as many as 50,000 registrants and it is impossible for the members to know their registrants no matter how hard they try.

For these reasons, I feel that reinstitution of Department of Justice hearings in cases involving conscientious objector appeals is prudent and necessary. Most of the criticisms underlying the 1967 deletion of this provision stemmed from the "unusually long and unnecessary delays" in processing these appeals which the Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement—the "Clark Panel"—noted. Under other provisions of H.R. 7784, a registrant would spend no more and no less than 12 months in the prime age group. If his classification is delayed awaiting a Justice Department report, he will enter the prime age group later. His length of maximum exposure will not be shorter. On balance, the reinstitution of Justice Department review of these cases will make it easier for registrants who do qualify for conscientious objector classification to obtain it, and much harder for draft-dodgers to escape service through the route of conscientious objection.

4. BASIC INVESTIGATIONS THAT ARE REQUIRED

I think almost everyone will agree, Mr. Chairman, that basic draft reform legislation ought to be concerned not only with remedying inequities and problems that have arisen in the past, but with ploughing new ground in the area of national military manpower policy. Consequently, H.R. 7784 would institute four broad-ranging studies to facilitate needed groundbreaking.

a. Military youth opportunity schools

Section 401 of H.R. 7784 originated in the opinion of the cosponsors that many of the men presently declared unfit for service in the Armed Forces could, with a minimum of expense, be so trained as to meet both the mental and physical requirements for military service. Section 401 would generate a basic study to determine the feasibility of this idea and the realization of it through "military youth opportunity schools."

In October of 1966, the Defense Department established Project 100,000 and concomitantly lowered mental and physical standards for military service, with the result that over 100,000 men who would have been disqualified for military service were accepted in the Armed Forces. Fifty-three percent of these men were volunteers. Of the "new standards men", 95.4 percent have successfully completed basic training. About 60 percent have been given non-combat skills, most of which have direct or related counterparts in the civilian economy. Particularly gratifying is the fact that after 19–21 months of service, 52 percent of the "new mental standards men" were in grade E–4 and above, as compared to 59 percent of a "control group" consisting of men taken into service under the regular standards. Also most gratifying is the fact that the assignments of "medically remedial men" have not been significantly different from those of the control group, and the fact that while entrance standards were lowered, performance standards were not.

Over 40 percent of the "new standards men" had been unemployed at the time of their admission to military service. Only 42 percent were earning a weekly salary higher than $60. Yet, considering remedial reading programs alone, those who took advantage of these programs, with just 6 weeks of help, were raised in military rank by 1.7 to 2.0 grades.

The average cost of Project 100,000 has been about $180 per "new standards serviceman." This cost is in addition to the $3,390 that must be expended to put any recruit through basic training.

Therefore, those sponsoring H.R. 7784 feel that the possibility of lowering entrance standards even further deserves very close and careful scrutiny. By such lowering a number of important national benefits would be achieved: many men who desire to join the Armed Forces would be given an opportunity to serve that would not otherwise be theirs; many unemployed and perhaps unemployable men would be given the opportunity to learn skills, such as reading ability and vocational skills, which could be used later in civilian life; many men who are unemployed essentially because they lack confidence in themselves and are pressed down by their feelings of insecurity would achieve through military service practical and positive remedies for these personal and social blights; and many men would not have to be drafted involuntarily, because their places would be taken by others who have much to gain from—not give up for—military service.

b. Volunteer army study

Everyone is painfully aware, Mr. Chairman, of the criticism that has been directed at the Selective Service System, especially over the last few years. Many alternative means and methods for providing the Armed Forces with manpower have been advanced. Of these proposals, the concept of a volunteer military establishment has gained a wide measure of acceptance. For these reasons, Section 402 of H.R. 7784 would create a study, under Presidential supervision, to provide both the President and the Congress the most expert opinion possible on the subject of the desirability and feasibility of instituting an all-volunteer military establishment.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that on March 27, 1969, the President appointed an "Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force," with instructions to report to him on this subject by early November 1969. Section 402 could be overtaken by events, so to speak, but Congress, as well as the President, must be satisfied that this vital matter of national policy is weighed and evaluated as thoroughly as possible. The enactment of Section 402 would guarantee this.

c. National Service Corps study

Section 403 would provide for a comprehensive study of the feasibility and desirability of creating a National Service Corps, with the possibility of permitting some National Service Corps programs to be considered as alternatives to fulfilling one's obligation of service to the country through the military establishment.

It ought to be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the United States would not be the first country to create a National Service Corps. Most of the programs in other nations were originally designed after the Peace Corps, but several have developed considerably beyond this concept. As Terrence Cullinan has pointed out in Donald J. Eberly, ed., *National Service, A Report of a Conference,* "France's obligatory 16 months National Service tour is satisfied by service in the Civilian Defense Service as a civil servant, policeman, engineer, health inspector, architect, technician, or civil defense specialist primarily in depressed regions. During war or emergencies, this Service staffs the Defense Corps and carries on tasks of civil defense for the whole population . . . The February, 1967, Italian national service law recognizes at least two consecutive years' service in a developing country outside Europe as equivalent to required military national service. Service is performed under bilateral agreement or a recognized international organization's program."

A number of other countries as well have found it both feasible and desirable to have a National Service Corps and to permit service in it to qualify as alternative service in lieu of military service. Therefore, it is clear that the whole of this extremely important issue deserves the attention and scrutiny of a Presidential study, as Section 403 of H.R. 7784 would provide.

d. Amnesty study

Section 404 of H.R. 7784 would require the President to conduct a study of the feasibility and desirability of allowing those who have fled the country and who are liable to prosecution under Selective Service law to return to the United States within five years, without being subject to criminal prosecution, if they accept their responsibilities under Selective Service law. Upon

return, they would be exposed to the draft in the prime age group just like other registrants.

Today, such amnesty is a much talked about and controversial issue. Before any decision on amnesty is made, a thorough study of the subject should be undertaken. As a preface to such study, it should be remembered that amnesty does not involve a moral judgment. Rather, it is a humane act of clemency. The Government would not be placed in the position of condoning the actions of those who are presently in jail or in exile. But because amnesty would be an act of clemency, it could serve to reunite a divided country and be a testimonial to governmental strength, security, and humanity.

Nowhere, Mr. Chairman, is the gap between national fairness and justice, on the one hand, and the law, on the other, wider than in the area of Selective Service. At a time when this country is bitterly divided over a war thousands of miles away, reunification of America is made all the harder by the present Selective Service System. It might be a giant step toward closing this gap and healing these sores if amnesty were granted, thus saving many young citizens from a life of permanent and lonely exile. As George Washington stated in his proclamation of amnesty on July 10, 1795: "It appears to me no less consistent with the public good than it is with my personal feelings to mingle in the operations of Government every degree of moderation and tenderness which the national justice, dignity, and safety may permit."

H.R. 7784 (The Selective Service Act of 1969), 90th Congress, 1st Session: Summary of Changes in Existing Law That Would Be Effected by Its Enactment

Introduction

H.R. 7784 was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 26, 1969, by Representative Frank Thompson of New Jersey, for himself and others, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. It is identical to S. 1145, which was introduced in the Senate on February 25, 1969, by Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, for himself and others. The following summary of H.R. 7784 focuses on changes in existing law that would be effected by its enactment.

Title I—Purposes and definitions

Section 101. Short Title

Cites the Act as the "Selective Service Act of 1969," thus changing the title of the basic national selective service law from the "Military Selective Service Act of 1967" (identified herein as MSSA).

Section 102. Findings and Declaration of Purpose

As section 1 of the MSSA does, it finds that the maintenance of adequate armed force is essential to national security; and that so long as all eligible persons are not required to serve, those who must serve should be selected by a fair, just, and adequate system which meets effectively the needs of both national defense and the national economy. Would add to the provisions of section 1 of the MSSA by finding that national military manpower needs should be met as much as possible through voluntary service, through the use of civilian personnel in noncombat positions, and through encouragement of the utilization of women in the Armed Forces and in civilian positions that support the Armed Forces. To meet the foregoing objectives, states that the purpose of the Act is to set up procedures for the fair and equitable selection of qualified men to meet national military manpower requirements, thus focusing the purpose of the Act more sharply than the MSSA does.

Section 103. Definitions

Defines terms used in the Act such as "United States" and "duly ordained ministers of religion." The definitions made are the same those in section 16 of the MSSA, except that H.R. 7784 does not define "local board."

Section 104. Saving Provision

As section 19 of the MSSA does, states that nothing in the Act shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947.

Section 105. Effective Date

As section 20 of the MSSA does, provides that the title becomes effective immediately "except that unless the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares a national emergency after the date of enactment of this Act, no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this title within ninety days after the date of its enactment."

Title II—Selective service system

Section 201. Organization

As section 10 (a) of the MSSA does, establishes within the Executive Branch a Selective Service System headed by a Director of Selective Service. Stipulates that the Selective Service System is to be composed of a National Selective Service System Office in Washington, D.C., eight regional headquarters distributed throughout the United States, and such area offices, appeal boards, and other agencies as are hereafter provided. Section 10(a) of the MSSA, on the other hand, provides that in addition to the national headquarters, there should be at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Provides that the Director is to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of six years. The MSSA, in Section (10(a), sets no limit to the Director's term of office, and designates an annual salary for him, namely, $12,500 per year.

Would add to existing law by prescribing that to the maximum extent practicable automatic data processing equipment shall be used in carrying out the provisions of this title.

Continues in effect that part of Section 10(a) of the MSSA which pertains to the Office of Selective Service Records, the Director of this Office, the transfer of this Office and this position to the Selective Service System, and the reestablishment of both at such time as the title may expire.

As the MSSA does in Section 10(b), authorizes the President to prescribe the rule and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Authorizes the President to appoint directors of regional Selective Service headquarters, whereas under the MSSA—Section 10 (b)—State directors of Selective Service are appointed by the President upon the recommendations of governors, and they represent governors in taking immediate charge of State Selective Service headquarters.

Like Section 10(b) of the MSSA, authorizes the President to employ such civilians as are necessary for the administration of the Selective Service System.

Provides, in times of national emergency declared by the President, for the utilization of National Guard and other Armed Forces personnel in the operation of the Selective Service System in the same way that Section 10(b) of the MSSA does.

Authorizes the President to create and establish one or more area offices in each State with an area of jurisdiction to be established by the Director of Selective Service on a population basis. The director of each area office, a civilian assisted by civilian staff, shall have the power within the jurisdiction of his area, and in strict conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by the President and subject to a right of appeal to the local board and from the local board to the appeal boards herein authorized, to hear and determine all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for or exemption or deferment from training and service of all individuals within the area of jurisdiction. Also authorizes the President to create such civilian local boards and civilian agencies or appeal as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Selective Service System. Each local board is to function in conjunction with an area office and shall consist of three or more members. Under rules and regulations prescribed by the President the local boards shall within the jurisdiction of appropriate area offices hear and determine appeals from decisions of area directors subject to the right of further appeal to appeal boards. At least one appeal board is to exist in each regional area. Appeal boards are to be composed of civilian citizens who are not members of the Armed Forces, and their decisions are to be final unless modified or changed by the President.

In contrast to the provisions summarized in the preceding paragraph, Section 10(b) of the MSSA requires the President to establish one or more local boards in each county or similar political subdivision, except that an intercounty local board covering not more than five counties or similar political subdivisions, with at least one board member from each subdivision serving on the intercounty board, may be set up by the President after he considers the public interest involved and upon the recommendation of a governor or comparable executive official. Each local board consists of three or more members appointed by the President from recommendations made by a governor or comparable executive official. Each local board member shall be a civilian citizen resident of the area in which the board exercises jurisdiction. The decisions of local boards with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training and service are final, except where an appeal is authorized and taken in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President. At least one appeal board, composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces, shall be located in the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States and within each territory or possession of the United States. Decisions of appeal boards are final unless changed or modified by the President. The President, upon appeal or his own motion, has the power to determine all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training and service, and such determinations shall be final.

H.R. 7784 states that no citizen shall be denied membership in any component of the Selective Service System on account of race, color, creed, or sex; that the membership of local and appeal boards shall, so far as practicable, represent all elements of the public the board serves; and that no citizen shall serve on any board for more than 25 years or after he attains the age of 65. Section 10(b) of the MSSA provides, on the other hand, that membership on local and appeal boards shall not be denied anyone on account of sex, and that no citizen shall serve on these boards for more than 25 years or after he attains the age of 75.

Retains the MSSA's proscription—in Section 10(b)—of the deferment or exemption of persons by reason of their status as officers, members, agents, or employees of the Selective Service System.

Retains the basic provisions of Section 10(b) of the MSSA pertaining to the authority of the President to compensate officers, agents, and employees of the Selective Service System; to utilize the services of departments and officers of the U.S. Government and of State governments; to purchase printing, binding, and bookwork; to prescribe regulations governing the parole for service in the Armed Forces of persons convicted of violation of this title; to procure and otherwise make available space deemed necessary

for carrying out the provisions of this title; and—in Section 10(a)—to delegate authority vested in him by this title.

Retains the provisions of the MSSA pertaining to the acceptance of gifts—Section 10(d); the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting responsibilities assigned to the Chief of Finance, U.S. Army—Section 10(e); the settlement of claims—Section 10(f); and the making of reports to the Congress—Section 10(g).

Section 202. Emergency Medical Care

Retains the provisions of the MSSA—Section 11—governing the payment of medical and other emergency expenses of registrants acting under orders issued under this title, except that burial expenses shall not exceed an amount to be determined by the President, rather than being limited to $150 in any one case, as the MSSA provides.

Section 203. Penalties

Establishes penalties for persons who violate the act, and in so doing retains the language of Section 12 of the MSSA, except: a) in stating "precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such cases shall, *upon request of the Attorney General,* be advanced on the docket for hearing at the earliest practicable date," the words underlined would be added to existing law, and the word "immediate" that precedes the word "hearing" in existing law would be deleted: b) Section 12(c) of the MSSA, which reads "the Department of Justice shall proceed as expeditiously as possible with a prosecution under this section, or with an appeal, upon the request of the Director of Selective Service System or shall advise the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing the reasons for its failure to do so," is omitted.

Section 204. Nonapplicability of Certain Laws

Identical to Section 13 of the MSSA, which relieves uncompensated citizens serving on local and appeal boards from the provisions of the Hatch Act and conflict of interest statutes; removes the functions of the Selective Service System from certain requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act; and pertains to the lump-sum compensation of certain Air Force and Navy Reserve officers.

Section 205. Selection

(Note: Given section 102(e) of H.R. 7784—"it is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to establish procedures for the fair and equitable selection of qualified young men to meet the continuing military manpower needs of the Nation"—the following parts of section 205 are presented in toto, accompanied by the analysis of sections 5(a) and 5(b) of the MSSA that was presented in U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, *Military Selective Service Act of 1967, With Analysis* [No. 35] Dec. 1, 1967, p. 5629.)

a. H.R. 7784

"Sec. 205. (a) The selection of persons for training and service shall be made in a fair and impartial manner from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted.

"(b) The order of induction of registrants found qualified for induction shall be determined as follows:

"(1) Selection of persons for induction to meet the military manpower needs shall be made from persons in the prime selection group, after the selection of delinquents and volunteers.

"(2) The term 'prime selection groups' means persons who are liable for training and service under this title, and who at the time of selection are registered and classified and are—

"(A) nineteen years of age and not deferred or exempted;

"(B) between nineteen and thirty-five years of age and, on or after the effective date of the Selective Service Act of 1969, were in a deferred status but are no longer in such status; or

"(C) between twenty and twenty-six years of age on the effective date of the Selective Service Act of 1969 and are not deferred or exempted.

"(3) A person shall remain in the prime selection group for a period of twelve months, unless inducted into the Armed Forces during such period. Any person in a deferred status upon reaching the age of nineteen shall, upon the termination of such deferred status, and if qualified, be liable for twelve months for induction as a registrant within the prime selection group irrespective of his actual age, unless he is otherwise deferred. Any person removed from the prime selection group because of a deferment shall again be placed in the prime selection group, if he otherwise qualifies, whenever such deferment is terminated. But no person shall remain in the prime selection group for any period or periods totaling more than twelve months.

"(4) On the effective date of the Selective Service Act of 1969, any person who comes within the provisions of Clause (B) or (C) of paragraph (3) of this subsection shall be placed in the prime selection group as follows:

"(A) A person who has attained the twenty-fourth anniversary of the date of his birth prior to such effective date shall be placed in the prime selection group during the first twelve-month period following such effective date.

"(B) A person between twenty-two and twenty-four years of age on such effective date shall be placed in the prime selection group during the second twelve-month period following such effective date

"(C) A person between twenty and twenty-two years of age on such effective date shall be placed in the prime selection group during the third twelve-month period following such effective date.

"(5) The order of call for induction from among those persons in the prime selection group shall be determined as follows:

"Under such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe—

"(A) the Selective Service System shall from time to time publish, for each month in the year, a list of numbers randomly arranged, corresponding to the number of days in such month;

"(B) those persons first called from the prime selection group for the particular month will be those whose day of birth is the same as the first number on the list; those next called will be those whose day of birth is the second number on the list; and this procedure shall be followed until the particular month's quota is met;

"(C) the Selective Service System shall also from time to time publish a list of the letters of the alphabet randomly arranged. In the event that the procedure described in clause (B) just above does not serve to distinguish clearly an order of call as between two or more persons, then reference shall be made to the list of letters and the first letter of the last names of such persons to determine such an order of call; and

"(D) the determination of order of call may be made upon a national, regional, or local or other basis, as the President shall determine.

"(c) Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the President, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, from establishing a separate and distinct selection system for persons found by him to have special skills essential to the national defense.

"(d) There shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race, color, or creed in the selection of persons for training and service under this title or in the interpretation and execution of any provision of this title.

"(e) No order for induction shall be issued under this title to any person who has not attained the age of nineteen years unless the President finds that such action is in the national interest."

b. Military Selective Service Act of 1967, with analysis

"Section 5(a). Selection

"Section 5(a), in paragraph (1), deals with the selection of individuals for induction under the provisions of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967. This section, among other things, specifically authorizes the President to select and induct persons by age group or groups and to select and induct physicians and dentists. Pursuant to Presidential regulations prescribed under this provision, men who are in class I–A, available for service, are selected and inducted by category. There are at present six categories: first, delinquents; second, volunteers; third, men 19 to 26 who are not married, or who were married after August 26, 1965, and who are without children; fourth, men 19 to 26 married on or before August 26, 1965, and who are without children; fifth, men over 26 years of age; sixth, men between 18½ and 19 years of age. In filling calls, local boards select and induct I–A available men by category, beginning with the first category and proceeding through categories sufficient to fill their calls.

LRS–13

"This paragraph affords the necessary flexibility to the President to change the order of selection to meet rapidly changing national and world conditions. It also permits the commissioning of alien doctors.

"The paragraph also provides that no person may be inducted under the age of 19 if there are individuals available for induction within the jurisdiction of the local board who have attained age 19.

"Paragraph (2) of section 5(a) insures that registrants shall continue to be called for induction in the order of their dates of birth in categories 3, 4, 5, and 6, or in other age categories which may be established by the President, unless a proposal to call by some other method is proposed in the form of legislation and approved by the Congress. The provision insures that the Congress shall have a voice in determining whether and what kind of a lottery may be substituted for the present system of calling by birth date.

"Section 5(b). Quotas

"Section 5(b) provides for quotas to be established for each State, territory, profession, and the District of Columbia, based upon the actual number of men in such States, territories, possessions, and subdivisions thereof who are classified as available for service. This section also establishes the credits to be given in the filling of such quotas for registrants for such subdivisions who are members of the Armed Forces."

Section 205 of H.R. 7784 also would add to existing law by providing that no person who is qualified in a needed medical, dental, or allied specialist category, and who is liable for induction, shall be held ineligible for appointment as a commissioned officer solely because he is not a citizen of the United States or has not made a declaration of intent to become a U.S. citizen; and that such persons who are appointed as commissioned officers may take an oath of service and obedience prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in lieu of the oath prescribed in 5 U.S.C. 1331.

Section 205 of H.R. 7784, finally, would add to existing law the definition that "a delinquent is a person who is required to be registered under this Act and who fails to perform or who violates any duty, with respect to his own status, required of him under the provisions of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder."

Section 206. Authority to Order Reserve Components to Active Federal Service

Identical to Section 21 of the MSSA. (*Military Selective Service Act of 1967, with Analysis*, cited above, states on p. 5637 that this section expired July 1, 1953, and is no longer in effect.)

Title III—The individual and the selective service system

Section 301. Registration

Requires every male citizen of the United States and every male alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence to register with the Selective Service System at age 18, whereas Section 3 of the MSSA establishes the same requirement, except as otherwise provided in the title, for all male persons in the United States.

Section 302. Classification, Training, and Service

Makes every person who is required to register and who is between 18½ and 26 liable to military service, whereas Section 3 of the MSSA requires all male persons in the United States to register and in Section 4 subjects to military service all male citizens, all male aliens admitted to permanent residence, and all male aliens in the United States in a status other than that of permanent resident, unless they apply for relief from such liability, in which case they are thereafter barred from becoming citizens of the United States.

Retains substantially unchanged the provisions of Section 4 of the MSSA that prescribe the immediate liability of registrants for classification and examination, including a physcal examination as soon as practicable after registration, and that affirm the continued liability of registrants who fail to report for physical and mental examination.

States that an alien admitted for permanent residence shall not be liable for training and service unless he has resided in the United States for a total of one year, thus extending to aliens in permanent residence the same one-year period of grace from liability that Section 4 of the MSSA now grants to male aliens who remain in the United States in a status other than that of permanent resident.

Retains and expands upon certain provisions of existing law concerning aliens, by providing that any alien relieved from liability for training and service under an existing treaty shall be permanently ineligible to become a citizen; that any alien who, prior to induction, has his status adjusted to that of a nonimmigrant shall be exempt from training and service, but in such case he shall be permanently ineligible for citizenship; that any alien whose status is adjusted to that of a permanent resident, or who is readmitted to the United States as a permanent resident within one year after departure shall have his liability extended as if he had been deferred; and that nothing in this section shall be construed as superseding the provisions of any existing treaty of the United States.

(NOTE: This last provision should be read against the background of the history of the status of "treaty aliens" under selective service law, which history has been summarized on p. 21–22 of the Director of the Selective Service System's *Legal Aspects of Selective Service, Revised Jan. 1, 1969:* "Under existing treaties, nationals of certain countries are relieved from liability for military service in the Armed Forces of the United States under certain circumstances. Treaties of this type, however, were suspended by the 1917 draft law and the 1940 law, since such laws specifically suspend all conflicting laws and the Congress has the same right to suspend or abrogate a treaty as any other law. The Selective Service Act of 1948 repealed conflicting laws, and had the effect of repealing inconsistent treaty provisions. However, the 1948 Act authorized The President to designate certain categories of aliens to be relieved from liability for training and service and under this authority treaty aliens were so designated. Later the 1951 amendments to the law limited The President's authority to exempt such categories of aliens by providing that aliens admitted for permanent residence shall not be so exempted. Subsequent to the 1951 amendments, the courts have held that the provisions of the treaty are in conflict with the law, that the law being later in time must prevail, and that a treaty alien admitted for permanent residence is not entitled to exemption from training and service based upon his alien status even though the Selective Service regulations provided for such exemption. The classification prior to the 1951 amendment of a treaty alien into a class exempt from training and service by reason of his treaty alien status did not give permanent exemption to the alien and his treaty right to such exemption ceased to exist when the 1951 amendment became law. After these decisions the Selective Service regulations were amended to exempt from liability for registration treaty aliens admitted for temporary residence, and to eliminate any exemption from training and service based upon a treaty where the alien was admitted to this country for permanent residence.")

Section 303. Right to counsel; right of appearance

Expands on the MSSA and the operation of the Selective Service System (and its regulations) under the MSSA by affording each registrant the right to appear before offices and agencies of the Selective Service System, and to be represented by counsel or to be provided with counsel, without charge, if he cannot afford to retain one himself, and so requests. No right to counsel is now provided for, and appearances are delimited, as by Section 1624.1 of the Selective Service Regulations, for example, which states "Every registrant after his classification is determined by the local board, except a classification which is determined upon an appearance before the local board under the provisions of this part [Part 1624—Appearance Before Local Board] shall have an opportunity to appear in person before the member or members of the local board . . ."

Section 304. Induction

Lays down several criteria governing the authority of the President to induct persons into the Armed Forces and the training given to such persons, including age limitations, the requirement that the training period shall not be less than four months, and the further specifications that no trainee shall be assigned to duty outside the United States, and its territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone). Corresponds to similar provisions of Section 4(a) of the MSSA. States that the mental and physical standards a person must satisfy to qualify for induction shall be no lower than those prescribed for voluntary enlistment in the Army of the United States, whereas the MSSA provides that minimum physical standards shall be no higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945, that the passing requirement for the Armed Forces Qualification Test shall be fixed at a percentile score of 10 points, and that except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress the last two aforementioned requirements may be modified by the President.

Section 305. Length of Service

Provides for 24 months consecutive service for persons inducted, unless released sooner, in the same manner as Section 4(b) of the MSSA. Provides that persons who serve less than 3 years on active duty shall be transferred to reserve components for 5 years of reserve service in the same manner as Section 4(d) of the MSSA.

Section 306. Enlistment

Retains substantially unchanged the provisions of section 4(c) of the MSSA pertaining to enlistment in the Regular Army or voluntary service in the Armed Forces by enlisted members of reserve components in lieu of the obligatory service provided for in selective service law.

Section 307. Pay and Allowances

Lays down provisions governing the pay and allowances of inductees that are the same as those provided for in sections 4(e) and (f) of the MSSA.

Section 308. Decrease in Period of Service

Retains the provisions of Section 4(k) of the MSSA that authorize the President, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, to decrease or eliminate periods of service required under this title

Section 309. Medical and Dental Officers

In the same way that Section 4 (1) and section 5(c) of the MSSA do, authorizes the President to order to active duty for not more than 24 months any member of a reserve component who is in a medical, dental, or allied medical specialist category, who is not 35 years old, and who has not performed at least one year of active duty, and provides that medical specialists in the armed forces shall hold grades or ranks commensurate with their professional education, experience, or ability, and that any person needed in such capacity who fails to qualify for, or does not accept a commission, or whose commission has been terminated, may be used in his professional capacity in an enlisted grade

Section 310. Exemptions from Registration, Training, and Service

Like Section 6 (a) of the MSSA establishes exemption from training and service for foreign diplomatic representatives and members of their families. Also like Section 6 (a) provides that persons who serve subsequent to June 24, 1948, on active duty in the armed forces of a nation with which the United States is associated in mutual defense activities as defined by the President shall be exempt from service but not from registration, except that H.R. 7784 reduces the period of such foreign service from 18 to 12 months. Unlike Section 6 (a) it does not exempt members of the armed forces, and various kinds of military cadets from registration. Exempts from service, but, unlike Section 6(a) of the MSSA, not from registration, commissioned officers of the Public Health Service on certain active duty; such duty must consist of assignment to offies and bureaus of the Public Health Service, including the National Institutes of Health, or any endeavor which the President determines is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, whereas Section 6 (a) limits Public Health Service assignments that carry exemption to "various offices and bureaus of the Public Health Service, including the National Institutes of Health, or assigned to the Coast Guard, the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, or the Environmental Science Services Administration."

Section 311. Veterans' Exemptions

Except for nonsubstantive textual changes, is identical to Section 6 (b) of the MSSA.

Section 312. Reserve Component's Exemptions

Save for nonsubstantive textual changes, is identical to Section 6 (c) of the MSSA, except that Section 6 (c) exempts from registration members of reserve components on active duty.

Section 313. Officers' Training: Officials; Ministers of Religion

Save for nonsubstantive textual changes, establishes provisions identical to sections 6 (d, e, f, and g) of the MSSA governing the deferment of persons enrolled in officers'

training programs, the deferment of officials, and the exemption from training and service of regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and students preparing for the ministry.

Section 314. Student and Apprentice Deferments; Casualty Ratio

(NOTE.—Given the importance of student and other deferments to consideration of selective service law in recent years, and in light of the several changes in existing law governing deferments that would be enacted by H.R. 7784, that part of the present summary which follows quotes in full Section 314 and the changes it would make in existing law; deletions from existing law are enclosed in brackets, new language is in italic, and provisions in existing law to be left unchanged are identified by normal typescript.)

[(h) Deferments for occupations, dependency, fitness; extended liability; criteria—(1)] *Section 314.* (*a*) Except as otherwise provided in this [paragraph] *subsection*, the President [shall] *is authorized*, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, *to* provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of persons *requesting such deferment who are* satisfactorily pursuing a [full-time] course of instruction at a *bona fide* college, *junior college, community college,* university, or similar institution of learning, [and who request such deferment.] *or at a vocational school, or who are enrolled in and satisfactorily pursuing an apprentice training program or similar occupational program.* A deferment granted to any person under authority of [the preceding sentence] *this subsection* shall continue until such person completes the requirements for his baccalaureate degree, [fails to pursue satisfactorily a full-time course of instruction] or attains the [twenty-fourth] *twenty-fifth* anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever first occurs.

[Student] Deferments provided for under this paragraph [may] *shall* be [substantially] restricted or terminated by the President (*1*) *whenever he finds, with respect to persons who have been inducted into the Armed Forces under this title, that the number of such persons killed, wounded, or missing in action as the result of armed conflict during the three month period immediately preceding his finding exceeds a number equal to 10 per centum of the total number of persons so inducted during such three month period;* or (2) [only upon a finding by him] *whenever he determines* that the needs of the Armed Forces *and of national security* require such action. *Such restrictions or terminations shall be in effect for twelve calendar months next following the month in which the conditions set out in the preceding sentence are met. Whenever members of the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in armed conflict in any area of the world, the President shall, for the purpose of clause (1) of the preceding sentence, make a finding not later than the tenth day of each calendar month respecting the number of persons killed, wounded, or missing in action in the three immediately preceding months.* No person who has received a [student] deferment under the provisions of this paragraph shall thereafter be granted a *further* deferment [under this subsection; nor shall any such person be granted a deferment under subsection (1) if he has been awarded a baccalaureate degree], except for extreme hardship to dependents (under regulations governing hardship deferments). [or for graduate study, occupation, or employment necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. Any person who is in a deferred status under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section after attaining the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth, or who requests and is granted a student deferment under this paragraph, shall, upon the termination of such deferred status or deferment, and if qualified, be liable for induction as a registrant within the prime age group irrespective of his actual age, unless he is otherwise deferred under one of the exceptions specified in the preceding sentence.

[As used in this subsection, the term 'prime age group' means the age group which has been designated by the President as the age group from which selections for induction into the Armed Forces are first to be made after delinquents and volunteers. (2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an Office (other than an Office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in graduate study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: Provided, that no person within any such ctaegory shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: Provided further, that persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 4(a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferrable under any other provisions of this Act.]

(*b*) The President is [also] authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone, except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deeemd to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place [at the office of each local board] *in each area office* a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such [local board] *area office.*

[The President may, in carrying out the provisions of this title, recommend criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under this title, and to the extent that such action is determined by the President to be consistent with the national interest, recommend that such criteria be administered uniformly throughout the United States whenever practicable; except that no local boards, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government, or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government.] *Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title the President shall establish national standards and criteria for the classification and deferment of persons registered under this title. Such standards shall be administered uniformly and impartially throughout all levels of the Selective Service System.*

[(1) Deferment of Students—(1)] (*c*) (*1*) Any person who is satisfactorily pursuing a [full-time] course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning shall, upon the facts being presented to the [local board] *area office*, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similiar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: Provided, that any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (1) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of such Act, or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of [section 6 (h) of such Act:] *this section.* [or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section.] Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed [under subsection (h) of this section] *in this section,* for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces [or training in the National Security Training Corps] of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.

Section 315. Conscientious Objectors

(Note.—Given the importance of provisions governing conscientious objection to consideration of selective service law in recent years, that part of the present summary which follows quotes in full the changes that

Section 315 would make in existing law, and does so using the same format followed for explaining the preceding section of H.R. 7784.)

[(j) Conscientious objectors.—] *Section 315.* (a) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. As used in this section, the term 'religious training and belief' does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views, or a merely personal moral code, *but it does include a sincere and meaningful belief, which occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by an orthodox belief in God.*

(b) Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the [local board] *Selective Service System* shall, if he is inducted into the Armed Forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, in lieu of such induction, be ordered by [his local board] *the Selective Service System*, subject to such regulations the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section [4 (b)] *305* such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the [local board] *Selective Service System* pursuant to Presidential regulations may deem appropriate. [and] Any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from [his local board] *the Selective Service System* shall be deemed, for the purposes of section [12] *203* of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title.

(c) *Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the area office or local board, be entitled to an appeal to the regional appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearings. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. If after such hearings the Department of Justice finds—*

(1) that the objections are sustained, it shall make recommendations to the appeal board in accordance with the procedures of subsection (b) of this section; or

(2) that the objections are not sustained, it shall so recommend to the appeal board. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to but not be bound to follow the recommendations of the Department of Justice, together with the record on appeal from the local board.

Section 316. Duration of Exemption or Deferment

Identical to section 6 (k) of the MSSA.

Section 317. Minority Discharges

Identical to section 6 (l) of the MSSA.

Section 318. Moral Standards

Identical to section 6 (m) of the MSSA.

Section 319. Sole Surviving Son

The same as section 6 (o) of the MSSA, except that section 319 would make provisions regarding the relief from induction of sole surviving sons effective "except during a war or national emergency declared by the Congress," whereas section 6 (o) qualifies such declarations by limiting them to ones made "after the date of the enactment of the 1964 amendment to this subsection."

Section 320. Bounties; Substitutes; Purchases of Release

Identical to section 8 of the MSSA.

Section 321. Reemployment

With minor textual changes, the same as section 9 of the MSSA, except for section 9(i), which has been included in H.R. 7784 as section 322.

Section 322. Right to Vote; Poll Tax

Identical to section 9(i) of the MSSA.

Section 323. Civil Relief

Identical to section 14 of the MSSA.

Section 324. Notice of Title; Voluntary Enlistments

The same as section 15 of the MSSA, except: a) the requirement that each registrant keep the Selective Service System informed as to his current address and change in status, having been included in section 301(b) of H.R. 7784, is deleted; b) there would be added to existing law a duty imposed on the Director of Selective Service to inform each registrant, in writing at the time of registration, of all rights and procedures available to him concerning classification, deferment, and exemption.

Section 325. Repeal of Conflicting Laws; Appropriations: Termination of Induction

Essentially the same as section 17 of the MSSA, except that part of section 17(b) pertaining to funds appropriated for administrative expenses of the National Security Training Corps is deleted.

Section 326. Aliens

Amends the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 (a) (15)) by adding a class (K) to the classes of nonimmigrant aliens not included under the term "Immigrant." An alien placed in class K would be defined as an alien who has requested and received an adjustment of status under section 247 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and who is not a nonimmigrant within any of the classes of nonimmigrant aliens presently established by law; but any alien whose status is adjusted to class K would have to depart the United States within one year of such adjustment, and any such alien would not be eligible for any further adjustment of status. Section 247 (c), which would be added to the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1257) by section 326 of H.R. 7784, provides that the status of an alien lawfully admitted to permanent residence may be adjusted to that of a nonimmigrant in class K or to any other class of nonimmigrant for which he may be eligible, if such alien requests an adjustment in order to be exempt from the requirements of selective service law. (Note: Section 326 (b) of H.R. 7784 would add a new subsection "e" to section 247 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, but since this probably is a technical or typographical error—section 247 currently has only subsections "a" and "b"—the present analysis refers to section 247 (c), as does section 326 (a) of H.R. 7784.) Also would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1258) so as to add aliens classified under K to those nonimmigrant aliens the change of whose nonimmigrant classification from one nonimmigrant classification to another is restricted in stated ways. Finally, amends the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1426) so as to add aliens granted an exemption under an existing treaty and aliens having their classification changed under section 247(c) to those aliens who are permanently ineligible to become U.S. citizens.

Title IV—Miscellaneous

Section 401. Military Youth Opportunity Schools

Would add to existing law by directing the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with other appropriate federal agencies, to conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of military youth opportunity schools, which would give on a voluntary basis special educational and physical training to those who fail to meet the minimum physical and mental requirements for military service. Also directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congress the results of this study and investigation, together with his recommendations, within one year after the enactment of section 401; and to include in his report to Congress specific findings such as the average annual number of men who fail to meet induction standards but who could meet them after spending a maximum of one year in military youth opportunity schools, and the costs and benefits to the Department of Defense of operating military youth opportunity schools.

Section 402. Volunteer Army Study

Would add to existing law by requiring the President to conduct a study to determine the cost, feasibility, and desirability of replacing involuntary induction with a voluntary system of enlistments; and within six months after the enactment of section 402 to submit the results of such study to the Congress, along with those recommendations that he deems appropriate.

Section 403. National Service Corps Study

Would add to existing law by directing the President to conduct a study and investigation to determine the feasibility and desirability of a national service corps in which physically and mentally qualified U.S. citizens would perform nonmilitary service designed to combat disease, ignorance, and poverty at home and abroad; to submit a written report forwarding the results of this study and investigation to Congress not later than one year after the enactment of section 403; and, in the event the establishment of a national service corps is found feasible and desirable, include in such report such subjects as what the nature and scope of a national service corps should be and the relationship of a national service corps to the Selective Service System.

Section 404. Amnesty Study

Would add to existing law by directing the President to conduct a study to determine the appropriateness of granting amnesty in the near future to those registrants presently outside the United States who are liable to prosecution under selective service law, such study to include such considerations as the implications for Armed Services morale of and the historical precedents for granting such amnesty; and to report the results of this study, together with appropriate recommendations, to the Congress within six months of the enactment of section 404.

ROVING JOURNALIST JIM BECKER REDISCOVERS HONOLULU

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the engaging reports from around the world by Hawaii's famed peripatetic journalist, Jim Becker, have long been favorite reading for residents of the island State.

Returning to the State he knows and loves so well, the noted Honolulu Star-Bulletin columnist has written a fascinating article, "Look What's Happened to Honolulu!" for the October issue of National Geographic.

Jim Becker has deftly captured the mood of the Hawaii State capital in his article, and the illustrations by National Geographic photographer, Bates Littlehales, are superb.

Mr. Becker traces the tremendous growth Hawaii has experienced during its first epochal decade of statehood, noting that the population of Honolulu has grown at an annual rate of 3 percent, more than double the national rate. Honolulu, which means "sheltered haven," was visited by more than 1.2 million people last year.

Yet, within this growing metropolis there exists a delightful paradox between progress and serenity which made it possible to film most of the movie "Hawaii" in Honolulu. Within an hour's drive of city hall and the modern concrete towers of downtown and the crowds at the world-famous Waikiki Beach, the directors of the movie were able to find the placid lagoons, the sheltered cliffs—"palis"—that rise as high as 4,000 feet, and the lush green valleys and forests required to film the epic movie which depicted island life in the 19th century.

Although the distinct ring of pile-drivers and the whirr of cement mixers testify to the quickening pace of island life, it is interesting to note that one of the few things unchanged in the island State by progress is the climate. Recorded temperature in downtown Honolulu does not exceed a high of 88 degrees, nor does it drop below 56 degrees. To quote from Jim Becker's article—

> The climate in this city, which I know well as a newspaper columnist and as an on-and-off resident for nearly 20 years, surely must have been designed for paradise.

I congratulate Jim Becker and the National Geographic for this penetrating and panoramic view of Honolulu and the Aloha State, and I commend the Becker Honolulu story for the reading pleasure of my colleagues in Congress and others.

STATEMENT OF CESAR CHAVEZ

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cesar Chavez, one of America's greatest sons and the leader of the United Farm Workers organizing committee, testified Monday, September 29, before the Migratory Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on the hazards from economic poisons endured by the workers of the grape fields of California. He told about specific incidents of death and injury that have resulted from virulent poisons sprayed upon grapes and vines where work crews performed their labors.

The plight of these grape workers has become a primary concern of all who are moved by poverty and injustice. In the words of former Secretary of Labor Wirtz:

> A thoughtful person sitting down to a large meal would turn away from it if he let himself think of the circumstances—at that hour—of some of those who had, in the fullest sense, worked to bring that meal to his table.

The California grape worker is poor. His work is exhausting, his income is low. His tenure is uncertain; his job and his rights unprotected, his conditions often incredibly degraded. Law, for him, both as written and enforced, is all too often the biased instrument of his subjugation. Order, the certain promise of endless repetition of suffering and decay. Above all, his right to organize, to participate in the decisions which control his life, still remains to be achieved.

It is that elemental right to organize which has been the focus of all the struggle—first in the fields, and then in the supermarkets—of the past 4 years.

What does the farmworker see when he surveys the questions of law, order, and Government responsiveness to his plight? He sees countless examples of governmental unconcern and arrogance and the institutional violence of which Robert Kennedy spoke, a violence which quietly and undramatically gouges out men's lives.

Most of the violence in the dispute has been directed against those who seek to organize. Strikers have been harassed; they have been physically attacked; they have been shot at, and kidnaped. They have been rammed by trucks. Their offices have been looted or destroyed. More often than protecting the rights of strikers, local police have condoned and even aided those who would destroy them. Officers of the law have looked on while pickets have been kicked, beaten, cursed, and spat upon. These same officers have proceeded personally to escort strikebreakers across the picket line.

Even the courts too often play a dismal and biased role in these affairs. Anti-picketing injunctions have unfairly inhibited activities at the labor site.

When the Guimarra Vineyards, after a bitter struggle, was tried and convicted on nearly 40 violations of child labor and health laws, it was fined a total of $1,000 by the Kern County Superior Court—and the fine was suspended. This same Guimarra Vineyards has received hundreds of thousands of dollars in subsidies from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And one of its best customers, perhaps the only one not subject to the grape boycott, is the U.S. Department of Defense.

With respect to other laws, the story is much the same. The laws governing working conditions, and particularly pesticides, are not adequate but the greater outrage is that even these inadequate laws are not enforced, so pesticides kill or make seriously ill an alarming number of farmworkers each year. Yet, when the union became concerned, the Kern County authorities refused to release the information they had about this situation.

A survey of 946 employers by the department of industrial welfare in California showed over 90 percent in violation of existing laws about drinking water and washing facilities. For field workers the open fields often provide the only available latrine, and often there are no facilities for washing. Then we eat the grapes grown and picked in such circumstances.

Discrimination problems in the fields are also considerable. Chicanos are often barred from the good jobs, blacks from any job at all. And once again, the law is applied unequally, depending on whose interests are involved.

The strike itself could not be resisted were there not a law permitting the importation of impoverished Mexicans who cross the border to provide union labor. Since one Federal law bars such laborers from areas in which labor disputes are certified to exist, strike centers often are not certified. Meanwhile, illegal immigration across the border continues in response to the demand for strikebreakers.

In this connection, the zeal of the Department of Immigration and Naturalization has been called into serious question. A lawsuit against the Department will be filed this week demanding that the Department enforce its regulations to detect and apprehend persons working illegally in strike areas.

And similar government inaction extends in all directions. When some growers substituted improper labels on containers of grapes to deceive the public, the responses of the Food and Drug Administration have been mere mild at best. Appeals for help against various other injustices have received half-hearted, reluctant, and sometimes perfunctory responses from the Departments of Labor and Justice.

On top of all this, the Department of Defense has increased its purchase of table grapes 40 percent since last year, and is now buying more table grapes than at any time in its history. All this in spite of the extensive violations of the law among those from whom the grapes are bought, in spite of the prohibition against dealings with firms practicing discrimination, and in spite of the low nutritional value of the grape. There is a standing order in the Defense Department that requires that the domestic implications of all policies be considered when decisions are made. But when a Department representative came before a Senate committee to testify on the procurement of grapes, not only did he affirm that the Department is not following this order; he was not even aware it existed.

So now our forces in Vietnam—disproportionately composed as they are of men from disadvantaged backgrounds—are being served almost 1½ times as many grapes as they were a year ago.

Farm laborers are excluded from minimum wage legislation and from unemployment insurance, and are at a disadvantage where social security is concerned. They are denied the collective bargaining rights guaranteed to nonfarmworkers, and are effectively cut off from every benefit of a negotiated contract. So the vast majority of California farmworkers have no contract, get no overtime, and may not even know their rate of pay.

They are often victims of deception and graft. They get no time off with pay, no health or pension plans, no regular rest periods. Speedups and abusive supervision are common. Workers may be

laid off at any time and for any reason, as for objecting to being assaulted by an owner, or for displaying a Kennedy bumper sticker. Safety provisions are minimal. Exempted from almost every kind of effective protection, the farmworker sees his employers—usually large corporations—lavished with many of the tax-supported aids provided by the Agriculture Department, as well as Federal subsidies of hundreds of thousands, sometimes millions of dollars per farm.

All this has suggested to millions of concerned Americans that the weak cannot succeed through established institutions, and that government is only to protect the powerful, to subsidize the rich, to legitimize the iniquitous. Almost the whole weight of government, which should protect the rights of the disadvantaged, has gone to frustrate their simplest aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, this whole situation is a scandal. For the human beings involved, it is a catastrophe—and the human beings involved include all Americans. How much longer can we ask powerless and despairing people to keep the faith as their lives continue to be passed in a futility and decay for which they are not responsible and from which there is no escape? How can we encourage them to try to right wrongs through the established process of law when nearly every impact of these processes frustrates their hopes and adds to the blight of the conditions under which they must live? After decades of tolerating silent misery and creeping disaster, how long can we go on counseling moderation and patience, while indifference and immobilism mark the behavior of the Government?

Young people are now demanding relevance and concern. They are tired of pious rhetoric that conceals indifference and seeks to conceal inaction. But we go on recklessly, blindly, assuring not only the continued sufferings of those affected, but escalating alienation, despair, and hatred in the broader life of the Nation.

Many of our national problems are formidable, many of their solutions distant and difficult to bring about. Here, surely, is one about which everyone could agree. With a little comprehension and compassion we could set out to ease and then erase, this problem from the national scene. If we tried hard enough, we could achieve both social justice and harmony for the grapepickers rather quickly. Think how great an incentive would be provided by success in this relatively simple and most pressing field of human misery.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the testimony of Mr. Cesar Chavez before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CESAR CHAVEZ

On August 1st, 1969, after testifying concerning the misuse of economic poisons by table grape growers, our general counsel, Jerry Cohen, submitted to the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor a Laboratory test from C. W. England Laboratories in Washington, D.C. which indicated that table grapes which were purchased by Manuel Vasquez at a Safeway store in northeast Washington contained an Aldrin residue of 18 parts per million. Subsequent to that time Senator George Murphy abused his privilege of senatorial immunity by making false accusations regarding the testimony of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee. The innuendo in Senator Murphy's remarks in the Congressional Record of August 12, 1969, is that the farm workers tampered with the grapes. I can assure you that this is false.

I am confident that our position will be vindicated in this hearing and that the reports which have been received concerning the fact that Safeway conducted its own independent tests which confirmed our tests and subsequently cancelled its contract with Bianco are accurate reports.

The real issue involved here is the issue of the health and safety not only of farm workers but of consumers and how the health and safety of consumers and farm workers are affected by the gross misuse of economic poisons.

The issue of the health and safety of farm workers in California and throughout the United States is the single most important issue facing the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee. In California the agricultural industry experiences the highest occupational disease rate. This rate is over 50% higher than the second place industry. It is also three times as high as the average rate of all industry in California. Growers consistently use the wrong kinds of economic poisons in the wrong amounts in the wrong places in reckless disregard of the health of their workers in order to maximize profits. Advancing technological changes in agriculture have left the industry far behind in dealing with the occupational hazards of workers which arise from the use of economic poisons. This problem is further compounded by the fact that commonplace needs such as clean drinking water and adequate toilet facilities are rarely available in the fields and are also deficient in many living quarters of farm workers, especially of those workers who live in labor camps provided by the employer.

In California an estimated 3,000 children receive medical attention annually after having injested pesticides. There are over 300 cases of serious nonfatal poisonings annually, most of which occur in agriculture. There are some fatal poisonings which occur annually in agriculture. In addition to this, literally thousands of workers experience daily symptoms of chemical poisoning which include dermatitis, rashes, eye irritation, nausea, vomiting, fatigue, excess sweating, headaches, double vision, dizziness, skin irritations, difficulty in breathing, loss of fingernails, nervousness, insomnia, bleeding noses, and diarrhea.

The misuse of pesticides is creating grave dangers not only to farmworkers but to their children as well. Dr. Lee Mizrahi at the Salud Clinic in Tulare County has recently conducted a study relating to nutrition, parasites and pesticide levels. Dr. Mizrahi chose his samples by inviting every fifth family who came to his clinic to participate in a free complete study of their children. Sixty families participated to date and 170 children have been tested. Dr. Mizrahi has reported to the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee that though the results of the test are not complete, based on the findings already received there are pesticide levels which can only be described as epidemic.

Thus far, on 29 children tested, 32 of the 84 reported values have fallen outside normal limits. Dr. Mizrahi has informed me that as a practicing physician he would be greatly worried if he found 10% of reportedly normal children outside normal limits. In this case he is frightened. These farm worker children are suffering from high levels of DDT in their blood and from low cholinesterase levels in their blood plasma.

Recently the state director of public health. Dr. Thomas Milby, said that there is ample evidence of many unreported poisonings in agriculture. Dr. Milby is currently conducting an investigation in an attempt to get an accurate picture of pesticide poisonings among the workers. The state of California is not releasing the data from this investigation. As an article in the Fresno Bee by Ron Taylor claims this study is headed by Mr. Henry Anderson who would not answer questions concerning the factual findings of the study to date because "the subject is too controversial." According to Mr. Taylor's article an undisclosed number of farm workers are reporting symptoms of pesticide poisoning. Many of these workers do not go to the doctors ordinarily but suffer in silence what they feel is an occupational hazard. The adverse effects of chemical poisons are so pervasive that they are considered by farm workers to be part of their way of life. They are accepted. One of the interviewers who is helping the state to conduct this investigation has informed the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee that of the 774 workers who filled out questionnaires which are now in the possession of the state, 469 of the workers had worked in the grapes and 295 had not worked in the grapes. Among the 774 farm workers, the following symptoms caused by pesticide poisonings were reported:

Eye irritation	548
Nausea or vomiting	141
Unusual fatigue	145
Unusual perspiration	159
Headaches	309
Dizziness	115
Skin irritation	249
Difficulty in breathing	188
Pain in the fingernails (some workers lost their fingernails)	52
Nervousness and/or insomnia	122
Itching in the ears	12
Nose bleeds	26
Burning and sorethroats	51
Swollen hands and feet	7
Loss of hair	4
Diarrhea	2

One hundred and fifty-four of the workers reported having one of the above symptoms, 144 reported two of the symptoms, 109 reported three, 83 reported four, and 163 reported five or more symptoms. Only 121 of the 774 workers studied reported none of the above symptoms. This study was limited to a relatively small county, Tulare, which is immediately north of Delano.

Dr. Irma West who works in the State Department of Public Health has written many articles concerning the occupational hazards of farm workers. Some of the examples of injuries are as follows:

On a large California ranch in the fall of 1965 a group of Mexican-American workers and their families were picking berries. None could understand or read English. A three-year-old girl and her four-year-old brother were playing around an unattended spray rig next to where their mother was working. The four-year-old apparently took the cap off a gallon can of 40% tetraethyl phyrophosphate (TEPP, a phosphate ester cholinesterase inhibitor) pesticide left on the rig. The three-year-old put her finger in it and sucked it. She vomited immediately, became unconscious, and was dead on arrival at the hospital where she was promptly taken. TEPP is the most hazardous of all pesticides in common use in agriculture in California. The estimated fatal dose of pure TEPP for an adult is one drop orally and one drop dermally. This child weighed about 30 pounds.

Because of engine trouble, an agricultural aircraft pilot attempted a forced landing in an unplanted field. The plane rolled into a fence and turned over. The hopper of the airplane contained a dust formula of TEPP, another of the phosphate ester pesticides.

The estimated adult fatal dose for TEPP concentrate is one drop orally or dermally. The pilot was not injured but was covered with dust. He walked a distance of 50 feet to a field worker, stated he felt fine, and asked for a drink of water. After drinking the water, he began to vomit and almost immediately became unconscious. By the time the ambulance arrived, the pilot was dead and the ambulance driver, the pathologist, and the mortician became ill from handling the body.

During this past summer in the grapes alone and largely in the Delano area the following incidents have been brought to the attention of our legal department.

On May 16th, 1969, Mrs. Dolores Lorta was working for labor contractor Manuel Armendariz in a table grape vineyard owned by Agri-Business Investment Company. Without warning, an Agri-Business spray rig sprayed the row she was working on, and Mrs. Lorta was sprayed all over her body with an unknown mixture of chemicals. Shortly thereafter, she experienced difficulty in breathing. She told her forelady, who responded that the spraying had nothing to do with that; that she must have had that difficulty before.

The next day she felt quite sick and large red blotches had appeared on her skin. She went to work that day but was unable to continue and hasn't been well enough to work since. She has suffered from continuing sores and rashes all over her body, headaches, dizziness, loss of weight, and her condition still continues. She has received no compensation from her employer as yet, and she has had to pay for her medical care herself.

Mr. and Mrs. Abelardo de Leon, and their teenage children, Juan and Maria, worked picking grapes for labor contractor Manuel Armendariz in vineyards owned by Agri-Business Investment Company during July and August of 1969. From the start of their work there, Mr. de Leon suffered rashes all over his body, which lasted until they quit. Mrs. de Leon began to suffer extremely irritated and swollen eyes as soon as they started working there and one eye is still somewhat swollen. The irritation ceased when she quit, and has not recurred though she has returned to work in a different crop since then. Both the de Leon children, along with their mother, suffered eye irritation while working for Armendariz, and often their eyes would water profusely throughout the working day. When this was brought to the attention of Armendariz, he laughed and called them cry babies. He did not suggest that medical help was available for the family under the workman's compensation program, and as a result they had to make do with drugs and home remedies. Though the de Leons were not sprayed on directly, there was a heavy white dust on the vines and grapes which they picked. They saw no signs warning of the ill effects of this chemical spray, nor did they receive any warning or advice about it whatsoever. The de Leon family eventually stopped working for Armendariz because of the ill effects they were suffering from the chemical poisons on the grapevines.

Mr. Gregorio Sisneros was engaged in spraying a vineyard in the Selma area in 1968. According to directions which came with it, he mixed one quart of economic poison with a large quantity of water. But his employer told him to add in another quart of poison, and so he did. After spraying this mixture for a short while he became ill and had to be taken to a doctor immediately. After receiving medical treatment he was confined to his home and unable to work for some days. Since then he has been sensitive to chemical spray and has become ill several times.

While working the vineyards of George A. Lucas & Sons this summer, Mrs. Beatrice Roman developed trouble breathing, sore throat, difficulty in speaking, and stomach pain. Each day her condition would improve as she left the vineyards, and it would worsen as she began work the following morning. There was a heavy white powder on the vines which she was working among. Mrs. Roman has worked in other crops without experiencing such illness. She has been informed by her physician that it is due to the spray residues on the vines. She stopped working for Lucas, because of the illness caused by the sprays, on August 4, 1969. She has been unable to work more than very little since then because of the continuing effects of the illness.

Mr. Mauro Roman (Beatrice's husband), along with his son, Jose, and a neighboring family all worked picking grapes in the vineyards of Lamanuzzi and Pantaleo in August 1969. All suffered severe skin rashes over their bodies, with cracked and peeling skin. All left this work after several weeks, and improved sharply as soon as they left. There was a very heavy white powder on the vines and grapes they were picking there.

After working in the vineyards of D. M. Steele for several days, Mr. Juan Q. Lopez developed trouble breathing, rashes on his neck and face, numbness in his left arm and upper left chest, headache and irritated eyes. There was a white powder on the vines. Mr. Lopez's condition began to improve when he stopped working in these fields.

While working picking grapes in a Caric vineyard about 10 days ago, Mr. Abelardo Hernandez ate some grapes from the vine. Shortly thereafter, he began to vomit and to bleed from the nose. His foreman refused to take him to a doctor until other workers finally convinced him to do so. The doctor who treated him said his illness was due to the grapes and the chemicals on them. He has suffered from this illness on and off since then.

During this season, Mrs. Dominga F. Medina has worked in vineyards near Richgrove. She has seen spray rigs spraying liquid preparations on the vineyards only a short distance from where she and the other members of her crew were working. She has suffered from bloody nose, eye irritation, and headache while working in these vineyards.

Aurelio de la Cruz worked with Giumarra Vineyards in the spring of 1969. On more than one occasion he saw spray rigs spraying right ahead of the crew he was working in; his crew was told to work in the sprayed areas shortly after the spraying was concluded. He suffered eye irritation and skin rashes on these occasions.

Mr. Claro Runtal suffered very severe rashes and dermatitis on his legs and neck while working in vineyards of Richard Bagdasarian from December 1968 to June 1969. Many of the other men in the crew suffered skin irritations during the same period from the chemical dusts which had been applied to the vines.

Juanita Chavera was working in the Elmco vineyards in the spring of 1969 when she developed, as a result of the spray residue on the vines, skin rash, eye irritation, and hands swollen so badly that her ring had to be cut off. Other women in the crew including Mrs. Chovera's sister, Linda Ortiz, suffered similar symptoms.

Maria Serna also working in the Elmco vineyards in May 1969, where she developed irritated eyes, headaches, and severe dizziness. Her daughter, Alicia Ramona, suffered rashes and eye irritation.

Frances Barajas also worked in the Elmco vineyards this spring. While she was working there, a tractor spraying a liquid economic poison came through the vineyard in which she was working. She ran out of the field because she did not want to get sprayed, but a foreman ordered her to go back in and get back to work. She later talked to the tractor driver, who said he had been ordered to spray there by one of the Elmco supervisors. While working there she developed skin rashes and eye irritations that led to a serious eye infection. She has been afraid to complain about the poisons for fear of being fired.

Rafaela Ayala woked in the Elmco vineyards in the same crew as Mrs. Barajas. When the tractor sprayed the field they were working in she immediately began to vomit and her eyes became very irritated; they are still sore. She stopped working for Elmco as a result.

Mrs. Celestina Pereales was working in the Elmco vineyards in May 1968 when a tractor spray rig approached the row her crew was working in. Her supervisor told them to hunch down under the vines while the spray rig sprayed them. Not knowing better at the time, she did so. Her eyes became red and watery right away, and became persistently irritated, and she has had eye trouble ever since.

Mrs. Josephine C. Moreno was working in a crew leafing vines in the Elmco vineyards this spring. A spray rig came through the vineyard one row away from where the crew was working, and she and other women got sprayed soaking wet, but were put back to work after five minutes.

Petra Sisneros was working in the Elmco vineyards, tipping grape bunches, in may 1969, when four tractor driven spray rigs came into the field. Without any warning, one of them came right over the spot she was working in, spraying her soaking wet and blinding her to the point that she almost fell under the spray rig. Other women workers dragged her away from the danger of the spray rig. Her supervisor did not take her to a doctor until she became visibly sick. Until then she had merely been told to sit in the shade under the vine. She was vomiting a great deal by this time. After she was taken to a doctor, who gave her an injection and bathed her eyes, she was returned to the vineyards where she had to wait for a ride home until her co-workers were finished for the day. She was extremely ill for the next 10 days with vomiting, nausea, trembling, dizziness, headache, difficulty in breathing, tightness of chest, and difficulty in sleeping. To date she has received no compensation from her employer. She is still suffering from the aftereffects of this illness. When she asked her supervisor and foreman what kind of chemical she had been sprayed with, they claimed they didn't know and said it was not their fault she had been sprayed.

Alfonso Pedraza was also sprayed by an Elmco spray rig while working in its vineyards in the summer of 1969. The spray hit him on his back. When he saw a doctor three days later, his back was very red and the skin was cracked. The rash spread all over his body, and he developed muscle stiffness and eye irritation as well.

The carelessness with which economic poisons are applied in this area is such that farm workers are endangered outside the fields as well as within. About a month ago, while Petra Ojeda was working in a Tulare County orchard, the grower's tractor driven spray rigs sprayed her car and the cars of other workers which were parked along the road nearby. Mrs. Ojeda's young child was in the car asleep, along with food for lunch for the entire family. The child was covered by a blanket, but her bottle was covered with spray. The entire car was white with the chemical spray.

The James Morning family didn't even have to leave their home in order to be sprayed with economic poisons. In May 1969, their country home was sprayed by an airplane which was applying poison to a nearby field. All six members of the family were hit with the spray, causing rashes, cracked skin and irritated eyes.

The United Farm Workers Organizing Committee is attempting to solve this pervasive problem by the collective bargaining process. We have recently attained what is

for farm workers an historic breakthrough in our negotiations with the Perelli-Minetti Company. We have completed negotiating a comprehensive health and safety clause which covers the subject of economic poisons. It includes the following protections:

HEALTH AND SAFETY

A. The Health and Safety Committee shall be formed consisting of equal numbers of workers' representatives selected by the bargaining unit and P-M representatives. The Health and Safety Committee shall be provided with notices on the use of pesticides, insecticides, or herbicides, as outlined in Section D 1, 2 and 3.

The Health and Safety Committee shall advise in the formulation of rules and practices relating to the health and safety of the workers, including, but not limited to, the use of pesticides, insecticides, and herbicides; the use of garments, materials, tools and equipment as they may affect the health and safety of the workers and sanitation conditions.

B. The following shall not be used: DDT, Aldrin, Dieldrin, and Endrin. Other chlorinated hydrocarbons shall not be applied without the necessary precautions.

C. The Health and Safety Committee shall recommend the proper and safe use of organic phosphates including, but not limited to parathion. The Company shall notify the Health and Safety Committee as soon as possible before the application of organic phosphate material. Said notice shall contain the information set forth in Section D below. The Health and Safety Committee shall recommend the length of time during which farm workers will not be permitted to enter the treated field following the application of organic phosphate pesticide. If P–M uses organic phosphates, it shall pay for the expense for all farm workers, applying the phosphates, of one baseline cholinesterase test and other additional such tests if recommended by a doctor. The results of all said tests shall be immediately given by P–M to the Health and Safety Committee.

D. P–M shall keep the following records and make them available to each member of the Health and Safety Committee:

(1) A plan showing the size and location of fields and a list of the crops or plants being grown.

(2) Pesticides, insecticides, and herbicides used, including brand names plus active ingredients, registration number on the label, and manufacturer's batch or lot number.

(a) Dates and time applied or to be applied.

(b) Location of crops or plants treated or to be treated.

(c) Amount of each application.

(d) Formulation.

(e) Method of application.

(f) Persons who applied the pesticide.

(3) Date of harvest.

SANITATION

A. There shall be adequate toilet facilities, separate for men and women, in the field, readily accessible to workers, that will be maintained in a clean and sanitary manner. These may be portable facilities and shall be maintained at the ratio of one for every 35 workers.

B. Each place where there is work being performed shall be provided with suitable, cool, potable drinking water convenient to workers. Individual paper drinking cups shall be provided.

C. Workers will have two (2) relief periods of fifteen (15) minutes which, insofar as practical, shall be in the middle of each work period.

TOOLS AND PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

Tools and equipment and protective garments necessary to perform the work and/or to safeguard the health of or to prevent injury to a worker's person shall be provided, maintained and paid for by P–M.

ARKANSAS RIVER TONNAGE SURPASSES ESTIMATES

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, commercial navigation of the Arkansas River has advanced to Little Rock, and the next major leg will enable barge traffic between Fort Smith and the Mississippi River, traversing the entire State of Arkansas.

Because of the heavy investment of Federal funds, some of the early-use statistics may be of great interest to my colleagues of the Congress. In these early stages of development, they tend to more than justify the faith, efforts, and good judgment of those far-sighted men who almost three decades ago sponsored the legislation and fought for its approval—the late Senator Bob Kerr of Oklahoma, the esteemed senior Senator from Arkansas, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, and countless other concerned and dedicated citizens of Arkansas and Oklahoma.

I commend to my colleagues the report by Stanley Mantrop in the October 2 issue of the Journal of Commerce. I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

ARKANSAS RIVER TONNAGE SURPASSES ESTIMATES

(By Stanley Mantrop)

LITTLE ROCK.—The Little Rock business community plans to set in motion soon the first phase of a massive multimodal transportation complex aimed at making this Arkansas River city the nation's next big warehousing and distribution area for the Midwest and South.

The financial leaders are so confident the area will succeed that they are willing to put up their own funds to get the first step, an airport complex built, rather than be held up waiting to raise the money in the bond market in this uncertain period.

A high-ranking business official told The Journal of Commerce they hope to turn the first sod soon. They'll also push for developments in other modes of transport.

ARKANSAS RIVER TRAFFIC

What has spurred along this kind of enthusiasm is the unanticipated heavy movement of cargo along the recently opened Arkansas River project which, by the end of the third quarter, had far surpassed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimate for the full river opening to Tulsa of 1 million tons, by the close of 1971.

By the end of September the river, which opened to barge traffic in January of this year, had surpassed 1,000,000 tons in both directions.

The Corps district engineer, Col. Charles L. Steel, stressing the impact of river transportation on the Arkansas economy, credited the new waterway with bringing some $500 million worth of new industry into the state, while creating a cargo outlet capable of moving the raw materials in for the plants, and the manufactured goods out.

There is also a drive on here for a free port area. Backers of the multimodal transportation plan which would combine air, sea, and land transport into one massive center, have discussed their project with top officials in Washington and other sections of the country. They claim they have received enough encouragement from these talks to proceed ahead at full throttle.

PINE BLUFF CARGO

Colonel Steel said the Port of Little Rock had handled cargoes far beyond the estimates when it went into business on Jan. 1. Downstream, at Pine Bluff, this port was already 50 per cent over the projected cargo estimates for a full year, less than four months after its dedication earlier this year.

Significant for the area is the fact that of the total tonnage handled so far well over half was in outbound movements, meaning that many cargoes, previously landlocked, were now being moved.

The cargoes shipped out consist of a large variety of chemicals and minerals all of which has raised hopes that these commodities will lead to the setting up of waterside plants.

Encouraged by the heavy cargo movement, a Pine Bluff firm has set up the first barge rental agency, with two large mooring facilities planned, one of 5,000 feet, the other of 1,800 feet. A number of studies also are underway to mark out key areas for plant and port locations along the length of the waterway.

So far, Little Rock and Pine Bluff have the largest port complexes. However, several private ones, geared mainly to handling products of raw materials inbound, have been set up.

The next one of any size to go into operation will be Fort Smith, close to the Oklahoma border, which should be ready by the time the Corps of Engineers bring into being the next stage of the multimillion-dollar waterway project by New Year's eve.

"We are moving ahead on schedule," Colonel Steel said. "We see no indications of any delays."

From then on the river job moves into high gear with one of the biggest dock installations being set up at Catoosa, which will be the port at Tulsa.

Backers of the Arkansas River project believe their prospects are good for winning Washington recognition for its free port plans. They appear to have picked up some solid support for this move. There is also a feeling that since most of the products moved in by barge are in international commerce, meaning they either are sent abroad from Gulf port to their destination, or are unloaded inbound at the same ports for mill consumption inland, the area should be designated as an important international trade area and should receive the official benefits that sometimes go with such a setup.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR AIR FORCE SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in these days of supersensitivity regarding the management of our large defense budget, it behooves each of us in this body to remain as aware as possible of the methods employed by the Services in the administration and expenditure of these funds.

A major element of the Air Force, the Air Force Systems Command, has the responsibility for a significant portion of the overall budget. During the recent Air Force Association fall meeting, held here in Washington, D.C., Gen. James Ferguson, the commander of Air Force Systems Command, headed a panel of research and development management experts who made presentations before

an audience of Government and industry aerospace officials.

The management concept outlined by General Ferguson in his presentation is indeed a refreshing approach for managing the development and procurement of our major aerospace systems. His remarks are worthy of your attention, for you will recognize, as I have, that the application of the principles embodied in his concept can lead to an increase in our national technological base while providing this Nation with markedly advanced aerospace weapons and support systems. Thus, I commend his speech to you and include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR AIR FORCE SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

My colleagues and I appreciate this opportunity to discuss "New Directions for Air Force Systems Management" with the knowledgeable membership of the Air Force Association. We know that, while we will be accorded a friendly hearing, we will also be exposed to objective and critical judgment.

Critical judgment—some objective and some anything but—is the reigning order of the day. I can't think of any AFA meeting in a good many years that was held in an atmosphere so thick with questioning, probing, and doubt. We should *all* be well accustomed by now to conducting business in a very transparent goldfish bowl. That, after all, is the "name of the game," and all of us throughout Government and industry knew it before we started. But it's hard to recall any time when it was such a popular sport for anyone and everyone to go spearfishing in that goldfish bowl—with or without a license.

In that context, then, the Air Force Systems Command panel will focus on one facet of the current controversy: the management of major defense system acquisitions. This is a target so large and so vulnerable, by virtue of its multibillion dollar scope, that even a novice spearfisher can easily draw blood.

So, for perspective, let's briefly review the way things used to be, and how we got to where we are today. Then, a look at what is being done about the current situation, from the highest level down—and particularly the role of Systems Command in this era of change. In the process, I think all of you from the defense industries should be able to assess the probable effects upon your own community—both from what we say here and from what you may extrapolate between the lines.

For my part, I will concentrate on an overview—the broad effects of the new management directions on AFSC. The other panel members will then bring to bear a finer focus on command and staff impacts; in the process, I would think, the impact on industry-defense relationships will become rather apparent.

By way of brief background, you undoubtedly recall that the 1950s saw the Air Force making pretty much its own development and deployment decisions. Program justification was based for the most part on Specific Operational Requirements approved by USAF. Thus, in 1955 and 1956, I can remember something like 19 SAC programs in the R&D mill, four interceptors, 11 applications of nuclear power to ground, aircraft and space systems, eight space projects, and all the so-called "L" systems for command, control, and communications. Systems were relatively less sophisticated, and therefore less costly. And, with the Air Force responsible for about 50% of the defense budget, there always seemed to be enough funding flexibility for new programs, as well as for modification and updating of older ones.

In those days, the Office of the Secretary of Defense was a small advisory body, with little direct involvement or detailed analysis at that level. Management authority was delegated to the field, so that quick decisions with minimum delay were characteristic of systems development. On the other hand, cost considerations were quite possibly not accorded the importance they deserved.

With the 1960s, the national strategy of massive retaliation was overhauled along the lines of flexible response and multiple options. At the same time, exploding technology offered a wealth of options for alternative weapon and support systems.

Given this great range of choice, and the tremendous costs of the numerous alternatives, the new Secretary of Defense sought tightened control from the top. The pendulum began a rapid swing in the reverse direction, as Mr. McNamara exercised various control systems and mechanisms. Most were admirable in conception—Contract Definition, for example. Or the attempt to quantify alternative choices through Systems Analysis and the Cost/Effectiveness Ratio. Or the Cost Reduction Program, with its emphasis on tighter contracting. Any one of us, I'm sure, could think of at least five more—with varying degrees of affection.

In seeking a cohesive allocation of finite resources according to broad roles and missions, these mechanisms and procedures were fundamentally sound. In practice, however, we moved too far toward the other extreme from the situation of the 50s. Procedures requiring detailed decisions at the OSD level generated a correspondingly massive requirement for detailed information, and for more and more technical people, at that level.

This very rapid growth in the Office of the Secretary of Defense caused a corresponding technical buildup of large proportions within the Air Staff. There was a mass exodus of many of our best project officers topside, and most of them, with some abetment from the field, took their jobs with them. That left Systems Command with a heavy mantle of responsibility, but, in reality, short-circuited out of the decision loop by this migration of detailed management to a higher level.

At a Washington meeting of the Armed Forces Management Assocation last month, Dr. John Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, summed it up in these terms:

"For reasons which are now history," he said, "we find the Pentagon today with too much centralization of authority—but not responsibility—too much layering in the decisionmaking structure, too many reports to be written by people already too busy trying to manage."

I like the way General McConnell put it in one of his last appearances on the Hill, because my own experience bears it out. When you're running a flying outfit, as he said, and a squadron commander goofs, you fire him. But in the procurement and development areas, it is virtually impossible to *find* the right one to fire. Too many people at too many levels have too much to say about the program. And very few of them can say "Go"—while most are authorized to say "No," or, as is more often heard, "more data" or "restudy."

That is about where things stood until fairly recently. Meanwhile, national tension and unrest were compoundng, aggravated by a growing frustration over the war in Southeast Asia, and resulting in a general disenchantment with anything military. Against that kind of backdrop, any apparent miscue in defense management—in cost, schedule, or performance—has triggered an immediate avalanche of accusation, recrimination, and investigation. All of which tend to escalate as they are bounced around the walls of the Capitol, reflected in the face of the TV tube, and splashed around the news and editorial pages of the printed media.

But every little attention is directed to the fact that, basically, it is the divorce of the Service R&D elements from control of their own programs that gives birth to these misfires.

This is not to say, by any means, that any of us—in any of the Services—is wholly without fault. Speaking for the Air Force, we have recognized for some time that, on many occasions, after a Niagara of studies and restudies, we let ourselves be stampeded into Contract Definition just to get going. In frustration—which is understandable but no less excusable—we have accepted and participated in program decisions without actually having the requisite technology sufficiently well in hand to proceed.

What that sort of thing does to schedules, performance, and costs is too well known to require extension elaboration. A few examples, such as the SRAM, Mark II Avionics, and the Minuteman guidance system, are representative. They amply illustrate the need for a much more detailed look at—and control of—the balance among Cost, Performance, and Schedule. *Not* only at the very beginnings of the system acquisition cycle, but all the way through to the final operational configuration.

Our greatest shortcoming may well have been that, recognizing these results of overcentralized control, we didn't really start a critical self-examination until about a year ago.

But what is much more important now, the basic problem is recognized—and is being attacked—at the highest levels. President Nixon, with his strong emphasis on decentralization, has set the tone and furnished the policy framework. The Department of Defense, as strongly evidenced by Dr. Foster's remarks last month, is taking the necessary steps to get management back where it can truly manage. As witness this excerpt from his address:

"In the Office of the Secretary of Defense . . . you can see a shift toward added emphasis on *future defense planning* and *away from the management of a given program*. The senior civilians will require a detailed justification by the Services of a program, but once approved, the Services will run it. The Office of the Secretary of Defense will monitor the program but hold the Services responsible for the proper conduct of the approved program."

I'm happy to say that the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff have expressed their agreement. Headquarters USAF and AFSC have been actively working with DOD, the Defense Science Board, *and the other Services* on the complex problems of managing huge programs. We have made detailed recommendations along the entire spectrum, and their acceptance in large part generated the new policy that detailed review and the decisions on approved programs will be delegated to the lowest possible level.

Within the Air Force, it would certainly seem to me that AFSC is the logical level. There *is* no higher level—in USAF or DOD—at which all the essential ingredients for detailed review and timely decisions come together. Systems Command *is* the organization charged with maintaining the technical and management capability to balance resources against thoroughly analyzed military requirements. At no other level of organization are all these ingredients constantly available for program decisions during the total system procurement cycle.

That premise clearly pinpoints responsibility where it belongs—and Systems Command is happy to meet the challenge.

So, from the top on down it is agreed that there will be a greater emphasis on future planning and Concept Formulation at the OSD and Air Staff levels. While General Rogers will discuss the AFSC role in this new environment in greater detail, I would like to point out several areas that I feel will be essential to our future success.

First, a very deep and penetrating look

into the operational capabilities required and the time frame for their intended use. These considerations are going to be essential in establishing priorities for future efforts in a climate of curtailed funds and manpower. And in this connection, let's be very clear about the tremendous need for judicious *selectivity* among the numerous choices technology makes available. The trend toward more elaborate frills and increasd "gold plating"—which too often turns out to be tarnished when it reaches the field—must be reversed.

Second, a more comprehensive understanding of the technology involved and the state-of-the-art available. We must have better estimates of technical risks versus performance requirements, costs, and delivery dates.

Third, a flexible scheme of contracting to cover the R&D phases of the program as well as production. We've got to recognize the fundamental differences between development and production, and tailor our contracting procedures accordingly.

Fourth, we're going to have to come up with far more definitive and realistic development schedules than we've done in the past. That means, for one thing, a more realistic use of analytical studies, prototype development, and advanced development of components in areas of high technical risk. *And* the establishment of *definitive decision milestones* at which we can assess the impact of problems in technology, costs, performance specifications, and time delays, on the comprehensive acquisition schedule.

What all this says, and I think it bears emphasis, is that all our problems must be visible and susceptible of solution before a final commitment to production. By placing greater emphasis at the highest level on program approval processes before we proceed to production, everyone—DOD, the Services, Congress, and the contractors—will have a full understanding of just what the base line is for what we are buying. Only with such a base line can we identify our problems and measure our progress against what we set out to do.

With this valid base line—knowing precisely what has really been approved—and with AFSC charged with the proper conduct of the program, we get back to the basic principles of management. Detailed management information rises only as high as the level at which it is needed and can be useful; spans of control become realistic; and authority is once again wedded to responsibility.

To put the theory into action, the Air Force is realigning certain functional responsibilities in the program management area. As of July, for example, the F–15 program came under the direct management control of Headquarters AFSC. The Office of the Assistant for F–15, reporting directly to me, has assumed the functions and responsibilities that were previously assigned to the Program Element Monitor on the Air Staff. Consequently, the appropriate PEM personnel from the Pentagon have been transferred to my headquarters at Andrews.

At the same time, the F–15 System Program Director, who formerly reported through the Commander of the Aeronautical Systems Division, now reports directly to me.

The same type of organizational structure and alignment of responsibilities is now being considered for the B–1A advanced bomber program. And we anticipate going the same route for selected major programs of the future, once they have been approved for development and acquisition.

Meanwhile, programs already underway—such as the C–5, Minuteman, and F–111—are also being considered for a closer tie-in to the Systems Command. This would entail a shift of many of the Air Staff program element monitoring functions to the appropriate AFSC staff agency as the focal point for detailed management information. And we may well consider following much of the same sort of process with regard to various advanced development programs.

I have discussed these changes in great detail with the System Program Directors who are directly affected, and charged them with surfacing problems and getting them to me as soon as they appear. The SPDs will thus be giving me detailed reports; emerging problems will be identified and resolved before they grow malignant and multiply out of control. And we will be paying very strict attention to cost, schedules, performances, and program decision requirements.

Now, all of this in no way means that we are trying to cut the higher levels out of the loop once a program has been approved. Rather, the purpose is to eliminate unnecessary briefing and reporting at all levels. We all realize that each level or organization must have the information necessary to fulfill its management responsibilities; but we must get rid of the study and re-study requirements from various staffs, offices, committees and other reviewing agencies that have neither the authority nor the responsibility for program decisions.

In conjunction with the other Services, we are developing a standardized format with which we, in turn, report to higher levels. In my own case, for example, I will be highlighting problems of our major programs for the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief, and DOD in a quarterly review—without the need for these higher levels to constantly review and drown in a flood of complex detail.

At the same time, AFSC should become the Air Force focal point, in Washington, for comprehensive program management information. We will therefore be able to respond fully to the Secretary and the Chief, as well as DOD levels, and these higher levels, in turn, can be responsive to the Congress through the System Acquisition Reports.

We are going to be particularly resistant to Engineering Change Proposals for increased performance, whether they come from the contractor *or* the user. Any ECP is going to be looked at through a jaundiced eye, *first* to see if there is any real need for it at all, and *secondly*, if it passes that test, what it does to costs and schedules.

And, as I mentioned earlier, we are moving very definitely in the direction of hardware verification—or prototyping—as a complement to the present flood of paper studies in the Contract Definition phase. I think of this as competitive "initial development," or, in effect, a "contract definition in hardware." After all, brochures *always* perform beautifully, but I frankly prefer in most instances to see a piece of hardware proving *what* it can do, *when* it can be delivered, and *whether* it is worth the money it will cost. In this connection, we must use all available techniques, including exploratory and advanced development efforts, to validate system feasibility. We *must* insure that we have a viable program *before* we commit ourselves to the major costs of development and production.

Having heard now how we got where we were, and what steps are being taken to remedy the genuine deficiencies, you can probably deduce what the impact on defense contractors is likely to be. The controlling factor, obviously, is the real squeeze on money and manpower that we can expect for at least the next few years—and very probably beyond. The necessity for the Services to get a great deal more value from every R&D and production dollar cannot help but have a profound effect on the industry.

You can expect our look at past performance, as a factor in source selection, to be far deeper, far more penetrating and far more realistic.

"Realism," in fact, is going to be the operative environment. There will, in the future, be very scant likelihood of low-cost buy-ins, or of our accepting performance specifications beyond those in the original definition, at the price of disproportionate cost increases.

All in all, I would say, we can expect, for the foreseeable future, a trend to the very basic "necessities of life," at realistic and thoroughly justifiable price tags.

Summing up: AFSC analytical capability applied to Air Force mission requirements, added to the command's technical competence, together form a potential for producing the best and most advanced aerospace systems in the world. When you add, as is now being done, the management authority necessary to really control your programs, that potential is much more likely to translate into reality. With these three ingredients—analysis, technology and authority—working together, we will be able to produce viable weapon systems that meet the nation's needs as fully as they can be met, are no more complex than they need to be to fulfill their functions, and are priced as close to their true worth as human effort can manage.

Now let me read you something that applies directly to what has been said today:

"I strongly believe in the pyramid nature of decisionmaking and that, within that frame, decisionmaking should be pushed to the lowest level in the organization that has the ability and information available to apply approved policy."

That sounds very similar to what we have been saying here. Yet it was written by Robert McNamara in *1964*, and we can only believe that those words reflected what *he* believed. If the tools and instruments with which he attempted to build the framework overwhelmed or aborted the original intent, or delayed it overlong, it was nonetheless a heroic effort to cope with unbelievable complexity and magnitude. In the process, we all learned something of enduring value about analysis, the cold light of judgment, and the intricate matrix of conflicting choices.

It is up to each of us now, *not* to disclaim the past or seek a scapegoat for our mistakes, but to make use of what we have learned, and to apply our knowledge strenuously to this new era of defense acquisition management.

I would like to leave you, then, with the assurance that the Air Force is taking major constructive steps, along the lines I have described, to remedy deficiencies that we ourselves have recognized for at least the past year.

For our part, the Air Force Systems Command is definitely off and running, doing exactly what the highest levels of Government—and we ourselves—have all agreed should be done.

PATTERN FOR PEACE

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great amusement to me, tinged with some dismay, that I am reading of and hearing a great deal about the various programs to end the war in Vietnam immediately. It is usually from the same source—although others occasionally join in—who have been playing this tune for months, even years. For once, we have a President who is actually withdrawing troops and who has promised to withdraw more. He is the first President to take the first step toward a

peace solution. Yet, we still have the crowds who shout for peace and protest as if they and only they have the price tag for the purchase of this illusioned target.

President Nixon has a very good grasp on foreign affairs and is a great President in this particular area. In addition to tons of information—all facts—as well as a multiude of experienced opinions on the war, he is in a situation where most of it is not available to these peace procurers. I have spent several years overseas in that area and converse in oriental tongue. I have visited Vietnam many times and still do not consider myself an expert on Vietnam.

Suddenly, all we have are Vietnam experts during such a critical time. We Americans have taken more official steps to achieve peace, and also more poignantly asked the committee to make a concomitant move on their part to show that they want peace. I seriously wonder if they do when I realize that the Communists in Hanoi show no indication to end the war. Each side has to give. We have abandoned every bargaining position and they have abandoned none. When the President was elected by the people of the United States, they knew he would be able to do his job. He is harangued, he is bothered, he is pestered with this bloc representing little more than their own provincial politics or immediate political expediency. Why do they not leave the President alone and let him try to run the Nation?

Each riot, each disturbance, is additional fuel for the enemy and makes it more difficult for the President to continue his pattern for peace. Mr. Speaker, I support this administration and I support our President now as I have supported past Presidents. Surely, the price of peace is not too high when all it requires is a little justice, courage, and even a little consideration from one American to another. I pray for my country, I pray for my President, and since he is my President, I will believe and trust in his capabilities to achieve this thing called peace. I must add in all candor, I do not believe that any real Communist wants peace now or ever; he wants prosperity and people. But surely some day the enemy will allow the people in free South Vietnam to live in peace and security and well-being. I will walk this way with Mr. Nixon and this administration as I believe he can bring real peace. He will have my most earnest prayers.

INFLATION AND THE BANKERS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are currently faced with a serious economic crisis, and we do not have much time to steer a course toward economic stability.

The administration has been promising us, for a long time, that we will win this fight against inflation, but, despite these assurances, we are losing this fight.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that credit is the basis of our American economy. When a consumer borrows money to make a purchase, he pays interest on the amount borrowed. If he decides to make this purchase on credit, the store charges interest on the amount owed on the credit contract.

In the guise of fighting inflation, interest rates have been increased which contribute to rising living costs. Such price boosts, paid by the consumer, are built into living cost for years to come.

To raise the price of money is like raising cost of any other essential commodity—it does not dampen inflation—it contributes directly to it.

The beneficiaries of soaring interest rates are the banks and, in this connection, I would like to include an article on the activities of the bankers and their fight to curb inflation through raising interest rates. The article, written by Jack Anderson, follows:

THE BIG BANKERS ARE DOING WELL

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—As part of the fight against inflation now gripping the country the federal government months ago called on big business to do its part. The nation's bankers happily responded by raising their interest rates five times over the past nine months.

The cost of borrowing money is now at the highest point in history—8½ per cent for prime customers.

How this will curb inflation may be a little hard to understand for the salaried American, who must pay more for almost everything he buys on credit.

But the effect on the average American has been inflationary, not the other way around. His home costs more. His automobile costs more. His food, clothing and medical expenses have skyrocketed.

All the while the bankers rake in the greenbacks. They have tried to conceal their good fortune by crying the blues over shrinking profit margins. But bank earnings—the cold, hard cash left after expenses—are higher than ever.

Banking used to be a nice stable industry which tended to breed bespectacled, staid, old gentlemen who reeked of a musty money smell.

But today, bankers have caught the go-go fever. Yielding to the profit mania, they now compete with big business. They manipulate the money flow, playing little paper games which cause the rise and fall of great corporations.

They are aided in all their endeavors by the federal government, which diverts more of the taxpayers' money to benefit millionaire bankers more than ghetto children.

The Government, for example, has set up dozens of guaranteed loan programs, which are really nothing more than guaranteed profit programs for the bankers.

Here's how they work: the banks lend money to Government-qualified borrowers who pay back the loans with interest. Thus the banks make all the profit, but the taxpayers take all the risk. For if a borrower defaults on his loan, the Government must make good.

These unique benefits for banks have been made possible by a Congress which is widely populated by bankers. More than 100 members of Congress are linked by stockholdings or directorships to national banks. A great number of these serve on the Senate and House banking committees, which handle banking legislation.

Through these committees, the banking lobby gains favorable legislation in almost every session of Congress. In theory, the committees are set up to serve the public. In practice, they seem to work for the bankers.

Those who oppose the banking lobby find that the enormous resources of the nation's financial institutions are turned against them on election day. Those who play along sometimes find unexpected dividends.

A FARM WIFE PROTESTS

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members, or at least for their consideration of the situation involving farm prices, I am inserting the following article which makes a potent point and should be of interest to the Members of the House:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Sept. 26, 1969]

A FARM WIFE PROTESTS

"Is it only meat that has gone up?" asks a Mitchell, Neb., contributor to the Public Pulse. Her query was written before the press dispatch from New York which reported that the supermarket meat boycotts generated by Mrs. Mickey DiLorenzo in the Long Island area were only "partially successful."

The Mitchell contributor, a "cattle feeder's wife," asks: Why complain about the high cost of one segment of the economy and not protest such things as a hair-do which once cost 75 cents and now costs $2.50, or the dress which once cost $25 and now is priced at $98?

Agricultural economists have repeatedly cited figures showing that the American housewife still has a bargain in her meat and other principal foodstuffs, and the Nebraska housewife quotes a University of Florida expert who says that "rather than condemn the farmer we should be thankful for the fact the U.S. consumer spends the least amount of his income for food of anyone in the world."

It is interesting to note that the breadwinners in the households of the wives mentioned in the boycotts have received pay increases many times in excess of what the farmer and cattle feeder have gained in this period of inflation.

THE AMERICAN FARMER—A FRIEND OF CONSUMERS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, because of our deep concern over the rising cost of food, we tend to forget that the American farmer is doing a phenomenal job for this Nation in producing mineral-rich foods in abundance at reasonable prices. Despite the fact that he is caught in a chronic cost-price squeeze, the American farmer continues to make it possible for the consumer to get a bargain on his groceries in this country.

In this regard, I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent news release of the National Limestone Institute which reports that in 1968, the American consumer spent 17.2 percent of personal income for food, in comparison with 25.7 percent in 1947.

It was also noted in the news release that a United Nations study of food price increases in 45 countries for the period 1963 through 1967 revealed that prices in the United States rose less than in most other countries.

As the very able president of the National Limestone Institute, Robert M. Koch, commented:

Plagued by constantly rising costs for everything he buys, by very acute labor shortages, by excessive hours for both him and his family—and a reputation for getting excessive Government handouts which is certainly not true for the "average farmer"—the American farmer continues to provide the most abundant and inexpensive food supplies to his countrymen of any nation on the face of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the NLI news release for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point for the further information of my colleagues:

FOOD COST

Many consumers in the United States gripe about the cost of food and price increases which have taken place in recent years. Many even remember prices when one could buy a "T" bone steak at 25 cents a pound and other prices were comparable. They minimize or even forget to take into account the increases in personal income and other changes in living standards during the same period. And, we tend to forget the numerous items that are now on grocery store shelves that a few years ago one could get only at the hardware or drug store that too many now think of as part of the food cost.

The consumer forgets the fact that the demand today is for prepackaged or frozen food items ready for cooking. These, of course, are a time-saving feature for the housewife in comparison with buying potatoes, apples, etc., by the bushel, flour by the sack, beef by the "side" and live fowl. But someone has to pay for these processing features—and it is the consumer. In spite of the increased costs, the consumer is still getting a bargain. In the U.S. in 1968, consumers spent 17.2% of personal income for food in comparison with 25.7% in 1947.

The United Nations made a study of food price increases in 45 countries for the period 1963 through 1967. As shown below, it revealed that prices in the United States rose less than in most other countries.

1967 Food Price Index

[1963=$1]

Index for Nation:	
United States	$1.10
Canada	1.12
Australia	1.17
Japan	1.23
Spain	1.32
India	1.64
Yugoslavia	2.01
Index for major city in:	
Venezuela	$1.06
Mexico	1.15
Philippines	1.36
Colombia	1.58
Chile	2.73
South Vietnam	3.63
Brazil	5.39

Instead of griping about food costs, we should extend a vote of thanks to the American farmers for producing mineral rich foods in abundance at such reasonable prices. The Federal government has contributed to this abundance by some of the USDA programs, including those that help preserve our National Heritage—the soil—for future generations. We cannot afford to cut back on Conservation Programs which help provide mineral-rich food at reasonable prices for all consumers.

PALME—A SCANDINAVIAN CASTRO?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Olof Palme—Sweden's leading America-baiter and acknowledged "Crown Prince" of the Socialists—has now ascended to the command for which he was groomed.

Palme believes that Americans' desire for an end to the war is synonymous with American approval of his comradeship with Hanoi and Cuba. There were very few Americans who did not favor an early and victorious end to World War II, but if any Swedish cabinet ministers had marched with a Nazi diplomat in an anti-American demonstration in Stockholm, we could hardly say he agreed with the majority of American people at that time.

Palme, having picked the Soviet horse to win is clumsily trying to hedge his bet by limpid protestations of his love for America. It is hard to see how Palme's transparent remarks could disarm any Swedes because he certainly is not fooling anyone in America.

Palme's babbling that he is not anti-American is the joke of the century. His party has announced their gift of $40 million to the Communist dictatorship of North Vietnam, and Palme's latest announcement is that the hard-working taxpaying decent, Swedish men and women will be called on to bear the additional burden of increased aid to Communist Cuba.

If Palme visualizes his countrymen so affluent that they can underwrite Communist countries, there certainly would appear no reason for American business to feel any incentive to bolster the Swedish economy.

Perhaps Palme's strange position comes as a result of his limited associations—that he has only fraternized with Communists. Contrary to Palme's indifference to the free government of Vietnam, Senators Akerlund and Hubinette, ranking Members of the Upper Chamber of the Swedish Parliament, upon their recent visit to Saigon, were reported to have expressed surprise over the "positive direction that the Government of Vietnam has taken toward social and military progress."

Americans who have always had great affection for the people of Sweden watch with concern as Sweden's destiny falls into the hands of a potential Scandinavian Castro.

I insert several news articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Oct, 3, 1969]

NEW SWEDISH LEADER

STOCKHOLM.—Olof Palme, 42, an outspoken opponent of the U.S. war effort in Vietnam, was named head of Sweden's ruling Social Democratic party Wednesday, clearing the way for him to succeed Tage Erlander as premier on Oct. 14. Erlander resigned after 23 years as the chief architect of the Swedish welfare state.

Palme, a 1948 graduate of Kenyon College in Ohio, will be the youngest Swedish premier. As education minister he took part in an anti-American demonstration in Stockholm last year at the side of North Vietnam's ambassador to Moscow.

Swedish-American relations have grown steadily worse since then The Nixon administration has yet to appoint an ambassador to Stockholm. Palme told a news conference Wednesday that he foresaw no change in Swedish policy toward Washington. Swedish Foreign Minister Torsten Nilsson said that, after North Vietnam, Sweden would greatly increase its aid to Cuba.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 3, 1969]

OLOF PALME, CRITIC OF U.S., IS NAMED SWEDISH PREMIER

STOCKHOLM.—Olof Palme, a critic of U.S. Vietnam policy, was named Wednesday by the ruling Social Democratic party to succeed Premier Tage Erlander who is retiring after 23 years in office.

Erlander and his cabinet will resign Oct. 9.

Palme, 42, was chosen to take over the premiership and party leadership from Erlander by acclamation of the delegates at the 24th party congress. He is a leader of the left-wing faction.

The only other candidate was Finance Minister Gunnar Straeng, 62, nominated by the right wing. But Straeng refused to oppose Palme, and urged the congress to elect the man Erlander had groomed as his successor.

TO CONTINUE NEUTRALITY

Palme, education minister in the Erlander cabinet, is expected to continue the policy of "active neutrality" which has placed a heavy strain on Washington-Stockholm relations. Palme has been a driving force behind Sweden's sharp criticism of U.S. foreign policy, particularly in Vietnam, although he disclaims being against the United States.

Recently Palme referred to an opinion poll indicating that Americans generally favored an end to the Vietnam war and told an interviewer: "How can you be anti-American if you agree with the majority of American people."

STUDIED IN THE UNITED STATES

Palme studied in the United States, and won a bachelor of arts degree in one year at Kenyon College in Ohio. He spent the next four months hitchhiking through the states before returning to Sweden to take his law degree.

Palme's rise to the top began in 1953 when he joined Erlander's staff as private secretary and executive assistant. He served the government as minister without portfolio, minister of communications and minister of education.

Palme and his cabinet are expected to be sworn in on Oct. 14. He is expected to retain all of the leading ministers in the present cabinet, including Foreign Minister Torsten Nilsson.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 1, 1969]

NORTH VIETNAM-AID PLAN OUTLINED IN SWEDEN

(By the Associated Press, Stockholm)

Sweden plans to give North Vietnam more than $40 million in economic aid, Foreign Minister Torsten Nilsson announced at the Social Democratic Party Congress.

He said the aid will be distributed over a period of three years, adding he was convinced the government action "is backed by a very strong public opinion."

SWEDISH SENATORS HAIL VIET PROGRESS

(Vietnam Newsletter No. 28, Sept. 27, 1969)

SAIGON.—Two Swedish senators Monday night expressed surprise over the "positive

direction that the Government of Vietnam has taken towards social and military progress."

Senators Henrik Akerlund and Gunnar Hubinette, ranking members of the Upper Chamber of the Swedish Parliament said, "Our general idea of Vietnam has been changed in favor of South Vietnam."

The two Swedish senators said Europeans generally have an incorrect concept of the situation here in South Vietnam. "As far as we are concerned, South Vietnam is doing better than what we believed before we came over."

Akerlund and Hubinette arrived here last September 17 for a one-week stay as guests of the government. The two Swedish lawmakers have been touring the country from north to south observing the social and military activities of the Republic of Vietnam.

"The world is becoming smaller every day in this jet age. Due to this, there should be an increased understanding now between Europeans and the peoples of Southeast Asia. This was the reason we decided to come over, to observe and be informed," the two senators added.

Akerlund and Hubinette also bared that Scandinavian countries; Finland, Norway, Denmark and Sweden—are now, "having a lot of discussions about extending economic aid to the Republic of Vietnam after the end of the war."

The two Swedish senators, who were interviewed by the PNS in their suites at the Caravelle Hotel in downtown Saigon, revealed that the Swedish Parliament, particularly—has been deliberating over this postwar economic aid to South Vietnam.

Hubinette and Akerlund, who are both members of the Swedish Moderate Party said though that the proposed postwar economic aid to South Vietnam would be a collective action of all the Scandinavian nations—and not based on individual help.

The two Swedish senators said at the present, their country's aid to South Vietnam is given through the Red Cross. It is for this reason that a visit to refugee centers has been included in their itinerary here.

SENATE—*Monday, October 6, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for all the blessings with which Thou hast enriched life—for the gift of life itself, the wonder of thought, the privilege of service and the sacrament of love. Most of all we thank Thee that Thou didst enter our fleeting life to share our nature, bear our burdens, and show us how to live.

"O Master, let me walk with Thee
In lowly paths of service free;
Tell me Thy secret; help me bear
The strain of toil, the fret of care."

Draw us to Thyself that amid differences and difficulties we may be united in bonds of common devotion to the welfare of the Nation. Keep the United States under Thy sovereignty and protection and use her in works of compassion and love.

In Thy Holy Name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 3, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 169; then going over and beginning with Calendar No. 433 and continuing with the succeeding measures in sequence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 111) to authorize temporary advances by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the emergency credit revolving fund.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 111 be postponed indefinitely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BARBARA ROGERSON MARMOR

The bill (S. 533) for the relief of Barbara Rogerson Marmor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 533

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Barbara Rogerson Marmor, the widow of the late Milton Marmor, a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to be an alien eligible for immediate relative status under the provisions of section 201(b) of such Act, and the provisions of section 204 of such Act, shall not be applicable in this case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an exerpt from the report (No. 91–437), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of an immediate relative to Barbara Rogerson Marmor which is the status she would be entitled to were it not for the death of her husband, a citizen of the United States.

DR. GEORGE ALEXANDER KARADIMOS

The bill (S. 2096) for the relief of Dr. George Alexander Karadimos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor George Alexander Karadimos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 28, 1961, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–438), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. IN BAE YOON

The bill (S. 2231) for the relief of Dr. In Bae Yoon was considered, ordered to