

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 7, 1969

luted conditions and to provide for better coordination between Federal, State, and local water pollution control programs. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Maine for the excellent leadership he has shown on environmental policy. His work on the Water Quality Improvement Act is but one example of his continuing efforts over the years to combat air and water pollution.

I understand that the Public Works Committee will later consider legislation on the very important subject of providing additional financing to State and local governments for the construction of needed water and sewer facilities. In 1968, State and local governments borrowed nearly \$3 billion to provide capital for financing water, sewer, and conservation programs. The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968 was passed by the Senate, but was not enacted into law because time ran out in the 90th Congress before differences in the House and Senate versions could be resolved. This 1968 act would have enabled State and local government units to raise between \$6 and \$7 billion in capital by means of municipal bond issues in order to pay for needed construction.

The amendment I offer today would afford to the State and local government units access to the capital market now enjoyed by State and local governments when they issue bonds for housing, university, and dormitory purposes. Having access to a competitive capital market will enable the State and local governments throughout the country to borrow money for water and sewer construction at the lowest possible cost. It is my belief that in view of the astronomically high interest rates which are now being paid, it is more imperative that new water and sewer construction be paid for by raising capital under the most advantageous conditions. Furthermore, as I mentioned earlier, the fact that the Public Works Committee has not yet considered legislation relating to financial assistance by the Federal Government for the raising of such capital is an additional reason why it is important at this time that every advantage of a competitive market be given for State and local borrowing for water and sewer needs.

Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has considered this amendment in some detail and hear-

ings have been held on it. The Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) is familiar with the action taken, as he serves as a member on that committee. It has also been discussed on the floor before, and I would hope, as it is discussed now with the distinguished Senator from Maine, that he will be able to accept the amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I support the adoption of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin. The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution has given considerable thought and study as to how capital is to be available to our hard-pressed States and cities for the construction of waste treatment facilities. I believe that every Member of Congress is aware of the acute need in every State and community for such facilities. Many different financing proposals have been considered by the subcommittee and by the full Public Works Committee. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 authorized \$3.5 billion for substantial Federal grants for this purpose. However, appropriations have fallen far short of the authorized amounts. This situation will be partially rectified this year if the Congress appropriates the amounts included by the House Appropriations Committee in the Public Works appropriations bill.

In the meantime, State and local government units have continued to raise the capital for both their share and the Federal share of a project cost by the issuance of bonds. They will continue to raise needed State and local capital by this method in the future. The amendment now under consideration would enable the public issuers to have access to the same capital markets now available for Federal financing thereby insuring that they may borrow in a competitive market at the lowest cost.

Mr. President, for many reasons the amendment is thoroughly consistent with the objectives of the committee, struggling against budgetary restrictions over the past 3 or 4 years, to find alternative ways to make it possible for States and communities to find the capital to build these facilities.

I compliment the Senator for offering his proposal. It has been heard by committees. It is demonstrably sound on the basis of the hearings held, and I am de-

lighted to take the amendment into the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 8, 1969, at 10 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 7, 1969:

## U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Charles Clark, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit vice Claude F. Clayton, deceased.

## U.S. ATTORNEY

Paul C. Camilletti, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years vice John H. Kamrowsky, resigned.

## U.S. MARSHAL

Robert D. Olson, Sr., of Alaska, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years vice George A. Bayer.

Leon T. Campbell, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years vice Elmer W. Dissipayne, retired.

Benjamin F. Westervelt, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years vice George J. Ward.

## ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

John Henry Schneider, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents, vice Gerald D. O'Brien, resigned.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## YOU CANNOT VOTE

## HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Virginia is one of two States holding statewide elections this year, and I do not think enough could be said about the importance of the individual vote. Not only is Virginia reaching a crucial period in its political history, but the entire Nation needs for all of its citizens to exercise their right to vote. A very fine editorial appeared on October 2, 1969, in the *Globe* newspapers which circulate

in my district which I would like to share with my colleagues:

## YOU CAN'T VOTE!

Those are fighting—and frightening—words. Or they should be, especially in Virginia and especially this year of 1969.

Yet, sometime within the next few weeks, those same words will be told to thousands of men and women who live here in Northern Virginia. They won't be able to vote because they didn't bother to qualify, didn't take the time to register.

No matter how strongly you may feel about the forthcoming elections, no matter what your opinion is about the various candidates at the state and local level, it won't make any difference at all unless you are registered and thereby a qualified voter.

But the opportunity to do something about your government, about the leader-

ship of that government, still exists for all Virginians. It's not too late. There is still time to qualify, still time to take an active interest in the affairs of this state of your community.

Which is just another way of saying, if you are realistic and honest, there's still time to take an active part in your own life. The very existence of each citizen is continually and consistently affected by government at every level. Taxes are merely the most obvious, the most familiar and perhaps the most annoying. The highways upon which you drive, the schools your children attend, the house in which you live, the very food you eat—all are touched in some way by the process of government in Richmond.

You can affect that government by the votes you cast in November. When you choose the next Governor, when you cast

your ballot for the next Lieutenant-Governor, for the new Attorney General, you are affecting your life and the lives of your family. When you make your choice for the members of the House of Delegates to represent you in the General Assembly, you are making a choice for the kind of immediate world you want to live in.

Don't lose the right to make this choice. Don't cheat yourself of the opportunity to make your opinions known, your voice heard. Don't throw away your right to vote.

The deadline for keeping this powerful right, this precious responsibility, is October the fourth. That's the last day to register, the final date to qualify yourself for voting in November.

Whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, be sure to register by this Saturday. Don't let anyone say, "You Can't Vote!"

#### THE UNITED STATES—A MARITIME NATION

#### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an address given by Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America. Speaking before the annual dinner of the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society, Mr. Hood stressed the firm confidence held by the maritime industry in President Nixon.

The United States is a maritime nation and I stand with the maritime industry in its support of the President's goal of restoring the United States to a first-class maritime power.

I commend Mr. Hood's remarks to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE UNITED STATES—A MARITIME NATION

(By Edwin M. Hood)

Many months ago, I accepted Wills Brodhead's invitation to speak at your Annual Dinner with a certain amount of hesitation. I anticipated that it would be difficult to select an appropriate subject for a gathering such as this, representing a significant cross-section of the American maritime community and knowledgeable of the true facts affecting the American merchant marine.

You know perhaps better than I and better than most people that the American merchant marine is in "bad shape." The new Maritime Administrator used exactly that term only last week while appearing before a Committee of the Congress at the Nation's Capital.

You know that only 5 percent of U.S. international trade and commerce—by volume—is carried in American bottoms.

You know of the relationship of shipping to the national security and the balance of international payments.

You know of the high factor of obsolescence which continues to mount in the American-flag shipping fleet.

You know that levels of ship replacements have failed to stem the never-ending creep of obsolescence.

And, you know that the inadequacy of the shipping capability presently registered under the American-flag to move the materials of defense and the substance of trade and commerce can be quickly demonstrated.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is also not new to you that these conditions result from a variety of factors:

The absence of a suitable national commitment;

The absence of sufficient national priority;

The absence of a firm national policy;

The absence of clear national objectives, and

The absence of effective national leadership and funding.

One might reason, with logic and history on his side, that these voids would have been obviated by the demands of the conflict in Southeast Asia and the many obligations of the United States around the world. But, as you know, the opposite has very much been the case, again for a variety of reasons mostly centering on fiscal and political considerations.

With all of what I have just said as background, it is interesting to note that both major political parties, in the platforms adopted at their national conventions last summer, took a strong stance favoring the elevation of maritime problems on the scale of national priorities.

The Democrats said: "To assume our proper place as a leading maritime nation, we must launch an aggressive and balanced program to replace and augment our obsolete merchant ships with modern vessels built in American shipyards."

The Republicans said: "For reasons of security, as well as economics, the decline of our merchant marine must be reversed. We therefore pledge a vigorous and realistic ship replacement program to meet the changing pattern of our foreign commerce . . ."

The platform of the American Independent Party even took note of the evidence that "our merchant marine fleet has dwindled," and registered its support of "all steps necessary to return our Merchant Marine fleet to its rightful place among the maritime nations of the world."

These pronouncements, remarkable for their consistency, reflect a cross-section of contemporary political thinking and public opinion, but the *Dictionary of American Politics* suggests that political platforms "are regarded as of less importance than candidates' campaign statements." It was therefore with more than passing interest that Candidate Nixon's "position paper," outlining his views on sea power, merchant marine and shipbuilding matters, released on September 25, 1968, in Seattle, Washington, was greeted by the maritime community and the American public.

Mr. Nixon pledged, if elected, his efforts toward the prompt restoration of the United States as a first-rate maritime power. He promised support for a domestic shipbuilding program to produce a fleet of American-flag merchant ships capable of carrying 30 percent of the nation's trade and commerce instead of the present 5 percent.

During the 1968 campaign, Candidate Humphrey was less specific though he promised an "imaginative and innovative" merchant marine program, if elected. At the close of his term of office as Vice President, however, Mr. Humphrey conceded: "We have starved our maritime service—our merchant marine—at a very dangerous time in world history."

Tangible evidence of the cult of starvation can be found in the level of funds—\$15.9 million—requested for merchant ship construction in the Fiscal 1970 Budget presented to the Congress by President Johnson on January 15, 1969. In only one year since 1950 has a lower amount been appropriated for shipbuilding under the auspices of the Federal Government. Taking into account the availability of so-called "carry-over" funds from previous years plus \$15.9 million in new funds, the Maritime Administration will only be able to enter into commitments for 10 ships in the coming fiscal year.

With this prospect and the record of the

past eight years, one is reminded of a passage from a humorous poem which goes like this:

Little by little we subtract  
Faith and fallacy from fact  
The illusory from the true  
And starve upon the residue

So it is, it would seem the American merchant marine will "starve" on the "residue" of inadequacy for another year. Meanwhile, American shipowners have evidenced a desire to place contracts of upwards of 75 ships with American shipyards in the next year if the Federal Government were willing to support a program of that magnitude.

The gap between an annual shipbuilding effort of 10 and 75 is of course great and will not be bridged in a single year. All of the mistakes and omissions of the past decade could not possibly be corrected in the span of twelve months. And, the cumulative consequences of inertia for more than a decade will never be rectified without annual expenditures greater than those anticipated for the coming fiscal year.

In terms of U.S. maritime affairs, an era of unfulfilled promises is hopefully coming to an end. In 1964, President Johnson promised "a new policy for our merchant marine," but he left office, four years later, without fulfilling that pledge. There were many "trial balloons." There was much pontificating. But, in point of fact, no positive actions were taken, and the American merchant marine deteriorated more in that time.

Hopefully, a new era of resolute purpose is about to begin. The epoch is near. There is a disposition to excuse the expediencies of the past on the grounds that the high costs of our military entanglement in Vietnam necessarily had precedence. Now, there is increasing realization that the point of further expediency has long since passed and that further procrastination in the reconstruction of the nation's sealift capabilities could be suicidal. There is recognition that further delay could be costly not only from the standpoint of monetary outlay but from the standpoint of national well-being.

President Nixon has set forth his objectives for maritime redevelopment in a manner far more comprehensive and far more specific than have any other occupants of The White House. He has indicated an intention to give the merchant marine high priority attention and evidenced a willingness to sponsor a national commitment to accomplish the goals he has defined.

Throughout history, unusual circumstances have often frustrated good intentions, but more frequently lofty aspirations, associated with pressing needs, have been fruitful. If our new President can produce the ships which the merchant marine so urgently needs, he will have succeeded in an area where his immediate predecessors have been eminently unsuccessful. Though there is much optimism favoring full achievement, even partial accomplishment will result in a greater shipbuilding effort than has been the case during the past eight years. A program to do this, it is said, will be presented by the Nixon Administration within the next 60 to 90 days.

These are the seeds of change—as Tennyson once wrote: "The old order changeth, yielding place to the new."

There are other signs of change.

Under the aegis of American ingenuity and inventiveness, a quantum jump in shipping technology and the art of shipbuilding has been experienced in recent years. The United States has pioneered the development and construction of containerships and other sophisticated types of cargo vessels. And, American shipyards have moved, once again, to the forefront in the advancement of new concepts and techniques for ship construction.

There has been a substantial movement toward a new spirit of unity within the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 7, 1969

maritime community. Ship operators are consolidating their interests; subsidized and unsubsidized operators are attempting to minimize any differences that separate them; shipbuilders and shipowners are endeavoring to improve the total ship procurement environment; and labor and management leaders are seeking to develop a mutual approach to the solutions of merchant marine problems.

It would be unrealistic to expect absolute unity for unanimity on complex issues can be an illusive thing. The American people were not united when they went to the polls last November, and it will be a majority or a plurality, not unanimity, that will determine the outcome of the next election. That is the democratic way, that is how it always will be in a republican form of government, and that is how it always will be in the maritime industry. Even so, among all segments of the industry, there is an unprecedented disposition to cooperate with the new Administration and to give President Nixon and his associates a reasonable period of time in which to develop a workable and effective program.

The same kind of attitude prevails on Capitol Hill. Fortunately, it is bi-partisan in nature. If anything, members of the Congress have been more outspoken than the Executive Agencies over recent years in their expressions of concern with respect to the qualitative and quantitative deficiencies of the American-flag merchant marine, Russia's incessant endeavors to achieve mastery of the oceans, and the inadequacy of levels of Federal appropriations for ship construction purposes.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; Congressman L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services; Congressman Edward A. Garmatz of Maryland, Chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and Congressman Charles E. Bennett of Florida, Chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Sea Power, are providing notable leadership, and they will continue to be influential in the shaping of legislation to carry out President Nixon's objectives.

From the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, your distinguished Senior Senator, the Honorable Hugh Scott, a member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and from the City of Philadelphia, the Honorable James A. Byrne, an influential member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, are dedicated to assuring sufficiency and stability in the nation's commitment to merchant shipbuilding.

Sooner or later, this commitment must be made. It is inevitable that the actions required to restore the United States as a first-rate maritime power will be taken. The alternative would be to place the destiny of the American people in the hands of other nations, whose policies and directions may not necessarily or always be compatible with ours. In that event, our whole reason for existence as a free people will have been negated.

Action more later than sooner constitutes procrastination fraught with hazards and problems. The constant phenomenon of inflation adds to the cost of ships. Construction of ships in limited numbers provides few opportunities to take advantage of the economies that accompany production of larger numbers. And, a minimal or sporadic volume of shipbuilding work fails to utilize the available and potential shipyard capacity of the nation.

There are at this moment vacant shipbuilding ways in our shipyards. Nevertheless, in the logical expectation that a merchant shipbuilding effort, of larger dimensions than those of the last ten years, is inevitable in the national interest, every major shipyard in the country is now engaged on either a capacity expansion or upgrading program. Last year, two yards doubled their capacity.

Two completely new yards will be in operation next year, and several other shipyard companies have plans to expand or modify existing facilities for the precise purpose of increasing output. There have also been reports of plans to reopen the Brooklyn, New York, Naval Shipyard as a facility for the construction of commercial vessels.

The shipbuilding industry of the United States has invested more than \$400 million in the last decade in new or improved facilities, and the plans, to which I refer, could involve a doubling of this expenditure should a major shipbuilding effort become a reality. Assurances of a continuing program would, of course, have the effect of accelerating the rate of investment. But, all signs point toward continued heavy capital expenditures well into the 1970's. These investments, actual and prospective, reflect a confidence and faith that this nation will, in the years immediately ahead, restructure shipbuilding programs to deal realistically with the obsolescence that has overtaken the merchant fleet as well as the naval fleet.

These developments provide assurance that the U.S. shipbuilding can reasonably accommodate the demand for new ships for registry under the American-flag as it crystallizes. This opinion has been confirmed by independent surveys, and U.S. shipbuilders firmly believe they can handle additional contracts for 35 to 40 merchant ships annually, with existing facilities. Indeed, current expansion and projected modifications strengthen the conviction that this number would be a minimum.

Whatever the number, the shipyard industry of the United States stands ready to work with the Nixon Administration, the Congress, and the shipping lines in the formulation and fulfillment of a program to provide merchant ships on an orderly schedule, at optimum costs, to restore the United States to a position of primacy as a maritime power.

To this end, the level of funding must obviously be raised above that contemplated for Fiscal 1970 and maintained at an increased level if a national commitment is to be valid and if the potentials for cost economies in ship construction are to be realized. To this end, many hardened attitudes of the past must be changed.

While on the topic of changing attitudes, it should be mentioned that American shipbuilders and shipowners seek no monopoly for themselves or the American merchant marine. What they do seek is a national policy similar to that which applies with most other maritime powers—a policy, properly implemented, to encourage growth, sufficiency and stability in the national interest.

Surely, the world's leading trading nation—the United States—should carry more than 5 percent of its own international commerce in its own ships; with most other maritime countries, including the Soviet Union, the comparable figure is approximately 50 percent or more.

Surely, the most powerful nation in the world should build for American citizens more ships in its own shipyards than are built in foreign shipyards. Yet, in the past 20 years, some 1230 ships of 41.7 million deadweight tons have been constructed in the shipyards of other countries for U.S. companies and their affiliated interests. In the same time span, U.S. shipyards have built 388 ships totaling 7.3 million deadweight tons for American companies.

As U.S. trade and commerce expands, as surely it will, it will as always be shared with the fleets of other nations. But, the American merchant marine should carry more cargoes in ships produced by American shipyards. A target of 30 percent which President Nixon has already defined is eminently reasonable and logical in the national interest. There appears to be no disagreement on this point.

The challenge and opportunities of the new era encompass everyone in this audience,

either directly or indirectly. They apply across the full spectrum of maritime activity. We, who represent the American merchant marine, should strengthen those things that unite us. We should look to the future with faith in each other and in the rightness of the importance of maritime strength and adequacy to national security and national well-being. For these are prerequisite to restoration of the United States as a first-rate maritime power.

## THE HANDICAPPED BUT DETERMINED YOUNGSTERS OF ROOSEVELT SCHOOL OF BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

**HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.**  
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues today a story about two groups of young people from Bridgeport, Conn.

In one group, the youngsters are handicapped and attend a special class at the Roosevelt School in Bridgeport.

The second group are the young men of Panta Delphion Fraternity at Sacred Heart University, Bridgeport.

Last spring the boys and girls in the special class and their teacher Mrs. Maureen Linderfelt decided to earn money to come to Washington as a class to see their Government in action and visit the historic sites that they had read about.

Skeptics felt that it would be impossible for the 16 youngsters to make such a trip.

Last week, the handicapped but determined youngsters came to their Nation's Capital and toured the many historic shrines of our Government in their wheelchairs and on crutches.

To earn the money to pay for their trip, the youngsters of the special class at Roosevelt School all pitched in on many projects such as selling festival programs, a cake sale and a car wash. Each of the boys and girls was expected to help to the best of their ability. The youngsters even washed cars from their wheelchairs to earn money to visit our Capital.

In their efforts the youngsters were aided by several groups including the Bridgeport Rehabilitation Center, the Bridgeport East Side Civic Club, the Barnum Festival Committee, and the East Side Lions Club. But, special help was provided by the Panta Delphion Fraternity of Sacred Heart University who made the class trip of the handicapped children from Roosevelt School its 1969 civic project.

The young men in the fraternity gave their time and energy. They came to Washington with the youngsters and helped the handicapped children with compassion and brotherly love.

The will and determination of the young people in this special class at Roosevelt School should be an inspiration to us all. When the going gets a little tough and things look impossible, remember these boys and girls who washed cars from their wheelchairs to come to see their Government in Washington although some said the trip was impossible.

And let us not be hasty in our judgment of the Nation's youth when we read of the actions of the radical minority. For I believe that there are many more concerned young people such as the men of Panta Delphion who are concerned about their fellow man, than there are ostentatious radicals who pay lip service to concern while engaging in destruction.

**JOHN A. DURKIN, NEW HEAD OF STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE DEPARTMENT**

**HON. NORRIS COTTON**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Durkin of New Hampshire" and published in the Journal of American Insurance for September-October 1969.

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

**DURKIN OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

New Hampshire blends the best of several worlds; the historic and modern, the scenic and the industrial.

The names of its famous capital city, Concord, and its best-known son, Daniel Webster, ring stirring historical notes. Yet its current role is that of the fastest-growing state in the Northeast.

New Hampshire is one of the great playgrounds of the nation, with its wooded White Mountains, clear blue lakes and beautiful river valleys. But on the basis of the percentage of its people employed in manufacturing, it is the second most industrialized state in the nation.

Skiers best remember the White Mountains. This region is also an attraction to hunters and, in the summer, to hikers and to motorists seeking scenic drives. Fishing, boating and swimming are attractions in the region of lakes south of the mountains, and along the seashore.

New Hampshire was settled only three years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth and was one of the first states to declare its independence from Great Britain. Its state seal still features a naval frigate, a reminder of early New Hampshire's militancy, as well as its orientation toward sea and sail.

Farming, especially in the fertile bottomlands of the Connecticut and Merrimack rivers, is also a traditional economic activity. And the state has long been known for its granite, to be found in many buildings throughout the East.

But in recent years, New Hampshire's farms, forests, mines and fisheries have provided employment for only a small part of the state's workers. Manufacturing is the leading occupation both in number of workers and in income.

A leading industry in value of goods produced has been the making of leather and leather goods. The second most valuable industry has been textile manufacture, a leading pursuit since the installation of the first power loom at Manchester in 1819.

Current industrial growth is taking place chiefly in southern New Hampshire. The spread of industry outward from the Boston area has resulted in the location of many branch plants of national companies along the southern border.

Fastest-growing of New Hampshire's diversified industries today is the electrical products industry. Other industrial segments showing significant growth include ma-

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

chinery, primary metals, and printing and publishing.

Assuring the financial stability for these enterprises is New Hampshire's insurance industry. The latest available statistics show some 575 insurance companies licensed by the New Hampshire Insurance Department to do business in the state. Of these, 29 are domiciled in New Hampshire. In all, insurance companies write annual premiums in the area of \$196 million.

The long, stable relationship of property insurance with the state is indicated by official records of fire insurance companies showing that the Sutton Mutual Insurance Company of Rochester was founded more than 100 years ago, in 1849.

Throughout the years, the insurance industry has made a substantial direct contribution to the state. Today, insurers pay approximately \$3.1 million annually in premium taxes. Companies, brokers, agents and rating bureaus pay an additional \$159,000 each year in fees.

The job of collecting these funds for the state and regulating the insurance industry in general is handled by the State of New Hampshire Department of Insurance, under the direction of Commissioner John A. Durkin. Prior to taking office July 1, 1968, Commissioner Durkin served the state as an assistant attorney general.

Commissioner Durkin was born March 29, 1936, in Brookfield, Massachusetts, and graduated in 1959 from Holy Cross College. He received his law degree from Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D.C., in 1965. After graduation, Mr. Durkin served on the legal staff of, and as legislative assistant to, James J. Saxon, Federal Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. Durkin is a member of the American, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts Bar Associations. With the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, he is presently serving on the Committee on Laws and Legislation, the Property, Casualty and Surety Committee, and the Federal Liaison Committee.

Mr. Durkin is married to the former Patricia R. Moses. They live with their two children in Manchester, New Hampshire. At nearby St. Mary College, Mr. Durkin serves as an instructor in commercial law.

**STATEMENT BY JEFFREY ST. JOHN,  
AUTHOR, "COUNTDOWN TO  
CHAOS"**

**HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most provocative analysis of the New Left movement and its implication is contained in a new volume on the bookstands called "Countdown to Chaos" by Jeffrey St. John. I commend this incisive look at one of our greatest problems today to the attention of my colleagues. I include the following remarks in the RECORD:

**COUNTDOWN TO CHAOS**  
(By Jeffrey St. John)

"The Great Political Riot" in this city a year ago this week represented a new phase of a domestic revolutionary movement's attempt to polarize and paralyze with violence America's educational, social, political, and economic institutions.

Next month the legal system of America will come into the revolutionary gunsights of some of the same New Left radicals who helped disrupt last year's convention. For next month the major radical leaders in-

volved in last year's disorders will stand trial: an event the New Left will use as a pretext for initiating fresh violence and disruption. It will be their intent to try to cast the legal system in the same light as the 1968 Democratic Convention corrupt, repressive, and in need of revolutionary overthrow.

As an example of what we can expect at next month's trials, we should consult the New Left protests over the trial of Black Panther leader Huey Newton in Oakland, California. The "Free Huey" campaign became a nationwide rallying point for New Left radicals and revolutionaries. Without question the threats of violence and incessant protests played a powerful role in the decision of the Oakland jury and judge—for they were intimidated to modify Newton's sentence.

New Left efforts did not "Free Huey" but the precedent was set for a minority to use threats of violence and disorder in order to force legal decisions in their favor. Last year at the convention a radical minority sought to use violence and disorders to make political decisions.

Not far from the Oakland courtroom where Newton was convicted, just five years ago this September, the so-called "student rebellion" at the University of California at Berkeley had burst into headlines. Berkeley set the precedent of using violent confrontations to bring about changes in the university—a technique that soon spread to other educational institutions across the country.

In the five years since Berkeley we have seen the emergence of a pattern out of the revolutionary past. Student protests began in the university and then fired violent protests in other areas of the society: be it in ghetto "Uprisings" at the Pentagon in October 1967, or Columbia University in the spring of 1968. The latter two events are described in my book, "Countdown to Chaos," as preludes to the disorders at the Democratic Convention.

"The Great Political Riot" of last year, in turn, proved to be the prelude to violent events at San Francisco State, Cornell, and Harvard, and other areas of the country in late 1968 and most of this year. It was the fulfillment of Rennie Davis's promise shortly after the '68 convention disorders that "we expect a lot of action at the universities, there will be Columbias all over the country."

Thus, in less than five years, we have seen how violence employed by a minority has disrupted our educational, municipal, and political system. And in the wake of the Chicago 1968 disorders, student-adult radicals injected themselves into labor disputes from coast to coast: for example, the grape boycotts and welfare protests, and many other areas of our social and economic life.

We have, therefore, seen violence move from our educational system to governmental, social, political, and economic institutions—all within a short five years. This pattern, as I said a moment ago, is much like earlier revolutionary movements in Europe in the late 19th and 20th centuries—revolution was preceded by an "uprising of the young." It began in the university and spread to the society as a whole. Currently, as in the past, the success of student-adult revolutionaries is due to official mistakes, incompetence, and cowardice.

Chicago 1968, like the violence of the entire 1960's was only possible because of the default of the established order. In "Countdown to Chaos" no one comes off as a hero; the howling success of the radicals who came to disrupt the convention succeeded beyond their wildest dreams because of the failure of Mayor Daley, the police, Senator Eugene McCarthy, certain members of the mass media, attorney Daniel Walker and others. Each contributed to the convention disorders or to the later misunderstandings because they lacked the deeper insight to understand that what we are faced with is not dissent, but the calculated use of violence toulti-

mately bring down the social, political, and economic order. That certain innocents were involved in the Democratic Convention disorders only demonstrated that, like past revolutionary movements, the idealistic and morally concerned are often used as a revolutionary battering ram.

The violent events of last year here in Chicago and those of the entire "sick Sixties" make it mandatory that President Nixon act. He should ask for the establishment of a special Senate-House Committee to investigate the entire disruptive and violent decade of the 1960's. In the past, most governmental investigations have concentrated on only a particular aspect of this disruptive decade. But what is needed is an investigation that takes an "overview" look to determine whether the nation is beset by a revolutionary movement intent on destroying the social-political, and economic institutions as we know them today.

Chicago 1968 was but an important milestone in this attempt at the Second American Revolution. To ignore this fact further is to invite more Chicago and further peril to the liberties made possible by the only true revolution of the last 200 years: the American Revolution of 1776.

#### INFLATION AND THE SST

#### HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Friday, October 3, contains an excellent editorial on the proposal for a supersonic transport aircraft.

The editorial makes the point that this inflationary period is a poor time for such an expensive project, especially since other national needs are more urgent. The chief editorial writer of the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch is Overton Jones.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Inflation and the SST," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### INFLATION AND THE SST

Congress has an opportunity to take a small but definite step against inflation. It can flatly reject President Nixon's request for \$662 million for development of supersonic transport aircraft.

Virginia's U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr. has added his voice to those of others opposing this expensive boondoggle.

He told the Senate Wednesday:

Congress would be setting a poor example for the nation if it were to approve huge expenditures for the SST at a time when it is vital that the inflationary cycle be halted by getting federal spending under control.

Government expenditures for the supersonic transport (SST) are unjustified at this time for other reasons than the inflationary aspect. Here are some of them.

Supporters claim the plane wouldn't fly at faster-than-sound speed over populated areas, but once the plane is operational, who can doubt that there won't be great pressure to remove any such restriction. In fact, some supporters already are saying people will grow accustomed to the booms and won't mind them. The sonic boom from the 1,800 mph aircraft could wreak havoc on human beings, livestock and man-made structures. As the Louisville Courier-Journal puts it: "It is a strange kind of progress that discomfits, annoys or damages the property of hundreds of

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

millions so that a few dozen can fly a little faster and a little higher, and probably be stacked up a little longer over airports that can't handle the planes we already have."

The total cost of developing the SST is estimated now at \$1.5 billion (and estimates usually are low), with the taxpayers bearing 85 per cent of that bill. As Senator Byrd says: "Aviation manufacturers and the airline industry stand to profit from the SST. I believe that they can be asked to bear considerably more than 15 per cent of the financial burden."

If the money is to be spent, the \$662 million could be used for far more worthwhile and productive purposes in the field of transportation: for improvement of airports so they could better handle present aircraft, for mass transit, for highway construction or for the merchant fleet. Or it could be used for certain health and education programs that are being curtailed due to lack of funds.

There is considerable doubt that the SSTs, so costly to build and fly, could be operated on a paying basis.

In announcing his decision to ask for SST funds—contrary to the recommendations of two study commissions, incidentally—Mr. Nixon said he wants the United States to continue leading the world in air transport. But France and England already have an SST in the air, so they're at least five years ahead of us, for whatever it may be worth to them. American prestige does not demand that we go ahead with an SST now, especially since no question of national security or vital national welfare is involved.

Senator Byrd appropriately sums it up:

"There may come a time for development of a supersonic transport. That time is not now."

#### ON LIBRARIES

#### HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial reprinted in the Loudoun Times-Mirror, a newspaper published in my congressional district. The editorial originally appearing in the Christian Science Monitor is a thoughtful discussion of the need for and changing role of libraries.

The editorial follows:

#### ON LIBRARIES

Among the best free things in life are libraries. At any given moment they offer experiences no less intense than TV and with every volume another channel, far more varied.

The public library today, of course, is amply used, even though it is not adequately praled or funded. Students crowd it after suppertime. Retired folks and notworking wives stop in during the day.

But the libraries in America's cities could do more to bring the enrichment of books and periodicals into the lives of the disadvantaged. A number of cities have been experimenting with traveling bookmobiles, storefront reading rooms, job information programs, to make the library more real and helpful to the underprivileged. And, the U.S. Office of Education has just launched a study of such programs to find out which ideas work. The findings should help all libraries improve their services.

This is a worthwhile project. Much is made of the dominance of TV among communications means today. And for immediate visual coverage of events it is a wonder. Yet the library need not take second place. As a repository of thoughts and adventures and knowledge, all of which can be brought alive by nothing more than taking a book in hand,

October 7, 1969

it will hold its importance. Hence the library's attempts to stay abreast of the social patterns of the times is most encouraging.

#### NO TIME TO BAIL OUT

#### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, with all the justified concern about what is happening on the Nation's college campuses, I feel sure that a recent statement by a leading business executive on the question of continued financial support of our educational institutions will be of particular and widespread interest. The views of Mr. Robert Anderson, former vice president of Chrysler Corp. and presently vice president of North American Rockwell Corp., are contained in a guest editorial entitled "No Time To Bail Out," and appearing in the October issue of Ward's Auto World, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### NO TIME TO BAIL OUT

Industry and commerce today depend as never before on the product of the colleges and universities.

That's why in 1950, corporate enterprise gave \$43 million to institutions of higher learning. That's why last year it was \$325 million—almost one-third of a billion dollars.

In addition, businessmen gave countless thousands of hours of executive talent to educational causes, some of it administrative, much of it for the hard, thankless job of raising funds for buildings, scholarships, faculty salaries, or payment of deficits.

Our first concern, of course, is a selfish one—to get good people into our companies. The need of business for better educated, more knowledgeable people is growing faster than the "production rate" of the colleges. We need such people in every part of our business, from engineering and personnel to accounting and research. We need them today in specialties that weren't even dreamed of twenty years ago; and we will need them tomorrow in specialties that we can now only dimly perceive.

But colleges have been seriously hurt by disturbances, by disruption of classes, by diversion of time and effort to negotiate student demands, and by the expense of repairing or replacing facilities.

That raises the question of just what is the role of business in the crisis of the colleges? What is the businessman to do in this new, strange and unexpected situation?

There are no easy answers to those two questions—or if there are, I don't know them. I do know, however, what we must not do.

We must not bail out. We must not wash our hands of this situation because we find it annoying, or unpleasant, or troublesome. Too much is at stake for us to permit ourselves that simple and self-defeating course.

It would be a natural thing to respond to outrageous student demands by reducing our personal, corporate or foundation gifts to the colleges. It would be quite a human reaction for a corporate executive on a college board of trustees just to walk away from a situation in which a band of militant radicals challenges his principles and his right to serve the college. A "confrontation" with self-righteous, arrogant adolescents is no fun. We have a hundred demands on our time and two hundred requests for money. We have our first job to do: to run a company, turn out a product, make a profit, and keep the stockholders satisfied. And so the impulse may be a strong one to say, "Who needs it?" and to walk away from responsibility.

And yet if we reduce our contributions of time and money—if we walk away from responsibility—we do so at the time when the colleges need us the most. The college administrator needs help and encouragement as never before. The chancellor is on the firing line. He, too, has his impulse to ball out—to retreat to the quiet academic life he thought he was getting into when he took the job. He is not helped by criticism that he is too weak, too soft, in a difficult situation. If we expect the college administrator to cope with the disruptions on his campus and to counter the onrush of the militant young, he at least deserves the support of the business community. Support, I might add, that is tactful, patient, and probably unobtrusive.

As a people, we should draw together to do the work that needs to be done and to realize the opportunities that lie ahead. As businessmen, we should continue to accept and act on our responsibility to the colleges and to the young people who will determine our national future.

BEST WISHES WALLACE R. BUNN

**HON. RICHARD FULTON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district of Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County is losing one of its outstanding business and civic leaders, Mr. Wallace R. Bunn, vice president and general manager of South Central Bell Telephone Co.

His company has recognized his exceptional talents and abilities, and he has been named vice president for the company's regional operations in a five-State area with headquarters in Birmingham, Ala., and has also been elected to the company's board of directors and named to the executive committee.

For the past 4 years, Mr. Bunn has involved himself in every major project to improve his adopted community. As president of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, he has lead our business community in its growth and progress. His civic activities are many and varied, and all benefited from his participation and initiative.

With the cooperation of Mr. Bunn and the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, and my office, a major statewide conference on comprehensive health planning was sponsored with the Tennessee Health Department. Largely through Mr. Bunn's genuine concern for the health and welfare of all of our citizens, this conference was a singular success.

On every occasion that I have called upon Mr. Bunn for advice, counsel, and assistance, he has unwaveringly made himself available to work for the betterment of our community. He has proven a good friend, and objective adviser to me, personally, and a dedicated citizen to our community.

We are pleased over his advancement, but deeply regret that his new duties and responsibilities will deprive Nashville and Davidson County of his impressive talents to get things done.

Our community's regards for Mr. Bunn are stated in editorial comments in both the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner, and they are submitted at

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

this time as part of my own personal esteem for this outstanding citizen:

[From the Nashville Banner, Sept. 30, 1969]

BEST WISHES, WALLACE R. BUNN

Personal and community esteem show in shared appreciation when a friend gets distinguished recognition; and in that spirit congratulations go to Wallace R. Bunn on the promotion yesterday announced by South Central Bell Telephone Co. Vice president and general manager of its operations in Tennessee, he has been named vice president of the firm's five-state territory.

Nashville's regret is that it takes him away. In his new capacity, effective Oct. 1, his headquarters will be in Birmingham.

His years here have been good for the city; in close association with its business and civic life; a leader whose tireless service has contributed much to the advancement of a truly Nashville-Plus. His tenure as president of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce has enhanced that program, with time given generously also to such other publicly-beneficial enterprises as the Middle Tennessee Council of the Boy Scouts of America, the YMCA, hospital and college interests, etc.—constructive in vision and accomplishment.

In the experience of this city, the telephone company's format of executive stature consistently has fitted responsibilities of community relationship. And Mr. Bunn has typified that, along with the professional standards requisite to successful operations of the industry he has directed.

He will be succeeded here by V. E. New, who has been vice president of personnel of Southern Bell in Atlanta. Nashville welcomes Mr. New.

Best wishes go to both men.

The heart-felt congratulations extended are tinged only with widely-shared regret that Mr. Bunn will be moving away. He will be missed.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Oct. 2, 1969]

**MR. BUNN WILL BE MISSED HERE**

Mr. Wallace R. Bunn, Vice President and General Manager of South Central Bell Telephone Company, operations in Tennessee since 1965, has been named Vice President for the company's regional operations in a five-state area with headquarters in Birmingham.

Mr. Bunn's departure from Nashville will leave a void in the business and civic life of the community. As telephone officials usually do, he has taken an active part in many vital community projects.

He is the current President of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, a post in which he has served with distinction. He is also a member of the Board of Trustees of the United Givers Fund, Director of the Middle Tennessee Boy Scout Council, the UMCA, and a director or member of a number of other civic organizations.

In addition to becoming Vice President of South Central Bell's regional operations, Mr. Bunn was also elected to the company's board of directors and named to the Executive Committee.

The people of Nashville congratulate Mr. Bunn on his business promotion but they will regret the loss of his services to the community.

**LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT THE  
SALE OR SHIPMENT FOR USE IN  
THE UNITED STATES OF DDT**

**HON. OGDEN R. REID**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to

amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act of 1947 to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT.

DDT is a persistent and pervasive pesticide, with at least four characteristics which make it a serious threat to the environment:

First. It does not stay where it is put, being borne away by air and water;

Second. It does not decompose rapidly;

Third. It does not dissolve in water readily; and

Fourth. It does dissolve in fatty tissue.

As living organisms take up DDT, they tend to concentrate it in their fatty tissue instead of excreting it. It induces enzyme activity which, in turn, causes compounds such as sex hormones to break down.

It has been discovered that many forms of wildlife, including the bald eagle, peregrine falcon, osprey, and brown pelican, have large quantities of DDT in their systems and in their eggs and are, in some areas, no longer capable of reproducing. DDT is known to be accumulating in man's tissues as well, although there is not yet proof that this accumulation is doing biological damage.

It would be deplorable to delay further the banning of the use of this chemical which poses such a threat to wildlife and man himself, especially since there are now available other pesticides which are both adequate and safe.

I therefore urge prompt action by the House and the other body on this measure.

**IN THE INTEREST OF FAIR PLAY**

**HON. J. HERBERT BURKE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we hear a good deal of talk lately about exercising fair play in the appointment of Federal judgeships, but fair play is a two-way street.

An interesting editorial has appeared in the Tampa Tribune concerning the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth as a Supreme Court Justice, which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues—in the interest of fair play:

**HAYNSWORTH'S BIG SINS: SOUTHERN CONSERVATIVE**

Pressure is on President Nixon to withdraw the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth to the Supreme Court.

On the facts thus far disclosed at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings, there is no valid reason why Judge Haynsworth should not serve on the high court.

His real fault, in the eyes of his critics, is that he is a conservative Southerner.

The attackers, naturally, do not say this. They point instead to "conflicts of interest" in which Judge Haynsworth was involved.

One concerned litigation between a labor union and a textile firm which did business with a Greenville, S.C., vending machine company in which Judge Haynsworth owned a one-seventh interest. Judge Haynsworth cast the deciding vote in favor of the textile firm. There was no evidence, however, that

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the vending machine company profited in any way from the decision.

The second case was one in which Judge Haynsworth, on the recommendation of his broker, had bought stock in the Brunswick Corporation while a foreclosure suit by the company against a bankrupt bowling alley was pending in his court. The suit involved a claim of about \$100,000; the Brunswick company does a business of some \$400 million a year, and the court decision could not conceivably have affected the value of the stock. Moreover, the three-judge panel had already agreed, unanimously, on the decision before the Haynsworth stock was purchased.

We think Judge Haynsworth would have been wise to disqualify himself in both cases, to avoid even the appearance of conflict. His failure to do so apparently was the result not of too little moral perception but of too many investments. During his 12 years on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals he bought and sold shares in a number of companies, and his current portfolio of securities is worth some \$800,000. Shareholding was so routine that the matter of conflict in these cases evidently did not occur to him.

In view of the unethical conduct of resigned Justice Abe Fortas and Justice William O. Douglas it is well that the Senate committee explore fully the financial transactions of Judge Haynsworth. The Senate should have the complete picture of his business dealings; and if it found actual improprieties there, it would be justified in rejecting his nomination.

But if Judge Haynsworth is kept off the court, either by pressures upon the President or by Senate rejection, it will be his philosophy rather than his conduct which bars the door.

In his judicial service he has refused to adopt the theory that a presumption of right automatically follows labor unions and minorities into court. Nor has he shown a willingness to stretch the Constitution to cover social change which, however, desirable, should be achieved by legislation rather than by decree.

Accordingly, he has encountered the opposition of spokesmen for organized labor, civil rights groups and card-carrying liberals. As the New York Times, no Haynsworth admirer, conceded in a recent analysis of the controversy:

"... The real reason why Judge Haynsworth is being opposed so earnestly is not that he is suspected of dishonesty but because there are doubts, as Senator Edward M. Kennedy put it, 'whether the candidate is a contemporary man of the times.'"

Man of the times?

Times and tides change but the principles of our constitutional systems are chiseled in granite. A Justice of the Supreme Court should have the wisdom and integrity to apply those principles, without first running to the window to see which way the crowd is going.

It is on Judge Haynsworth's qualifications to interpret the law fairly, not on his ability to follow political fashions, that the Senate's decision ought to be made.

## END THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as one who participated in the thoughtful discussions that led to the statements which follow, I am privileged to recommend to the attention of my colleagues what was said to President Nixon this summer

concerning a way to bring the Vietnam war to a long overdue conclusion. It is no less valid now than it was then. As a matter of fact it is a matter of greater urgency than ever.

The statements follow:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE  
CHURCHES OF CHRIST,  
New York, N.Y., June 30, 1969.

President RICHARD NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of its long-standing, deep concern with the Vietnam war, the National Council of Churches convened on June 20-21 a meeting of highly qualified people to consider the present stage of the conflict. The results are embodied in the main text herewith transmitted, which the signatories, six of whom were prevented from participating personally in the meeting, hope will be helpful in your efforts to secure peace.

Since the composition of this letter, press reports have conveyed statements by representatives of the Hanoi Government which pose severe difficulties that the group I am certain would recognize. Congressman Morse and McCloskey wish me to report their view that the announcement of a date for troop withdrawal (point 3 of the letter) and the pursuit of the negotiations suggested (point 1 of the letter) present particularly difficult objectives in the light of these recent Hanoi statements. In regard to these statements, however, we all continue to be convinced of the necessity of a broadly representative interim body and subsequent government in South Vietnam, as suggested in the group letter.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE  
CHURCHES OF CHRIST,  
New York, N.Y., June 30, 1969.

President RICHARD NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Americans who join you in the hope for an early and permanent peace in Vietnam, we support your decision to withdraw United States forces from Vietnam, beginning by the redeployment of 25,000 combat soldiers from the area this summer. We welcome the direction of the Vietnam policy of your Administration as indicated in your address to the nation on May 14 and your press conference on June 19, particularly your public commitment to accept any government in South Vietnam that results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese people, and not to perpetuate military bases in Vietnam or seek military ties with the future South Vietnamese government.

We believe, however, that additional steps are now required. The demands of the American public, the repression in South Vietnam, and the meager progress in Paris necessitate new initiatives to end, and not simply de-Americanize, the war. We therefore propose the following:

1. To press vigorously toward an early negotiated settlement of the Vietnam War by simultaneously—

(a) Replacing the strategy of maximum military pressure on the other side in South Vietnam by a policy of reducing the scale of fighting in every possible way, looking toward the prompt achievement of a standstill ceasefire, and

(b) Seeking agreement through the Paris negotiations on an interim body which will be broadly representative of all political, religious, social and ethnic groups in South Vietnam (and not merely the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam), designed to lead to the creation of a government that gives full

October 7, 1969

expression to the political will of the people of South Vietnam, this government to have, by prior agreement in Paris, the specific authority to:

(i) Require the withdrawal of external military forces from South Vietnam, and  
(ii) Determine its future relationship with North Vietnam, and with other countries.

2. To make clear that the United States will not continue to support any regime in South Vietnam that is not broadly representative and does not extend normal political liberties to its people;

3. To make clear to the American people, as well as the Vietnamese, a specific date by which the United States will have completed the withdrawal from South Vietnam of all its military forces; and

4. To repeat again in clear terms the moral commitment of this country to help meet humanitarian needs in Vietnam, both North and South.

In our judgment, Mr. President, the interconnected actions we have outlined are now politically possible here at home, and essential in Vietnam to any "peace we can live with and be proud of." Believing that the United States now has a unique opportunity, we pledge our whole-hearted support for such an honest ending of this war.

Yours sincerely,

Arthur S. Flemming, President, National Council of Churches, New York, N.Y.

R. H. Edwin Espy, General Secretary, National Council of Churches.

Ernest A. Gross, Chairman, Department of International Affairs, National Council of Churches.

Morris B. Abram, President, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

William B. Arthur, Editor, Look Magazine, New York.

Harold J. Berman, Professor, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.

Robert S. Bilheimer, National Council of Churches.

Robert S. Browne, Professor, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, N.J.

John H. Burt, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio.

Jeffrey Cohelan, United States House of Representatives (California), Washington, D.C.

John Conyers, Jr., United States House of Representatives (Michigan), Washington, D.C.

Andrew Cordier, President, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Gerhard Elston, National Council of Churches.

Paul C. Empie, Lutheran Church in America.

George F. Harkins, Lutheran Church in America.

Tracey K. Jones, Jr., Chairman, Advisory Committee for Peace, National Council of Churches.

Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., United States House of Representatives (California), Washington, D.C.

Kenneth W. Morgan, Professor, Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y.

Hans J. Morgenthau, Professor, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

F. Bradford Morse, United States House of Representatives (Massachusetts), Washington, D.C.

Allan M. Parrent, National Council of Churches.

Edwin O. Reischauer, Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Howard Schomer, National Council of Churches.

John Coventry Smith, Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

John Sommer, Author, *Vietnam—The Unheard Voices*, New York.

David M. Stowe, United Church of Christ.

Joseph D. Tydings, United States Senate (Maryland), Washington, D.C.

October 7, 1969

29015

## ACT FOR CLEAN WATER NOW

### HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the House will consider the appropriation bill for Public Works for Water, Pollution Control, and Power Development and the Atomic Energy Commission this week. I believe that my State of New Jersey and also our great Nation must consider this legislation one of its major priority items of domestic legislation before this Congress. We must move to correct this problem now and stop putting this matter off to the future before the current crisis becomes much greater.

The Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., published an enlightening editorial on October 5, 1969, that I believe sets forth the call for action in regard to this important appropriation bill. The editorial follows:

#### ACT FOR CLEAN WATER NOW

Striking while the iron is hot is a maxim that has political as much as, if not more than, any other application.

In American politics, this would appear to be a vintage year for striking on some long-standing basic issues.

Currently we have the drive to abolish the Electoral College in favor of direct popular election of the president. With the near-disaster of the 1968 election still reasonably fresh in the public mind and the political climate therefore favorable as perhaps never before, the House has passed and President Nixon has now come out in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment. There is now just the faintest chance that the procedure for electing the American president may be rescued from the 18th century and brought into the 20th by 1972.

Earlier we had taxes, the rare spectacle of congressmen in numbers exercising themselves not, as usual, over raising more but over simplifying, even easing, the citizen's burden. With signals of an imminent taxpayers' revolt flashing all over the horizon, it was clear that the time for tax reform had clearly come. The final results aren't in yet, but both Congress and the administration have taken advantage of the mood of the moment to tackle the most far-reaching overhaul of the tax system in recent history.

In this grab bag of issues, there is yet another item, not as exciting perhaps but probably even more important in the long run, where, hopefully, Washington will show itself equally willing to follow where public opinion leads.

For a long time now pollution has rivaled the weather as a subject generating a great deal of talk but precious little action. We all know by now what we are doing to our environment, the dire predictions for the near future and how far we are falling short in taking the steps necessary to prevent them from coming to pass.

The public is clearly in favor of action. A recent Gallup Poll reported 85 per cent of the population concerned about water pollution and 73 per cent ready to spend money—i.e., taxes—to combat it. Washington also seemed to be in step with the passage of the Clean Water Act back in 1966, which was supposed to channel a steady flow of federal funds into state and local pollution-control programs.

Unfortunately, the flow has been more of a trickle. Actual fund appropriations have consistently fallen short of clean-water authorizations. In 1968, \$450 million was authorized and \$203 million finally appropriated. In 1969, it was \$214 million appropriated against \$700 million authorized. In this current

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

budget, the administration has again asked for \$214 million, where Congress authorized a round billion.

It is sorely needed. Without the promised federal funds, the cleanup program would eventually collapse despite efforts by local governments, which have passed bond issues to raise their share of needed funds, and even, increasingly, industry. And that, with the consequent accelerated deterioration of our water resources, is something we can much less afford.

#### A HEARTBREAK INSTEAD OF HONEYMOON

### HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, no one will remember my words here but I know that all of us will remember the brave young men who have given their allegiance and their lives without protest to the defense of America and free men everywhere.

There may be questions of policy or skepticism over tactics but no one can doubt the valor of our fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, our sympathy and the sympathy of millions of Americans goes to the fiance, the parents, and the family of Thomas Jefferson Gabbard, who paid the ultimate sacrifice for his country in Vietnam. But we owe him more than sympathy. We owe him our highest debt of gratitude, for he died for all of us.

The October 4, 1969, article about his sacrifice, from the Kentucky Post, by Sigman Byrd, appears below:

#### A HEARTBREAK INSTEAD OF HONEYMOON

(By Sigman Byrd)

Plans for a November honeymoon dissolved in tears and heartbreak today as a Highland Heights family awaited the return of another slain serviceman.

Army Sgt. Thomas Jefferson Gabbard, 21, was killed on Sept. 28 in a combat operation in Quang Tri Province, Republic of Vietnam.

At their pretty frame house at 2519 S. Main Avenue, Highland Heights, the young hero's parents, brother and fiancee tried in vain to comfort each other.

The parents are Mr. and Mrs. Brown Gabbard. The father is a welder employed by Vulcan Manufacturing, Woodlawn, O. The couple has another son, Johnny, 17.

Sgt. Gabbard's fiancee, pretty Sharon Reusing, blond and blue-eyed, has been living in the Gabbard home for the past year, awaiting the return of her high-school sweetheart.

"Everything was arranged," she sobbed today. "He had only 17 or 18 more days in the field and about a year before coming home.

"I was going to meet him in Hawaii for the wedding and honeymoon."

Miss Reusing is an information operator for Cincinnati and Suburban Bell.

Said Sgt. Gabbard's mother:

"I've kept his car all clean and waiting for him; he loved the '57 Chevrolet. Now he'll never drive it again!"

And his father added:

"Tommy lived for just four things. To come home, marry Sharon, start a family of his own and study commercial art at Northern Kentucky State. He had a lot of talent."

"He was a wonderful artist," Sharon said. "Tommy used to drive to the Telephone building in Cincinnati and wait for me to get off work."

"And while he waited for me he'd draw sketches of me, from a photograph or from memory."

Mrs. Gabbard was bitter about the tragedy. "I suppose they'll want to take Johnny next and send him out there to get killed."

"Oh, it wouldn't be unbearable to give to a worthwhile cause. But my son died for nothing—just nothing."

"You should see all the dishes I bought," said Sharon. "I feel like breaking them now."

Tom Gabbard graduated from Campbell County High School in 1967. He and Sharon met at a Christmas party three years ago while she was a student at Our Lady of Providence.

He was employed by the Disabled American Veterans Headquarters at Cold Spring when he was called to the service in February 1968.

After training at Ft. Benning and Ft. McClellan, he was ordered to Vietnam on Armistice Day, Nov. 11, 1968, with Co. C, 11th Infantry, Fifth Division.

"He made sergeant fast," his father said proudly. "His job when he was killed was leading a squad of 10 infantrymen."

Sgt. Gabbard was born in Covington. He was 21 last Sept. 16.

In notes prepared for The Kentucky Post, Sharon Reusing wrote:

"He was MURDERED on Sept. 28, 1969." News of the young sergeant's death came to the Gabbard home last Tuesday.

Two days later Sharon got a letter from him. It concluded:

"I just hope I get home alive and well. Love forever."

Sharon says she'll never leave the Gabbard home. Her dead sweetheart's parents agreed. "We hope she'll stay with us always," said Mrs. Gabbard.

Funeral arrangements await the arrival of Sgt. Gabbard's body.

Burial will be in Owsley County, Ky., following services directed by Dobbling Funeral Home, Ft. Thomas.

## IMMEDIATE NEED FOR EDUCATION FUNDS

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I join wholeheartedly in cosponsoring the resolution introduced today by Mr. COHELAN to provide funds immediately for the Office of Education at the levels appropriated in H.R. 13111.

Delayed funding of Federal education programs works almost as great a hardship on schools as underfunding does. As a result, school administrators are forced to estimate how much Federal money they will eventually receive. Because of the constant fluctuations of Federal education funding in recent years, such estimates must often be merely wild guesses; yet definite commitments must be made on the basis thereof.

The House has already indicated its readiness to support generous funding for Federal education programs by its overwhelming approval of H.R. 13111 on July 31. Now the House ought to demonstrate its readiness to get this money to the schools immediately, not months from now.

The delay in funding vocational education is especially pernicious. The 1969 funds now being used simply do not

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

stretch to cover the additional authorizations provided for by the 1968 vocational education amendments. Instead of the progress which Congress intended to encourage in this important area, we may see actual decline in vocational programs.

The resolution introduced today reaffirms the intent of Congress in passing not only H.R. 13111, but also the vocational education amendments and every authorization which has pledged Federal assistance to education. I strongly believe that this resolution deserves the full support of every Member of this body.

## THE SST DECISION

## HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, newspapers in all parts of the Nation have spoken out in favor of the President's decision to give the green light to development of a supersonic transport.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the accompanying sample of editorial comment:

[From the Kansas City Star, Sept. 24, 1969]

## A GO-AHEAD FOR AVIATION PROGRESS IN NIXON'S SST DECISION

Too much was at stake for President Nixon to say "No" on proceeding with the supersonic transport (SST) project. So he has given the SST the green light after eight months of uncertainty and deliberation.

The next move will be up to Congress. That body can be expected to vote the 96 million dollars in new funds to round out another year of work on the program. For such a sum to be spent otherwise could scarcely make a dent in this country's large social and economic problems. So the contention of some critics that the United States cannot afford an entry in the international supersonic sweepstakes is not valid.

On the contrary, to scrap the American SST undertaking could be irreparably damaging. It would mean forfeiting the long-time international leadership of the United States in aircraft development and production. The loss of prestige would be enormous. And it would mean passing up the potential military advantages of being able to move troops across the ocean in three hours.

There is the further consideration of how inconsistent it would be to spend 24 billion dollars to fly to the moon and then balk at the ultimate 1.4 billion-dollar price tag of an SST that can have huge value as a super-swift carrier of the public. Of course Americans will be able to travel on U.S. or foreign airlines flying either the British-French Concorde or Russia's Tupolev-144. The two foreign versions of the SST will be in service as much as half a dozen years before their American competitor. But they will have the disadvantages of less speed by several hundred miles an hour and being able to carry fewer than half as many passengers. America's SST is designed to convey 300 persons comfortably at a speed of 1,800 miles an hour.

Thus various airlines, both U.S. and foreign, prefer the forthcoming American aircraft as they look to the travel market of the late 1970s and the 1980s. This choice is backed up by reservation deposits on 122 of the as-yet unbuilt jetliners. Royalties on purchases will enable the U.S. government to recover its investment. Sales to foreign carriers can aid greatly toward relieving this

country's chronic balance-of-payments headache.

Some problems in our SST effort remain to be solved. The foremost of these is the noise of the sonic boom. But America's aeronautical experts have overcome past difficulties more defiant than the jolting blast of faster-than-sound flight. Thus there can be little doubt that the most ambitious of the world's three supersonic designs will be flying on a test basis in late 1972 and over airline routes by 1978. With his affirmative decision on the SST's future, President Nixon has declared for continuing aviation progress by the United States.

[From the Plain Dealer, Sept. 24, 1969]

## RIGHT APPROACH TO THE SST

President Nixon's request for congressional appropriation of \$662 million spread over five years for development of the supersonic jet transport (SST) makes good sense.

Scaling the work on the two prototype planes to a slower pace fits the trend of the times against new high spending commitments. But either this is a national project or it isn't. Three presidents in a row now have said it is. We agree.

This 298-passenger craft is to overwhelm the half-size, slower-speed British-French and Russian competition.

The SST is highly important to the United States for more reasons than commercial air transportation. Its development should produce a vast technological "fallout" of value to industrial and military applications and in many other areas as well.

Airliners that can make New York-London in 3 hours or West Coast-Tokyo in 4½ hours are going to be built by someone, and the airlines will be forced by competition to buy them. If the United States failed to develop an SST, America could wind up a double loser. Its own airlines would be spending dollars overseas on foreign airplanes (increasing the balance of payments problem) and the domestic aircraft industry would be losing out on overseas sales.

And the Ohio economy would be a loser, too. The Boeing SST is to be powered by four General Electric engines made in Cincinnati.

Boeing believes it will sell 500 SSTs for about \$40 million each. When enough planes are sold, the government is to get back all it advanced, with interest.

The Federal Aviation Administration acknowledges that once the high-risk development phase is over, it should be up to the companies to raise their own money. President Nixon concurs with Presidents Johnson and Kennedy that developing the SST demands a national effort. Each president faced sincere reports antagonistic to the SST effort. Each president overruled the objections. In 1963 President Kennedy first declared that the national interest required development of an American SST.

Although the United States is three to four years behind the British-French Concorde and the Russian TU144, backers of the Boeing SST say it will far outsell the others because it will carry 298 passengers, more than double the others' seating capacity, and will fly 1,800 miles an hour to their 1,400.

By spreading development over the five years President Nixon has pushed production back into the late 1970s. Such timing purposely gives the SST a lower priority on the government scale than solving mass transit problems, especially in the urban areas. This is logical.

The government's word that no supersonic flights will be allowed over populated areas should eliminate fears of a 50-mile-wide bang zone trailing sonic booms after each SST. The planes will have to slow down under the sound barrier. The sonic boom problem is a serious one and will remain so until a solution is found.

Yet Cleveland can find a great advantage in the decision not to allow supersonic flights

October 7, 1969

over the continental United States. This should permit planning for a new airport to handle SSTs. With no sound barrier problem, SSTs could take off from this area for London and Tokyo just as easily as from New York or the West Coast. And far more easily for the convenience of passengers from all over the Middle West.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Sept. 24, 1969]

## PROGRESS DICTATES SST

After what he described as a "spirited debate" within the administration, President Nixon has decided to gamble \$662 million more on the Boeing supersonic transport plane (SST) despite a number of technological problems yet to be overcome.

In asking Congress for an additional \$96 million this year to assure construction of two prototypes of the 1,800-miles-per-hour, delta-wing superjet, Mr. Nixon has set the stage for what may become another antiballistic-missile-type national debate.

As in the missile battle, which went down to the wire and a one-vote victory in the Senate, the SST battle will be between experts evaluating identical data but coming up with opposite opinions. In such an atmosphere "facts" are hard to believe and the ultimate congressional decision will no doubt be made as much on personal emotion as on careful reasoning.

President Nixon seemed to have come down to that himself. He said he was recommending the go ahead on construction of prototypes because "I want the United States to lead the world in air transport." He said he was convinced that technical factors associated with the SST—mainly sonic booms and financing—can be overcome.

The government already has put about half a billion dollars into development of the SST. Test flights are not expected before 1972 and initial deliveries to the airlines is not scheduled before 1978. The British and French have jointly built a smaller and slower SST as have the Russians. The British-French plane, the Concorde, is expected to make its first supersonic test flight this week. The Russian plane, similar to the Concorde, is now undergoing test flights.

Arguments against going ahead with the SST are both convincing and difficult to refute. Development is expensive. Return on both government and private investment in the SST is doubtful at this stage. Sonic booms, in the present state of technology, are annoying and destructive. Time saved by the SST under today's airport-to-city bottlenecks, is less than spectacular. There are other urgent national needs that demand immediate attention. The plane could hurt U.S. balance of payments instead of help them.

All these and many more points against the SST constitute a powerful case that will be exploited to the full in congressional debate. But they run headon into mankind's unsuppressable urge to advance, to do things better, to go places faster, to grow. This urge has long found its most ambitious expression in the United States.

President Nixon seems to have based his decision on recognition of this will to advance. Surely he, too, realizes the possible drawbacks. But he must also have realized that if it is possible to build an 1,800-mph, 300-passenger plane, some one is going to build it. He wanted that "someone" to be the United States and we don't see how he could have decided otherwise.

[From the Seattle Post Intelligence, Sept. 26, 1969]

## THE SST DECISION

**A P-I View:** President Nixon's decision to proceed with the development of the supersonic transport plane (SST) should greatly aid this nation in keeping the aviation leadership it has enjoyed over the past 60 years.

The Boeing Co. people got a tremendous

shot in the arm with President Nixon's announcement he would push forward with plans to develop two prototypes on the supersonic transport aircraft.

Although the proposal faces tough going in the Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, the President's action has done much to improve the sagging morale of Boeing officials and employees involved in the project. After a somewhat lengthy delay in waiting for Mr. Nixon's decision, his remarks were most encouraging.

We applaud the President's "difficult" decision in giving the go ahead for construction of the SST. At the same time we don't see how he could very well have failed to do so.

The SST—a monster able to carry 300 passengers at a speed of 1,800 miles an hour—admittedly is almost as controversial as the ABM antiballistic missile system. And for very good reasons.

Its practical economic value is unproven. Its potential sonic booms over residential areas could be intolerable. Many engineering and technological problems remain unsolved. Its immediate development program promises to cost a tremendous amount of money—ultimately as much as \$4.5 billion.

To many of the critics, it is the cost of the program which should rule it out at this time of urban crisis and the war in Vietnam. "They insist—and will insist in the coming congressional appropriation debate—that the SST does not merit its recommended priority treatment.

All these are pretty impressive reasons for continuing to stall on a plane which was first planned under the Kennedy administration. Yet the fact is that other nations are not stalling. Russia's supersonic airliner, the TU-144, and its British-French counterpart, the Concorde, already have been test flown for many hours.

To President Nixon, and to us, this fact overrides all others. As happened in the space race, it is imperative this nation catch up and recapture leadership in another of mankind's major thrusts into the future.

Technical problems, even sonic booms, can be solved if we really try. Money will be found for the war and for our social problems. What we must not lose, and certainly not by default, is the world pre-eminence we have earned by topping the competition in every really important challenge.

#### SAM WYLY APPOINTED CHAIRMAN OF MINORITY ENTERPRISE ADVISORY COUNCIL

#### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Nixon in his appointment of Sam Wyly of Dallas, Tex., as Chairman of the Minority Enterprises Advisory Council. This appointment was a critical one because, the Minority Enterprise Advisory Council will play a vital role in coordinating the administration's program to provide self help for our Nation's minority groups.

The President made a judicious choice when he appointed Sam Wyly to this important post. Mr. Wyly comes to his new position with a wealth of successful business experience behind him. His experience will be of special benefit because throughout his career, Sam Wyly has not been afraid to initiate, to innovate, or to challenge. These qualities will stand him in good stead on the Council.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In addition to his commercial success, Mr. Wyly has long been an active participant in community affairs; and, in addition, has distinguished himself through various civic and philanthropic activities. As Council Chairman, his enlightened social consciousness will provide an invaluable perspective from which to encourage the development of minority enterprise.

Sam Wyly is a man of many talents. His is a credit to the business community and the State of Texas. I know his tenure as Chairman of the Minority Enterprise Advisory Council will be marked by distinguished and effective service.

#### IMPROVING THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY

#### HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the fertilizer industry is a basic part of American agriculture, a segment of the economy which generally fails to receive the attention and appreciation it is due.

Mr. Edwin M. Wheeler, president of the National Plant Food Institute here in Washington, presented an excellent paper on the status and future of the fertilizer industry at a fertilizer production and marketing conference in Memphis, October 3.

Mr. Wheeler is an attorney with extensive experience in private industry. The National Plant Food Institute was formed in 1955 when two much older fertilizer industry related organizations united to advance their common goals.

Mr. Wheeler gives strong support to the vital work of the Tennessee Valley Authority's National Fertilizer Development Center at Muscle Shoals, Ala.

He points out that the savings to the American farmer from improved fertilizer and marketing methods resulting from work of the TVA Fertilizer Center produce a line of benefits which extends to the fertilizer industry and to the eventual food and fiber consumer as well.

So that my colleagues may know of the importance of the fertilizer industry, I include Mr. Wheeler's comments as a part of my remarks at this point:

#### BUILDING A HEALTHY INDUSTRY

(Edwin M. Wheeler)

A healthy industry is a mature industry—and the U.S. fertilizer industry is growing up.

It's reaching maturity in a number of ways—maturity that it has never known before. Let me give two or three indicators that make me feel this way:

For one thing, the industry is no longer afraid to let the skeletons shake in the closet. It has seen its problems . . . and it's doing something about them. One of the first steps was the successful initiation, one year ago, of the NPFI monthly Fertilizer Index. For the first time, industry voluntarily disclosed data to a private, independent, confidential business research firm on production, disappearance and inventory of the major fertilizer products. This is the closest we've ever come to having accurate figures in a month-by-month comparative index.

The reality was a shock to some, a vindication to others—but an eye-opener to all.

#### INDEX A FACTOR IN CUTBACK

This rendezvous with a reality certainly was part of the reason for the sharp fertilizer production cutback early this year. Whatever you call it—a period of reassessment or adjustment—it was the first time U.S. fertilizer companies have trimmed their production since World War II.

The strengthening effect of this cutback was weakened somewhat by a heavily waterlogged spring season in the Midwest, which caused fertilizer sales to plummet drastically.

But yet, it's interesting that, even with a discouraging spring season, most representatives of the fertilizer industry feel fairly confident that next year will be better—that the industry is on the way toward a strong recovery. At least, the ones I've talked to leave that impression, and I don't think I've been talking to "Pollyannas"—because they don't last long in this business.

Let me emphasize that the optimism lies not in the fact that a production cutback was obtained—because no industry rides forward on cutbacks—but the optimism arises from the fact that industry is gaining a market-wise attitude, an improved knowledge of what's going on across the country. Improved statistics, I think, build the basis for this attitude.

#### TO GATHER FINANCIAL DATA

The Institute hopes to follow on the heels of the Fertilizer Index with another "first" for industry—an accumulation of key financial data—information too long unavailable. The plan is to gather critical data—primarily from balance sheets and profit-and-loss statements—for several major industry categories. The objective is to provide ratios and comparisons that will aid each company in financial management and serve as a useful public relations tool in helping explain the essential role which this 100-year-old industry holds in the basic agricultural economy of this nation—and much of the world.

There's going to be an increased effort to accumulate fertilizer transportation statistics to aid in sustaining a just balance of freight rates for the industry's product—a product whose price to the farmer is made up of fully 25%—35% transportation costs.

As many of you know, the Institute, on behalf of the major portion of industry, has for years backed the Association of American Fertilizer Control Officials in efforts toward more uniform state monthly reports. At mid-year, a significant agreement was reached between major fertilizer companies and AAFCO for faster reporting of consumption information with modern computer facilities which industry and states are obtaining in increasing numbers. Thirty-three states can now accept tonnage reports in one or more forms from computers. Eleven states have adopted the AAFCO approved uniform reporting system, providing monthly information on consumption—another sign of maturity.

#### POSITIVE STAND ON POLLUTION

I'll mention a couple more. The fertilizer industry has adopted a positive stance toward those who criticize fertilizers as alleged water pollutants. The Institute is helping, using our members' dollars, co-sponsor a USDA research project in the Midwest to help establish answers to questions about fertilizer application and soil runoff. The industry isn't hiding behind the skirts of ignorance—or is it slapping blindly at its acquisition.

As the Institute's past Chairman Jaral D. Aston said at the NPFI convention this summer: "The public shall know the facts. It is the minimum that the public deserves. The industry can abide the facts—but we will not abide innuendo, allegation and emotional appeals . . ."

The industry is not assuming a head-in-sand position on pollution. If there's a prob-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

lem regarding use of fertilizer and environmental pollution—we want to know about it—but we want to know facts—not supposition, not innuendo, not half-truths designed to grab headlines. And, the Institute and industry are searching for the facts.

## MORE SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURE

A healthy industry is an industry which thinks not only of its own problems, but of those of others as well. We at the Institute are becoming more involved, on the industry's behalf, in helping develop increased support for agriculture. It is essential that this be done.

As Under Secretary of Agriculture Phil Campbell so aptly phrased it at our meeting this summer . . . "Somehow we must bring home to the 19 out of 20 who are not farmers that agriculture is basic to this country—and that sound agricultural programs are vital to the nation."

Most Americans, I'm afraid, couldn't care less.

This indifferent attitude is evident in Congress; it's evident in the state houses. We have to make the non-farm public care at least a little bit about agriculture and the businesses that serve it.

As Under Secretary Campbell pointed out—after all, agriculture is a 50-billion-dollar-a-year customer in the American economy—with farm exports alone providing one million non-farm jobs.

That seems important enough to care a little about!

The Institute has been hammering at this theme for several months now—but, as you know, it takes a heavy hammer to make a dent in the urban-oriented media.

One hopeful effort is an NPFPI award program that has just been initiated with the National Agricultural Advertising and Marketing Association. The object is to honor the NAAMA member judged most creative in telling agriculture's story to the non-farm audience.

The fertilizer industry is concerned about agriculture's problems, because they are our problems, too. They're your problems. If agriculture fails to prosper, most of us are going to find a lack of prosperity in our current occupation, too.

## HEALTH IS UNITY; GROWTH

A healthy industry is a united industry. I think you're likely aware of the efforts toward unification among the National Plant Food Institute, the Agricultural Nitrogen Institute, and the National Fertilizer Solutions Association. In June, the NPFPI Board passed a resolution approving such unification in principle and setting overt actions into motion to accomplish such an objective.

A healthy industry is a growing industry. You can look back over the past 20 years of fertilizer industry activity and note a definite growth pattern—both in tonnage and in dollar value of sales.

Although industry has cut production in this adjustment period, I firmly believe that there is no future in continued retrenchment. The industry must—and will—continue to grow. The growth won't be as rapid as we've seen it in the past decade, but potential is still there. I'm convinced it will be a great deal more orderly. There's no way to meet increased food and fiber needs without increased use of fertilizer and other proven production practices—it's just that simple.

Here, I'd like to give a well-deserved pat on the back to the National Fertilizer Development Center. The industry's thanks, although not always too vocal in the past, are nonetheless sincere.

## AGGRESSIVE R. &amp; D. ESSENTIAL

Industry leaders recognize the value—and necessity—of a strong, aggressive program in research and development. Without the type of program activated here at the National Fertilizer Development Center, obsolescence would overtake industry rapidly.

Those of you who have guided the work of the Center have long realized, I think, that along with the recognition of leadership in fertilizer research and development comes the responsibility of providing continuing programs for introduction of new and better fertilizer products. It's a responsibility not only of national, but also of world, importance.

Savings to the American farmer from improved fertilizers and marketing methods are the nucleus of the TVA research and development contribution . . . and the line of beneficiaries extends to include the industry and the eventual food and fiber consumer as well.

The fact that fertilizers are truly international products is not a profound one, but its increasing importance is sometimes overlooked in considering potential growth of underdeveloped nations. It is becoming more and more evident that the economies of most nations hinge on their country's agriculture, and on the ability of their farmers to adapt to the use of modern production inputs.

## ROLE IN LEADERSHIP

The National Fertilizer Development Center has played a vital role in helping our industry become the world leader in providing the best possible fertilizer products economically to U.S. farmers. Maintaining this posture becomes more difficult daily, as world competition sharpens. Refining plants along the Dead Sea—ammonia plants on the Persian Gulf—phosphate plants in Russia—all place increased burdens on TVA research and development and on the adaptability of U.S. industry.

You may be assured that the nation's fertilizer industry will continue to look to the National Fertilizer Development Center for world leadership in this area.

## CONCENTRATION ON BUYER

The next decade is going to see a decided change of emphasis in fertilizer marketing. As important as the product is, I firmly believe that fertilizer marketers must concentrate more on the man who buys the product than on the product itself. The farmer is changing faster than industry—faster than the county agent—faster than the agricultural scientist—faster than any of us may realize.

The old marketing cliche, "Know your customer," has a new urgency to it. And, fertilizer's customers in the 1970's are going to be a great deal different from the ones in the 1950's and 1960's.

We know something about this new farmer—but we don't know enough. We must know more about "who" he is, rather than "what" he has accomplished.

One thing we're finding out—he's a lot more sophisticated, a lot more demanding, with a great deal more "savvy" than every before.

## WHEN IS MARKETING SEASON?

Just recently, Lane Palmer, editor of *Farm Journal*, told of some things his regional editors had found about farmers' decisions on buying fertilizer.

The decision-making process on fertilizers starts, for many farmers, as early as September, and most have their plans made by January—with a full third of the buying decisions already made before that time.

The term "fertilizer marketing season" is losing its validity. The top farmer is thinking of and planning for his needs all the time.

This is having a profound effect on our industry. To help him reach buying decisions, the one-out-of-three farmer, who produces 80% of our farm output, wants more than a colored brochure on the product. He demands factual information—and that demand is almost insatiable. He demands service—and he demands more convenience.

He expects a tailored fertilizer formula to fit his precise soil-and-crop needs—not some general state grade list. For the fertilizer in-

dustry, this means an increasingly heavy investment in on-site facilities.

## FEWER BUT BIGGER

Candidly, there will be fewer fertilizer retail outlets in the next 10 years, but the ones left will be bigger and offers more service and more information to serve the large producer.

It's a new situation—and an exciting prospect. The outlook is for an increasingly strong, more viable fertilizer industry than ever before—with a realistic, market-wise maturity.

It's a promising future—and a welcome one.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ISSEI OF DELANO, CALIF.

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS  
OF CALIFORNIA

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the Record, at the request of Mr. Joe Katano of the Japanese American Citizens League in Delano, Calif., a brief history of the Issei of Delano. Since Mr. Tsurumatsu Nagatani first came to Delano in April of 1905, the Japanese Americans have made many social, economic, and political contributions to the Delano area and to the entire State of California.

I think it is only fitting that we recognize the long and distinguished history of these outstanding people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this brief history of the Issei of Delano to my colleagues and to the general public:

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ISSEI OF DELANO, CALIF.

Like a novel from the Western Era, the Japanese Issei's life in Delano began April of 1905. Mr. Tsurumatsu Nagatani came to Delano from San Francisco through the employment office to work in the Railroads. To his surprise, he was asked to leave after sleeping one night at the R. R. Boarding House at the end of a gunpoint. He left for Fresno and returned once more in 1912 and purchased land of 20 acres and started orange grove near Ducor.

1911—Mr. Ichita Kawata was the first Japanese to purchase and plant 20 acres of grapes on Cecil Avenue.

1911—Mr. Tatsuguma Ota started 20 acres of oranges.

1911—Mr. Yorizani purchased land for oranges.

1912—Mr. Tsurumatsu Nagatani bought and started 20 acres of oranges.

1912—Mr. K. Tahara purchased land in Pixley area.

1912—Mr. H. Hirose purchased 20 acres of land near Richgrove and started orange grove.

1912—Mr. Einosuke Misono leased 640 acres of land and raised rice near Pond for 5 years. His daughter May went to school by buggy.

1912—Mr. Norikane started nursery for Mr. Wallace on Cecil Avenue and later purchased 40 acres of land which later was sold to Mr. Stradley. Mr. Oishi bought land and started farming with Mr. T. Jo as partners.

1917—Mr. Misono started raising watermelons and cantaloupes 60 acres in Delano.

1917—Mr. Takeshi Kawata, Tadashi Ogata, and Mr. Kinichi Sakai all went into farming.

1919—Mr. Gohachi Kawano with another partner started Rice Farming on the C. L. Cole place.

1918-19—Business started in Grocery by Mr. Juneau Nozaka. Mr. Furuchi started a

October 7, 1969

restaurant. Mr. Yano Fish Market. Many others followed in various business and farming.

1920—Japanese-American Friendship League formed in response to the Anti-Japanese feeling that was rampant at that time. Mr. Ichiro Kawata was first President.

1925—The Japanese-American Friendship League was changed to Japanese Association of Delano with Mr. Kawata president; Mr. Sakai, second; and Mr. Misono, third.

1925—Japanese School was built and all the children in the community and families of about 100 enjoyed the facilities inter denominating as one. During the World War II it was burned. Mr. Orimo first school teacher.

1925—Mr. Ushi Yonaki came to Delano and went into farming.

1925—Mr. Harry R. Katano started Pool Hall.

1925—Mr. Komasuke Nakagama started farming various crops as cantaloupes, etc.

1925—Mr. Kikichi Nakayama went into farming. Mr. Shigeru and Isamu Ichinaga purchased and operated a Gas Station and Grocery in Pixley.

1926—Mr. Morima Kono started farming. Mr. Ikemiya became foreman for Setrakian.

1926—Mr. Gohachi Kawano started the Westside Grocery until 1940; he went to Japan. Mr. Sam Okasaki continued the business.

1927—Mr. Yamane purchased land near Earlimart.

Mr. Soichi Enoki purchased 80 acres land and went into farming. Various Labor Camps started in the later 20's and early 30's.

1927—Mr. Setoguchi at McGivitt; Mr. Johnny Katano, Mr. Takahashi, and Mr. Miyake were some of the individual camps.

Mr. M. Watanabe—Individual camp.

Di Giorgio Corporation had Camp I, II, and III with the following Issei's operating: Mr. Tanimura, Morita, Tagawa, Hyodo, Fujita, Yoshihara, Nakajima, Yamamoto, and Yamashita. Mr. Yoshihara was one of the men instrumental in helping the community grow.

1929—Mr. Tsuda with his family started the Laundry. The following businesses were thriving until evacuation of 1942: Nitta Hotel and Barber Shop; Sato Hotel; Yano Hotel; Takaki Drugs; U.S. Grocery—Honda; Yamaguchi Fish Market; Westside Grocery; Misukami Fountain; Arita Cafe; Dan Lunch Room; Nozaki Asahi Sushi; New Chop Suey; Tokyo Chop Suey; Hamaoka Pool Hall; Iwazawa Pool and Barber, and Yasuhira Pool Hall.

1931—Mr. Morihiro purchased 160 acres near Earlimart.

There were 3 Packing and Shipping Sheds formed by the Japanese farmers. Early ones were: Sakai Packing Shed—in Earlimart; Delano Growers Exchange—with Mr. Frank Fukuda—Shipper, and Farmers Assn. United Brokers—Mr. Matsuoka—Shipper.

1930—Buddhist Church was built but the actual Buddhist Church was not affiliated with the North America Buddhist Churches until 1940. Mr. Shigemi Fujii was one of the many men active in this with about 40 families.

1934—Mr. Sakushi Kubota came to Delano and was associated with Westside Grocery.

1939—Sakai and Yoshimura bought land before World War II.

1940—Mr. Tsurumatsu Nagatani purchased 160 acres near Earlimart.

1949-50—With Doshi Kai sponsored, there was a commemorating party for Mr. Seiji Fujii winning the Repeal of Alien Land Law case which made it possible for Issei to purchase or lease land by 300 person.

1945—Mr. Tsurumatsu Nagatani returned with his family and resumed farming later being Incorporated and built the Nagatani Farms & Packing shed. 1948—Purchased 640 acres; 1950—380 acres; 1952—160 acres; totaling 1,340 acres.

Mr. K. Tahara returned to his land near Pixley.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Yonaki families returned, and he helped at the Texaco Gas Station and Garage until his retirement.

Mr. Sakushi Kubota and Mr. Sam Okasaki opened the Grocery Store Sam's Market on Fremont Street. Later in 1954 moved to present location on Cecil Avenue called City Food Basket. Mr. Kubota is sole proprietor to this day.

Mr. Kikichi Nakayama resumed farming in Richgrove area and later opened the Kikichi's Restaurant & Bar on Glenwood until retirement. Mr. Katsutaro Kono and Mr. Eiji Yamashita started camp for Mr. Pagilarulo.

Mr. Frank Fukuda returned to Delano and started farming and shipping cantaloupe, lettuce and tomatoes.

1946—Mr. Einosuke Misono returned to Delano and worked for Mr. Butera raising lettuce, and various crops, and later went into farming with Mr. Pandol until retirement.

1946—Mr. Tsunekusa Kawasaki started camp in Deer Creek Orchard and in 1947 Michinori Honbo resumed the camp until 1947.

1947—Michinori Honbo, Eiji Yamashita, Tadao Yamamoto, and Katsutaro Kono opened once more the Di Giorgio Sierra Vista Camp #2.

1947—Mr. Morima Kono returned and went into farming, later working for Molica Inc.

1947—Mr. Enosuke Fukawa and family went into farming near McFarland until his retirement.

Mr. Gohachi Kawano returned from Japan, and resumed responsibilities in the community working at the City Food Basket until retirement.

1947—Mrs. H. Okino lived with the Kubota family until she passed away in the Delano Hospital.

1949—Mr. Tsunekusa Kawasaki came to Delano taking over Camp 18 for Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. In August 1949 resumed the Camp #2 having both camps until 1951 when he let his nephew have Camp 18 and he with his son had Camp #2 until his retirement. He was instrumental in the refugee program and the exchange student program which the Japanese Government gave him recognition.

1949—The Delano Pioneer Club was formed with Mr. Tsurumatsu Nagatani president, and all the members totaling very few namely—Einosuke Misono, Eiji Yamashita, Morima Kono, Sakushi Kubota, Kumaemon Tahara, Inosuke Fukawa, Katsutaro Kono, Tsunekusa Kawasaki, Kurazo Okasaki, Michinori Honbo, Gohachi Kawano, and Tomokazu Kawasaki.

1956—The Buddhist Church organization was formed again with Mr. Tsunekusa Kawasaki as president. With the building burned during the war years, there were no church to hold the meetings so it was held at Camp #2 Sierra Vista Ranch. The services are held once a month, and after the closing of Sierra Vista Camp #2, it is held at the Honbo Camp each month at present.

1958—Michinori Honbo opened the Caratan Camp on Cecil and Zachary and at present operating.

1964—Mr. & Mrs. Kuwahara moved to Delano from Bakersfield.

### AWARDS

#### *Mr. Einosuke Misono*

1 Foot Silver Trophy for instrumental in Japanese School.

Dai Nihon Mokai—Recognition.

Gaimusho or State Department Recognition.

Agriculture Dept. Recognition.

#### *Mr. Tsurumatsu Nagatani*

Agriculture Dept. Recognition.

State Dept. Recognition.

#### *Mr. Gohachi Kawano*

State Dept. Recognition.

#### *Mr. Tsunekusa Kawasaki*

State Dept. Recognition.

Agriculture Recognition.

Sacred Fifth Order Recognition.  
Kern County Council Recognition.  
18" Trophy from Refugee.

Radio from Delano Japanese Organizations.  
Clock & Pen Set from Wakayama Club.

#### *Mr. Michinori Honbo*

State Dept. Recognition.

#### *Mr. Morima Kono*

Agriculture Dept. Recognition.  
State Dept. Recognition.

## CLEANER AIR WEEK A NATIONAL COMMITMENT

### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, each year, during October, communities throughout the country join in a week long series of public observances of Cleaner Air Week. It is a time when we focus attention on what has finally come to be recognized as one of our most serious domestic problems.

Cincinnati, Ohio, is fortunate to have the chairman of Cleaner Air Week, Mr. Charles N. Howison, as a resident of our community. He was the originator of what has grown to be a nationwide program.

On September 26, Mr. Howison, in an address before the East Central Section Convention of the Air Pollution Control Association, commented on the growth and potential of Cleaner Air Week.

I believe the following remarks are worthy of our consideration:

### CLEANER AIR WEEK: THE COMMUNITY COMMITMENT TO THE 70's

(By Charles N. Howison)

Program Chairman, Henry Mayer, extended an opportunity and a challenge when he invited me here today to join members and guests of Air Pollution Control Association's East-Central Section in a preview of the air quality management in the '70's.

An invitation to assess the community role in air quality management over the next ten years is indeed a challenge—particularly in view of the superlative contributions of yesterday's speakers. Their estimates of the roles of research and development, environmental health, industry and government, in restoring air quality, provided us with a penetrating insight into the "decisive decade."

It was a rewarding experience, indeed, to hear Mrs. Swigart, Mr. Jones, Mr. Pickard, Mr. Ronald and Mr. Bowling examine prospects for increased public participation in air quality management at this morning's session.

The insight and thoroughness they displayed in projecting an expanded role for the public in air conservation makes my assignment much easier.

My primary interest, of course, is enlistment of all air quality interests in a coordinated approach to community-wide air problems under the banner of Cleaner Air Week.

This morning's panelists provided information which we can use in future Cleaner Air Weeks and perhaps some of our Cleaner Air Week education instruments may prove useful to you in future endeavors of your own.

Information is the currency of the air conservation realm and we need all of it we can get in coping with the new air problems that arrive with every population gain and every new industrial process.

The approach of Cleaner Air Week's 21st observance—just a month away—recalls a late October Monday in Perth Amboy, New

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 7, 1969

Jersey, schoolyard where students and teachers gathered around a cluster of yellow balloons.

It was morning recess time and the pupils were out for the Annual Balloon Ascension—signaling Cleaner Air Week in the New Jersey port city.

Each balloon carried two attachments: a little card inviting whoever might recover it to report the time and place of the balloon's capture, and a child eager to release his aerial messenger.

The balloons shot skyward except for one. A little boy, representing the first grade, refused to let go of his; he decided to retain possession of his balloon, and perhaps he still has it as a memento of the nation's first observance of Cleaner Air Week.

As 126 metropolitan centers prepare to celebrate Cleaner Air Week's 21st birthday, many important things will be said about this successful public relations program but the essence of Cleaner Air Week is commitment of the individual.

There was little or no air pollution control in 1949 when Cleaner Air Week opened for business. Eight years of World War II production had worn out existing air conservation systems and defense priorities had made it impossible to manufacture replacements. Smoke trails located industrial stacks and home chimneys in every corner of our metropolitan centers. Clouds billowed after railroad engines and identified scrap yards. Anything less than a community-wide approach would be futile in attacking the air problems of 1949. And yet, how do you achieve community-wide action?

Community-wide action calls for the awareness on the part of every individual of his involvement in the problem and his personal stake in its solution. True, everybody realized we had an air pollution problem 21 years ago but there was little or no individual commitment, and little awareness that the individual, who suffered most from polluted air, was also the source of pollution.

As a matter of fact, there was very little hope for individual action, even among Cleaner Air Week's first sponsors. Like the youthful nonlaucher, they went along with the idea but didn't exactly go into orbit.

Cleaner Air Week gained in momentum and expanded in scope during the '50's—but for most of the metropolitan population it remained a spectacle. People read the posters, enjoyed the balloon launching, followed the conservation panel shows on TV, read the newspaper advertisements and stopped to see the Cleaner Air Week displays in store windows. These devices and events serve to dramatize community-wide problems but continue to present solutions in general rather than specific terms.

It seems to this observer that the participation stage—marking the individual Cleaner Air Week supporter's employment of his own resources to do something about the air took over in the '60's. Cleaner Air Week activity throughout the country began to reflect a thinking man's approach to his own special air quality problems.

Control officials were no longer satisfied just to conduct a community tour of a new industrial air-cleaning system but measured the air cleaning device in terms which enabled each visiting neighbor to evaluate the new installation as an investment in his air interests.

Economists briefed the community residents, who ultimately foot all of the air conservation bills, on his economic stake in community air resource management.

Women's clubs beat the drums for carburetor checks, furnace overhauls and scores of other opportunities open to the individual to lessen his additions to contamination of the air he—and his fellow citizens—had to breathe.

Seventy metropolitan centers carried the Cleaner Air Week banner into the '60's and

now as we enter the '70's, their number has risen to 126.

If Cleaner Air Week grew from a spectator event in the '50's to a vehicle of personal participation in the '60's, then the approaching '70's confront this late October public relations event with the biggest challenge in its 21-year history: to provide the individual community resident with information that will enable him to exert influence on the adoption of community air quality safeguards that best serve his needs.

The Air Quality Act of 1967, in effect, wrote an order for Cleaner Air Week by providing for regional air quality control with procedures and schedules for setting regional air quality standards.

William Megonnell, Assistant Surgeon General, gave the key to the Cleaner Air Week Committee's educational role in New York on Wednesday, April 9 of this year. Mr. Megonnell said that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare will study the hearings' records carefully and if he finds strong public support for the adopted standards, he will be inclined to accept them, provided, of course, that they are consistent with health effects criteria.

As a result, Cleaner Air Week Committees around the country are engaged in developing information programs in these vital areas of information to the resident of the air quality region.

A. Just as each of us help create our air pollution problems, so we may contribute to their solution within the over-all context of a community-wide air pollution control program. Universal involvement is essential in the community-wide effort to bring control technology abreast of production advances.

B. Scope of the hearings. Only two pollutants, representing a fraction of the over-all air pollution problem, are being considered in the 1969 hearings. It is important for the individual resident to know that the cost and other factors involved in the approaching areas apply only to a segment of the problem.

C. Control equipment required to meet standards set at these hearings may be inadequate to meet standards for the control of other pollutants, the determination of which is at least a year away.

E. Progress reports. Reduction in particulate and sulfur concentrations, improved airport ceiling visibilities and other progress data are vital public information before and during the hearings. The local Cleaner Air Week Committee consults metropolitan center air pollution control directors and other government agencies for this type of information.

F. Schedules for continuing reduction of pollutants are indispensable information to every community resident.

G. Cost/benefits ratio. The cost differential between extremely tight standards and slightly less-stringent standards that would still protect public health may be of vital importance to every community resident. These comparative figures may be reduced to cost-per-light customer in the case of utilities.

H. Who pays the control costs? A vital information point is that air conservation costs are borne by the community resident in the price of goods and services, taxes and limitation of economic opportunity. The community resident needs this information in terms of significance to him as an individual in order to determine in his own interest the degree of air quality that best meets requirements. This is a formidable commitment, indeed, for the Cleaner Air Week of the '70's: individual involvement not as an observer, not just as a participant, but a decision maker. In order to make the regional air quality program work to the advantage of the community resident, he must have this information and Cleaner Air Week is well equipped to provide it.

Some Cleaner Air Week Committees are considering year-around operation in order

to better serve their community interest in regional air standards.

Other Cleaner Air Week Committees are being formed for the first time with the objective of public enlightenment as a means of securing adequate regional air quality standards.

Some say it is too big a job for a volunteer organization. Well, they said we couldn't attract and hold the public interest in the '50's and again in the '60's many critics put us down as an entertainment spectacle incapable of inducing individual action.

Twenty years ago the Advertising Council told us that we could successfully "sell" the public the idea of breaking a match to prevent forest fires but anything beyond the simple dimensions of this assignment was too much to ask of Cleaner Air Week.

My answer to the Advertising Council is contained in the Cleaner Air Week Handbook for 1969.

First graders in all of Chicago's school districts won the competition for attention among competing Cleaner Air Week events, hands down, by electing Cleaner Air Week queens. Scores of congregations read the Cleaner Air Week message in their church bulletins. Suburban community residents took part in special Cleaner Air Week events and newspapers joined radio and television in bringing Cleaner Air Week information to almost every area resident.

The New York Giants football team literally kicked off Cleaner Air Week during pre-game ceremonies at Yankee Stadium.

The Indianapolis Cleaner Air Week Committee conducted a survey that indicated 85% of the people are more concerned with what they see—too much dirt in the air. They also indicated that they want information about methods of controlling air pollution.

Indianapolis rewarded outstanding performances in safeguarding air quality with "good neighbor" citations.

Twelve thousand Cleaner Air Week brochures were distributed in Tampa, and window displays played important Cleaner Air Week roles in Minneapolis.

Cleaner Air Week in Newport News featured educational billboards sponsored by the Anti-Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association of Tidewater, Virginia. "Operation Weather Study" engrossed third grade students in Rockville Center, New York, Albuquerque posters asked "Wouldn't you like the air to stay clean?"

As we approach the decisive '70's, ladies and gentlemen, I invite you to join your Cleaner Air Week Committee in the critical task of providing residents of air quality regions with the information they need to make intelligent decisions in safeguarding their community air resources.

## BIG TRUCK BILL

SPEECH OF

## HON. FRED SCHWENGE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGE. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the Caldwell, Idaho, News-Tribune in the State of Idaho. The editorial follows:

BIGGER TRUCKS? No!

The trucking industry is back before Congress this year with a bill to permit the operation of heavier and bigger trucks on the nation's interstate highway system. Congress, as it did with a similar measure last year, should reject the proposed changes.

Foremost among the opponents of the legislation is the American Automobile Associa-

tion, whose executives testified recently before the House Public Works Committee. The AAA's opposition is based on two points. The first is that bigger trucks will constitute a hazard on the highways because their bulk diminishes the visibility of other drivers and their length makes passing more risky.

The second point the AAA stresses is that the increased weight of tractor-trailers and tractor-two trailers will punish pavements and bridges and increase not only the costs of upkeep but also the construction of new roads built to withstand the heavier loads.

Highway costs warrants concern, but the argument Congress should find most persuasive is the likelihood of greater danger on the nation's already unsafe roads. A 70-foot truck, more than eight feet wide and weighing as much as 15 tons, is an intimidating object. To allow such snorting behemoths on the public roads is not in the public interest.

#### SENATOR BAKER'S VICTORY

#### HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

**Mr. KUYKENDALL.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an editorial in the RECORD telecast by one of the leading TV newscasters and editors in Memphis, Tenn., Mr. Norman Brewer, news director of WMC-TV.

It goes without saying, I share Mr. Brewer's views on my friend and colleague, Senator HOWARD BAKER.

#### SENATOR BAKER'S VICTORY

(By Norman Brewer, telecast of Sept. 25, 1969)

Well, the Senate Republicans just made a mistake. But that's the price they paid for not consulting with us Tennesseans before voting for a new minority leader. It should have been a landslide for Howard Baker. Actually, the junior Senator from Tennessee probably fell victim to the Congressional seniority system—just slightly more precious on the Hill than the free haircuts provided United States Senators. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania had been a member of the club longer than Howard Baker and that was that. It would have been a signal victory for Baker, one almost unprecedented in Senate history because of his youth. That he did not pull it off, however, does not spell defeat. The veterans of intra-Congressional politics tell us that there is some kind of victory in the fact that a man of 43 years and only three years in the Senate came as close as he did. It was a measure of the esteem in which Baker is held by his colleagues; evidence that he has made a mark on the Senate, an institution not easily marked. "Newsweek" magazine, reporting on the activities of freshmen Senators a couple of years ago, took note of that fact when it said of Baker, "His speeches have shown careful research and his parliamentary skill helped defeat a restricting bill backed by his father-in-law, Everett Dirksen."

Last year at the Republican convention, Baker was seriously mentioned as a Vice-Presidential candidate. He was a leader of the Nixon floor forces at the convention and he helped forge Nixon's winning "Southern strategy." In just three years, Howard Baker has accomplished what some Senators never accomplish and what takes others decades to accomplish—he has proven himself an articulate, effective spokesman for his state and his nation. And his future is filled with more promise.

The vote Wednesday was not an end for Howard Baker, but a beginning.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

#### INDEPENDENT BUSINESSMEN SUPPORT BAN ON UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS

#### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

**Mr. OTTINGER.** Mr. Speaker, for 2 years I have sought to convince the Congress and the administration of the urgent need for new controls to curb the unfair practices and abuses arising from the mailing of unsolicited credit cards. In the 90th Congress and again this year, I have introduced legislation to accomplish this, and I am pleased to announce that a nationwide survey by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., found 80-percent support for my bill.

I hope that this survey will spur congressional action on my bill, H.R. 858, which is pending before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., news release on the survey, and a copy of my statement before the Federal Trade Commission in connection with recent hearings on unsolicited credit cards:

#### NEWS RELEASE OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC.

(The Brief Facts: Mailing credit cards to virtually every household—without application or request—has made "easy credit" more of a reality than ever. Loss, theft and illegal use of credit cards has been a problem, and many think the unsolicited card has encouraged more people to live beyond their means. A bill to prohibit the mailing of any unsolicited credit cards, H.R. 858, was put before the Congress by Representative Richard Ottinger of New York. Voting through the National Federation of Independent Business, the independent business owners react in this way: 80 percent favor the measure, 16 percent oppose it, and 4 percent have no opinion.)

Mass mailing of credit cards has no mass appeal for the nation's independent business owners.

The practice of mailing credit cards to "everybody in the phone book", instead of only to those who request them or those with good credit histories, is frowned upon by the independents, says the National Federation of Independent Business.

This technique has been used by banks in promoting their credit card plans and by some major oil companies.

Credit never came so easy. Too easy, say critics of mass credit merchandising, including Representative Richard Ottinger of New York, who has introduced a bill to prohibit entirely the mailing of unsolicited credit cards. Independent businessmen polled by the National Federation of Independent Business concur: 80 percent endorse this action, which supports the position taken by the Nixon administration, only 16 percent object, and 4 percent have no opinion.

In (Name of State), — percent favor the restriction, — percent are against it, and — percent are undecided.

The bill to amend the U.S. mail regulations carries a \$10,000 fine for a violation.

The businessmen's strong stand against unsolicited credit card mailings comes despite the fact that many independent retailers are participating in bank credit card plans. The Federation's continuous field survey shows that 35 percent of the retailers make credit card sales and do 18 percent of their volume on them.

Many small retailers find this preferable to carrying accounts themselves, and it gives them "easy credit" to rival the big stores' revolving credit plans.

Nevertheless, four out of five independents want to see Representative Ottinger's bill become law. Many unsolicited cards are lost or stolen which can result in a person being billed for charges he did not incur on a credit card he did not ask for and never received. A legal cloud hangs over such situations.

Banks claim more screening of mail lists has reduced such problems.

Fundamentally, too, many businessmen believe that credit should be granted only to those who ask for it and have demonstrated they will make good on their obligations. Many complain of the many "deadbeats", the problems of collecting past-due accounts, and the ease of bankruptcy.

Some independents are alarmed at the magnitude of consumer credit, nearly \$100 billion in short-term debt, and fear possible economic collapse if uncollectibles mounted. Mass mailing of credit cards—which has increased consumer debt sharply—is reprehensible, in this view.

The Federation research staff concludes that, whatever the individual businessmen may think about the "credit card explosion" and the trend to a "cashless society", a huge majority firmly supports regulation of credit card distribution.

#### STATE BREAKDOWN FIGURES—A BILL TO PROHIBIT THE MAILING OF UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS

State	Percent in favor	Percent against	Percent undecided
Alabama	78	14	8
Alaska	65	33	2
Arizona	79	18	3
Arkansas	79	15	6
California	82	14	4
Colorado	79	17	5
Connecticut	86	9	5
Delaware	83	15	2
Florida	76	19	5
Georgia	80	15	5
Hawaii	80	17	3
Idaho	78	19	3
Illinois	83	13	4
Indiana	83	12	5
Iowa	82	13	5
Kansas	79	17	4
Kentucky	78	17	5
Louisiana	74	20	6
Maine	80	14	6
Maryland	85	12	3
Massachusetts	78	18	4
Michigan	84	13	3
Minnesota	81	15	4
Mississippi	77	19	4
Missouri	80	16	4
Montana	73	23	4
Nebraska	82	14	4
Nevada	79	20	1
New Hampshire	82	14	4
New Jersey	87	9	4
New Mexico	64	29	7
New York	85	12	3
North Carolina	83	13	4
North Dakota	80	17	3
Ohio	80	16	4
Oklahoma	79	15	6
Oregon	79	15	6
Pennsylvania	83	13	4
Rhode Island	74	21	5
South Carolina	81	15	4
South Dakota	82	14	4
Tennessee	78	17	5
Texas	75	21	4
Utah	72	23	5
Vermont	75	19	6
Virginia	82	16	2
Washington	82	13	5
Washington, D.C.	100	—	4
West Virginia	79	17	4
Wisconsin	85	11	4
Wyoming	73	25	2

#### STATEMENT ON MAILING OF UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS

(By Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of New York, for inclusion in the public record of the Federal Trade Commission trade regulation rule proceeding)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express my views, at this public

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

hearing, for a proposed rule which would prohibit the mailing of credit cards in the absence of an expressed written request, or an expressed written consent from the recipient.

I hope the hearing today will emphasize the urgent need for new controls to curb the unfair practices and abuses arising from the mailing and issuing of these cards, and that the Federal Reserve, having jurisdiction over commercial banks—which in my view are among the major unsolicited credit card offenders—and those regulatory agencies having jurisdiction over common carriers and air carriers (exempted from any rule which might be promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission) will consider and initiate new supervisory regulations in this area.

In April of 1968, I urged the Post Office Department to prohibit, by regulation, the mailing of unsolicited credit cards and require that requested cards be sent by registered mail. I was told by the Postmaster General that this practice did not appear to violate the provisions of any postal law, and, legally, an Act of Congress would be required to achieve my purpose.

In response to the apparent need for Legislation to protect consumers from the possible adverse affects of issuing companies mailing practices, and in response to the encouraging number and quality of mail I received supporting my position on credit cards, I introduced a bill on June 11, 1968, to restrict the mailing of credit cards.

I am particularly concerned over the number of Americans who carry and use credit cards; the number of credit cards that are in circulation in the United States; the volume of credit that is extended through the use of credit cards, and the possibility of a credit card being intercepted and used fraudulently before it reaches the prospective customer.

It would be very much in the public interest for the Commission to issue a Trade Regulation Rule to curb the widespread practice of mailing unsolicited credit cards, and I urge that such action be taken without delay.

I submit that the practices and abuses arising out of the mailing and issuing of credit cards such as issued by retail department stores, marketers and retail dealers of gasoline, travel and entertainment credit card establishments and other credit card issuers—the subject of this hearing—and the obvious adverse affect bank and check credit cards can have on our economy and the individual consumer, indicate an urgent need for control over the mailing and issuing of these cards.

Extremely vital issues are at stake here—individual consumer credit and the economy of the nation. We cannot afford to overlook them or take them lightly. These issues warrant action, now.

## COOPERATION OF BUSINESS WITH GOVERNMENT URGED

## HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there is an ever-increasing awareness of the need for Federal-State-local cooperation in financing and managing the many programs for the benefit of all of our people.

There is also an ever-growing awareness of the need of added cooperation between business and the Government.

This awareness is evidenced by the fol-

lowing editorial which appeared in the Brainerd Daily Dispatch in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District on Friday, September 19. I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

## COOPERATION OF BUSINESS WITH GOVERNMENT URGED

Cooperation of business with government is being urged by the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, who is also publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, believes that the opportunity has now arrived for a level of cooperation between business and government which hasn't existed for many years.

"If businessmen ignore recent pleas by government for cooperation and counsel, it will be a grievous error," Jones told a group of business executives in Washington. "Cussing the government is fun, but we see on every hand areas where cooperation makes a lot of sense."

The Chamber president cited government-business cooperation in such areas as training the hard-core unemployed, working to improve the vocational training programs, and government pleas to the construction industry to devise new building techniques for low-cost housing in mass volume.

As a result of such cooperation, Jones said, the old tendency to pile one government agency on another is being dampened. Instead, private firms are contracting to operate economic and social development projects.

Business-government cooperation works both ways, he pointed out. Without the aid of government, for example, business wouldn't get very far with a satellite communications system.

Observers recently have noted an increased tendency on the part of the government bureaus toward the idea of enlisting groups of citizens, particularly members of the business community, in joint efforts toward solving problems.

Today's Chamber leadership believes businessmen should respond with warmth to these invitations from governmental leaders.

## GREEN BERET AFFAIR

## HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Columnist William S. White, in a recent newspaper column, discussed the unfortunate Green Beret affair. Mr. White, in criticizing the manner in which the entire matter was handled, notes the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, PETER RODINO, as well as those of the Honorable CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, and the Honorable PAUL ROGERS of Florida.

Congressman RODINO has been especially active in seeking protection for the accused soldiers. I wish to commend him and the other Members who took it upon themselves to insure that the soldiers received fair treatment.

Columnist White's article follows:

## BAD GREEN BERET DECISION

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The Army will long regret its decision to try the Green Berets for murder in a field military court martial whose verdict, by the very nature of the circumstances, will be forever debatable.

Already, there had been an ugly odor arising from this cloak-and-dagger case, which

October 7, 1969

involves the killing of a South Vietnamese, Thai Khac Chuyen, claimed by defense counsel to have been a double agent. For the principal defendant, Col. Robert Rheault of the Special Forces in Vietnam, had had a record of marked heroism and devotion to duty, and the issues raised here have frightening implications.

Already, some Americans with past experience in the darker and clandestine side of warfare had been wondering aloud whether the colonel and his associates were perhaps being thrown to the wolves under pressure from the South Vietnamese government or, alternatively, simply because they followed the harsh orders of wartime in an action that backfired upon higher authorities.

Such suggestions may, of course, be utterly unwarranted, given all the inside facts, and this columnist, for one, strongly suspects that just this is the case. Nevertheless, a court martial in the field, with all its inherent power to retreat behind security clampdowns, is the very last forum for a satisfactory inquest into this business.

The plain truth is that all sorts of sinister and quite likely fantastically false rumors have been flying about for months—whispers that the Central Intelligence Agency had reason to want Thai Khac Chuyen liquidated; and that some of the regular Army types were jealous of the elite Green Berets; and so on.

The mere existence of such rumors strongly supports the wisdom of protests made in Congress that this extraordinarily difficult thing should have been transferred to Washington for trial and ventilation under supervision of the very highest authorities in the Pentagon.

Rep. Peter Rodino of New Jersey, for example, declares "no confidence" in the fairness of a court martial in a battlefield area, given all that has been muttered about this affair. Rep. Paul Rogers of Florida fears we may be seeing the establishment of a precedent under which "any American fighting man could be charged with murder for carrying out an order which resulted in the death of an enemy."

The Democratic leader of the House, Rep. Carl Albert of Oklahoma, is concerned that the most basic rights of American soldiers might become "bargaining points" in this country's relationship with allies.

Now, none of these three members of Congress knows the full story, of course. But this is the very point. They should know it or be able to learn it. And at all events, none of the three is a jaw-flapping politician and all three are men of the highest sense of responsibility.

One can sympathize with the dilemma of Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor, who has declined to intervene against the field court martial on the ground that he should not tamper with the ordinary course of military justice. But this is any thing but an ordinary case.

Apart from the central fact that it involves the liberties and honor of men who have repeatedly put their lives on the line for the rest of us, there is another immense consideration. The entire military service has long been under sustained and even savage attack from the new pacifists.

Already, it is hard enough to find young men willing to take on the hard role of the combat officer.

Any suspicion, however false, that such officers can be destroyed by hindsight judgments to placate either an ally or an anti-military bloc here at home must be smashed. And it can only be smashed in the full light of day. The critics of the Army here are as friends; not its enemies.

Everybody concerned, including a CIA unable by its function to talk back in public, would be better off by a method of justice not only done, but justice also seen to have been done.

October 7, 1969

29023

## PROGRAMS AND PROGRESS

### HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and privilege that I rise to draw attention of the Members of this body to an outstanding youth organization which has done and is doing much to involve youth in the American political system.

The Teen Age Republicans—TARS—has just prepared a report of their activities that was presented to the National Federation of Republican Women's recent convention here in Washington.

As former chairman of the Young Republicans, I presided over the growth of TARS to a truly national organization and have been very interested in their subsequent development under the tremendous leadership of the current national director, Barbara Wells.

I think the Members will be interested to see how this organization is providing an opportunity for our youth to "plug-in" to the political system.

Mr. Speaker, I include this report in the RECORD at this point:

#### PROGRAMS AND PROGRESS (By Barbara Wells)

#### NATIONAL TAR HEADQUARTERS

National TAR Headquarters was established in December, 1965. The purpose was to get young people involved in constructive political action: first by educating them in the traditional Republican principles of free enterprise, constitutional government, and patriotism; and second by training them in the techniques of practical politics to help elect Republican candidates to local, state, and national office.

State TAR Directors have been appointed in all 50 States to coordinate TAR activity. (In most states, each Congressional District also has a TAR coordinator.) Contact has been established with TAR Clubs, Advisors, and general membership in all parts of the country.

The direction and operation of the TAR office has—from the beginning—been the responsibility of National TAR Director, Barbey Wells. TAR Headquarters employs three full time secretaries, two part time college students, and one part time bookkeeper. However, this past summer the National TAR staff consisted of 3 TAR Field Representatives, four College Young Republicans, and two Teen Age Republican volunteers. TAR Headquarters from its establishment has been self supporting and receives no funds from either YRNF or RNC.

Upon opening, TAR Headquarters received a TAR mailing list composed of 257 names. Today, we have a TAR leadership list of 21,000 names categorized into 5,082 Clubs representing a total national TAR membership of approximately 101,000 Teen Age Republicans nationwide.

The TAR office houses and maintains its own list. Scriptomatic allows us a wide range of selectivity and by simple end notching we are able to classify important information. Following the Election, TAR Headquarters acquired the national Youth for Nixon names. TAR staffers processed all 7,000 names and added to our TAR mailing list those persons who were 17 years old and younger. By punching the "year of high school graduation" on each card we are able to keep our mailing list current and also supply the College Republican National Committee with

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the names and addresses of all high school graduates.

#### NATIONAL TAR LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

The first annual National TAR Leadership Conference was held in Washington June 16-21 at Trinity College, and by everyone's estimate, was an overwhelming success. One hundred fifty-two state and local TAR officers participated in the Conference representing a total of 33 states. The TARS who attended arrived full of excitement and anticipation, as they came seeking an insight into some of the problems that confront us today. The TARS challenged, debated, and questioned many of the speakers as they discussed such topics as: "Cold War Hot Spots", "Semantic Warfare", "The New Left", "The Volunteer Army", "Biafra", "Voluntary Action", "Vietnam", "Campus Unrest", "Communism", "Free Market Economics", and "Systematic Conflict." The list of speakers included Senators Goldwater, Thurmond, and Packwood; Congressmen Frey, Buchanan, Lukens, Riegle, and Goldwater; Phil Luce, Dr. Walter Judd, Dr. Erik Vesely, and many others. TARS found the White House Panel composed of Harry Dent, Pat Buchanan, and Tom Cole particularly interesting along with Miss Alice Hipsley of HUD; Martin Anderson, who is a special assistant to the President; and Lea Meyers, a staff member of the White House Voluntary Action Committee.

One of the most exciting events of the week was the reception for all of the TARS in the East Garden of the White House. Tricia Nixon was the hostess for this event, and all the TARS were given an opportunity to talk with her and get autographs. The White House photographer was on hand to take pictures. Following the White House tour and reception, the group loaded back into the waiting buses to go to Capitol Hill for an afternoon session on how some of the major House and Senate Committees are run and to talk with Congressmen and Committee staff members. Immediately following this session, which was held in the House Ways and Means Committee room, a Congressional reception was held in honor of the TARS in the Rayburn Building. A great many of the GOP Congressmen and Senators were on hand to welcome these TAR leaders to Washington. Our Republican "Cheerleaders" were at the reception for a "warm-up" preceding the annual Congressional Ballgame which was held that evening. All of the TARS again loaded on the buses and headed for D.C. Stadium where they cheered our Republican team on to victory as they once again defeated the Democrats by 6-2.

The banquet held on Thursday night at picturesque Evans Farm Inn in nearby Virginia was designed as a special treat for all the TARS. TARS arrived in plenty of time to visit the Antique Shop and wander the grounds prior to the banquet. National YR Chairman, Jack McDonald, was the featured speaker.

Although the Conference schedule was a full one from early morning until late in the evening, the TARS in attendance still found time to organize a number of committees to discuss problems and make suggestions regarding TAR programming, fund raising, membership recruitment, National TARS, and many other items that are essential for good TAR organization. Some of these committees were hard at work until the early morning hours and as a result many good suggestions came from the committee reports presented to the entire conference on Saturday.

#### NATIONAL TAR CAMPS

The 5 camps this summer were held during the month of August in the following locations:

TAR Camp East, Camp Caesar, Webster Springs, West Virginia.

TAR Camp West, Boise State College, Boise, Idaho.

TAR Camp Midwest, Boone 4-H Camp, Boone, Iowa.

TAR Camp South, Centenary College, Shreveport, Louisiana.

TAR Camp New England, State YMCA Camp, Winthrop, Maine.

This summer's National TAR activities drew TARS from 46 states including the District of Columbia. The largest National TAR Camp was TAR Camp South held in Shreveport. All 12 Southern states were represented.

Speaker at the camps included such Republican personalities as Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska, Governor Arch Moore of West Virginia, Lieutenant Governor Jepson of Iowa, Congressmen Orval Hansen, James A. McClure, and Buz Lukens; Former Congressman Stan Tupper of Maine, State Representative Martin Linsky of Massachusetts, News Commentator Fulton Lewis III, and many other GOP leaders.

In addition to the many outstanding speakers at each of the camps, TARS learned a great deal by organizing their own activities. During the TAR Camp "mock legislatures" TARS were given an opportunity to discuss current problems facing us today and offer possible solutions. The debate teams organized at camp allowed TARS to discuss the pros and cons of issues directly affecting them such as the 18 year old vote, drugs, and the voluntary army, while other activities such as the camp newspaper gave them practical experience in writing and producing a newsletter.

Workshops at the camp covered the following topics: Modern campaign techniques, American Domestic & Foreign Policy; TAR Club Organization, Community Action, Free Market, Economics, The New Left: Vietnam, Precinct Organization, Computers in Politics and the Urban Crisis.

For the third year, seminars were held at each camp in Drug abuse education. We were fortunate this year to have representatives from the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, State Youth Councils on Drug Abuse, and at four of the camps the students had a unique opportunity to hear and talk with a former addict about his experiences with marihuana, speed, LSD, heroin, and other drugs.

A member of the TAR Staff and a Field Representative attended each of the National Camps this year and during the week met with each individual state delegation at the camp to discuss particular problems within their state and to find new ways to expand their organizations. In addition, the Field Representative gave a seminar at each camp on TAR Club programming and activities as well as services available through National TAR Headquarters. TAR Staff personnel held meetings with adults at the camp to discuss ways in which adult advisors could most effectively assist TAR groups in their areas.

Between seminars, various committees were organized by the TARS to exchange ideas and suggestions for membership recruitment, finance, campaigning, programming, community service, special projects and many other areas essential for an effective TAR organization.

#### NATIONAL TAR FIELD PROGRAM

TAR Headquarters launched a summer Field Program and hired three immediate past State TAR Chairmen to participate in this new program. In the course of the summer, the TAR Field Representatives traveled to twenty nine state TAR Camps and Workshops to meet with state, county, and individual TAR Club officers and assist them in organizational techniques and TAR Club programming.

Due to time, money, and limited number of people, National TAR Field Representatives only spent 2 or 3 days in each State. States are already requesting that field personnel spend a minimum of a week for the purpose of traveling throughout "target

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 7, 1969

counties" assisting State TAR leadership in organizing new TAR Clubs and "beefing up" existing ones.

The overall success of the TAR Field Program was phenomenal and National TAR Headquarters plans to not only continue—but greatly expand—TAR fieldwork in the years ahead.

## TAR SERVICES

*Organizational materials*

TAR organization materials ranging from helpful hints on increasing TAR membership and better Club programming to precinct booklets and Advisors' manuals are all available at National TAR Headquarters. On an average we send out some 3,000 pieces of literature each month and since the opening of the TAR office we have distributed approximately 132,000 pamphlets, manuals, books, brochures, and guides. New manuals which have been written during the past 3 months include TAR Financing, an updated version of TAR Club Programming, TAR Campaign Guide, SOS Manual, and What Republican Leaders Say. The TAR Drug Abuse Manual will be available on October 1, 1969.

*Film library*

TAR Headquarters has built a library of thirty two films and hopes to purchase an additional eighteen more by October. All of the films have been previewed and are officially recommended by the TAR office. Thus far this year we have answered 161 requests for films from numerous TAR Clubs. Films are sent to TARS free of charge and the only cost to the Club is that of return postage and insurance. The number of requests has significantly increased since last November's elections as TARS are turning to new means of recruiting additional TAR members.

*Books and seminars*

During the past 3½ years TAR Headquarters has distributed thousands of paperback books free of charge to TAR Clubs. To name a few of the books:

"Economics in One Lesson" (Henry Hazlitt).

"Reflections on the Failure of Socialism" (Max Eastman).

"Reclaiming the American Dream" (Cornuelle).

"Intelligent Student's Guide to Survival" (Luce & Hyde).

"Masters of Deceit" (J. Edgar Hoover).

"Road to Revolution" (Phillip Luce).

Seminars on Freedom vs. Communism, Basic Economics, and Practical Politics are available at the TAR office, and additional seminars are currently under preparation.

*TAR publicity*

Since August, 1968, TAR Headquarters has subscribed to a national Press Clipping Service and each week receives news coverage of Teen Age Republicans across the country. The clipping service is invaluable in that it keeps TAR Headquarters up to date on numerous TAR activities, and alerts us to many newly organized Clubs.

Letters of congratulations are sent to those TAR Clubs and Club leaders who receive newspaper coverage, and as a follow-up TAR Headquarters sends lists of all new TAR Clubs to each State TAR Director.

It's amazing how much publicity Teen Age Republicans all across the country receive and during the campaign TAR Headquarters was receiving over 150 clippings a week!

*Speakers bureau*

Prominent political leaders on tour are being made available to State, District, and local TAR meetings. TAR Headquarters is in constant contact with numerous Congressional offices and attempts to keep an overall schedule of the out-of-district speaking engagements of those Members of Congress (104) serving on the National TAR Advisory Committee. As a result TAR Clubs are able

to avoid paying transportation costs as the visiting dignitary addresses the area TARS in addition to his other speaking commitments in the community.

## NATIONAL TAR NEWSLETTER

The response to TARGET—the official newsletter of Teen Age Republicans—has been tremendous. Through TARGET, Clubs and their Advisors are kept informed of the various national projects and services available in Washington as well as apprised of activities of other TAR Federations and Clubs across the country. In essence, the newsletter serves as a clearing house of ideas and new programs for Club development.

TAR Clubs—as well as individual TARS—are encouraged to "subscribe" to TARGET for \$2 yearly. However, TARGET is mailed to all TARS (21,000) on the National TAR mailing list regardless of whether they have officially subscribed.

## TAR NEWSLETTER EXCHANGE DIRECTORY

TAR Headquarters has been in the process of mailing a NEWSLETTER EXCHANGE SURVEY to all State and TAR Club officers. State TAR Federations and individual TAR Clubs who wish to be listed in a Newsletter Exchange DIRECTORY are returning these forms to the TAR Headquarters and consequently will be listed in this new directory to be available October 1. It was the consensus at all the National TAR Camps that new ideas for programming, recruitment, and fund raising projects could be more easily obtained through a national Newsletter Exchange program. Here again, TAR Headquarters is encouraging closer communication between TAR Clubs on a State and Regional level.

## DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM

Drug abuse is one of the most important issues facing young people today. National TAR Headquarters strongly feels that teenagers should be knowledgeable on the subject of "dangerous drugs" and should be aware of the dangers—both physical and mental—resulting from the use of narcotics, and has therefore launched a nation-wide education program aimed at the Junior and Senior High School students throughout the country.

By working with other state and national organizations who specialize in drug abuse education, TARS are now able to obtain literature and films about this important subject through the TAR office. TAR Headquarters has been in close contact with a number of organizations including the Bureau of Drug Abuse and Control, Justice Department, Smith, Kline, and French Laboratories, D.C. Drug Addiction Rehabilitation Center, Department of Defense, the Food and Drug Administration, Blue Shield, American Pharmaceutical Association, American Medical Association, National Association of Retail Druggists, National Institute of Mental Health, Oregon Council on Drug Problems, Smart Set International, and others. In addition, we are working closely with the officers of Congressman Gil Gude and Bill Steiger, as well as other Members of Congress interested in this important subject.

TAR Headquarters has previewed ten films on drug abuse and three of them are being officially recommended to TAR Clubs. These will be added to our film library and loaned to local TAR Clubs free of charge. In addition, a wide range of pamphlets, brochures, flyers, and posters have been read and sorted by the TAR Staff in preparing a packet of materials that will best suit the needs of today's teenagers in . . . the ghetto . . . suburbs . . . and rural areas. These materials cover the psychological, physical, and legal aspects of the drug problem, and the packet of materials can be easily updated as more current information becomes available. We are also planning to use materials and information compiled by the Republican National Committee in order to have a completely coordinated program.

In developing this program, National TARS—for the third year—held drug abuse seminars at all of the National TAR Camps. A two-part program was presented in which TARS learned the various types of narcotics, their potency, and the body's reaction to these stimulants and depressants. During the second session, TARS had the unique opportunity of hearing a testimonial from an ex-addict who related his personal experiences with drugs such as Marijuana, LSD, Speed, Heroin, and others. This program proved to be one of the most popular topics discussed at the camps and many of the TARS are already launching drug education programs in their schools and communities.

A number of Washington area TARS have assisted with this program in providing guidance and direction to our efforts. With their help we have been able to find out what approach and which materials are the most effective with teenagers. Our aim is to provide the facts, eliminating the scare tactics and the appeals to the emotions too often used. It is only through early drug abuse education that we will finally be able to slow the traffic in drugs which is rising at such an alarming rate and claiming the lives and futures of our nation's young people.

## COMMUNITY ACTION

"Freedom is neither automatic nor confirmed by the happenstance of birth or geography. Freedom must be earned again by each succeeding generation through the sound exercise of its citizenship responsibilities."—National Governors' Conference Report.

Recognizing that effective citizenship must start at the local level and be locally initiated, National Teen Age Republicans urges—and persistently encourages—all TAR Clubs to initiate monthly community service projects.

TAR Headquarters distributes free of charge copies of Reclaiming The American Dream and has an assortment of community service manuals available.

In addition to their organizational, educational, and campaign activities, TARS all across the Nation find plenty of time to be involved in community action projects.

## SUPPORT OUR SERVICEMEN

National TAR Headquarters' Support Our Servicemen program has met with phenomenal success and hundreds of TAR Clubs are supplying Military Hospitals in Vietnam and men in the field with needed personal items. TARS working with the American Red Cross are also supplying SREO Units and Clubmobiles with such items as tape recorders, projectors, cameras, and record players.

In addition, many TAR Clubs have adopted a South Vietnamese child while others are making Friendship Kits containing small toys, jump ropes, and balloons which are distributed by our Marines as part of the Pacification Program.

TARS are also writing individual service-men in Vietnam. National TAR Headquarters has established a close working relationship with the Chapel Foundation of Saint Louis, Missouri. TARS who do not know soldiers in Vietnam are now able to obtain names of individual servicemen from their own states.

A great majority of TAR Clubs have appointed SOS Chairmen and the newly published SOS Manual is available at National TAR Headquarters.

## AMERICANS FOR BIAFRAN RELIEF

National TAR Headquarters has endorsed the Americans For Biafran Relief and TARS all across the country are participating in this project.

A special "Biafra" mailing was sent to our entire National TAR mailing list and articles promoting this program have appeared in the May issue of "Notes From Here and There" and the June-July issue of TARGET. In addition, a comprehensive Biafra packet has been designed containing materials and spe-

cific instructions on how to participate in this worthwhile project.

TAR Clubs throughout the United States are enthusiastically raising money for the continuation and expansion of the airlift to Biafra, and this National TAR Program—like SOS—continues to be one of the most popular TAR projects.

#### STARS AND STRIPES FOREVER

National TAR Headquarters is proud to announce the adoption of a new project allowing Teen Age Republicans across the nation to display their patriotic colors by distributing colorful red, white, and blue plastic American flag decals free of charge. In cooperation with the Gulf Oil Corporation, National TARS will have available a large supply of American flag decals for distribution by TARS to be placed in the window of any automobile or home.

We encourage all Americans to join with the Teen Age Republicans in proclaiming a faith in America by proudly displaying the "Stars and Stripes." Make every day American Flag Day.

#### TAR PAGE PROGRAM

The TAR Page Program was first established at the 1965 National Young Republican Convention. TAR Pages were again selected to serve at the recent Young Republican National Convention held in Chicago, Illinois.

A number of TARS (approximately 70) were chosen to represent their own states and to serve as Pages to Convention officials and state delegations. The TAR Page Program—sponsored by National TARS—not only provided personnel to assist with convention business, but also gave these high school students the opportunity to see a political convention in full operation. During nonconvention hours a special program for TARS took place and throughout the week informal meetings and "coke sessions" were held in the TAR Suite at the Hilton Hotel.

#### AWARDS FOR OUTSTANDING TAR SERVICE

At the Young Republican National Convention in July, TAR Director Barby Wells, presented awards to the Outstanding TAR Boy and Outstanding TAR Girl in the Nation as well as to the Outstanding TAR Club in small, medium, and large categories. Also—for the first time, an award was presented to the Outstanding State TAR Director.

The recipients of these awards are:

Tar boy: Jeff Hollingsworth . . . selected Outstanding TAR in Maine and also serves as State Treasurer and Chairman of the Belfast TARS. In June he attended Maine Boys State and was elected Governor.

TAR girl: Kathi Drew . . . Chairman of the Dallas County TAR Federation in Texas and has done a fantastic job as leader of this 785 member TAR organization. She was also selected as the Outstanding TAR Girl in the State of Texas.

TAR director: Mrs. Stevie White . . . State TAR Director of Kentucky. Mrs. White has devoted "hundreds of hours" during the past two years to building a strong TAR Federation in Kentucky and has been the major force behind their success. She also is the Young Republican National Committee-woman.

Small club: Steam Boat Rock TARS . . . This Club of 25 members was also chosen this year as the Outstanding TAR Club in Iowa. Steam Boat Rock TARS, although small in number, have enthusiastically participated in all phases of TAR activity.

Medium club: Scranton TARS . . . Working out of their own headquarters in Scranton, Pennsylvania, this 125 member Club was also national winner of the Operation Kinfolk Contest. Special congratulations go to this Club for their exceptional work in the precincts.

Large club: Dallas County TARS . . . With close to 800 members Dallas TARS were one

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of the major factors in the victory of Congressman Jim Collins. Like the other Club winners this TAR Club also participates in a wide range of TAR activities.

Supplementing these awards, National TAR Headquarters is initiating a brand new awards program to further stimulate interest and action in TARS at all levels. National TARS will recognize the Outstanding TAR Boy and Girl in each State . . . Outstanding TAR Club in three categories within each State . . . Outstanding State TAR Newsletter in the country . . . the "five" most Outstanding State TAR Directors.

#### 1968 CAMPAIGN REPORT

Activities of literally thousands of TAR volunteers all across the country played a major role in putting dozens of Senatorial, Congressional, and State House candidates over the top last November.

Just one example is the victory of Bill Whitehurst. Over 500 TARS (under the leadership of State TAR Chairman, Sammy Howlett of Norfolk, Va.) worked long hours spending afternoons, Saturdays, and Sundays blitzing shopping centers with literature; assisting at Whitehurst Headquarters; and conducting voter registration drives. Even on school mornings the youngsters were up at dawn manning their TAR "Coffee Booth," serving free coffee and distributing brochures at factory entrances. They hand made and placed over 3,000 yard signs and canvassed thousands of homes in the heavily Democratic 2nd District. The result: a Republican was elected to Congress . . . the first Republican to hold this seat in 40 years!

#### Nixon-Agnew pumpkins

On Halloween Night, 1968, thousands of TARS blitzed precincts throughout the United States and informed neighbors they were not asking for treats, but "giving" them by distributing Nixon-Agnew literature along with brochures promoting Congressional and local candidates. In addition to circulating campaign literature, TARS affixed to each doorknob a large orange pumpkin reading "Even the Great Pumpkin Is Voting Nixon-Agnew". Headquarters printed and distributed the pumpkins to hundreds of clubs across the country. At the final tally some 202,000 pumpkins had been distributed by TARS.

#### Operation Kinfolk

This project sought to encourage people who are old enough to vote, to support the Nixon-Agnew ticket. TARS sent postcards to their voting friends and relatives, urging them to support the Nixon-Agnew team. All Operation Kinfolk cards were furnished to Club Chairmen by National TAR headquarters. Each club submitted a report after the cards had been mailed and prizes were awarded to winning clubs in each of three divisions based on the size of the club. Each of the winning clubs received a gold engraved plaque, TAR sweatshirts for each member, and the Club President and Operation Kinfolk Chairman had the opportunity to visit the White House in June. The winning clubs were:

Large Club: Scranton, Pennsylvania TARS.

Medium Club: Geneseo, Illinois TARS.

Small Club: Merrill, Wisconsin TARS.

#### Campaigning with coffee

The TAR "Win Votes with Coffee" program which was co-sponsored by TAR Headquarters and the National Coffee Information Service was a tremendous success. The heart of the program was a specially prepared TAR Campaigning Manual, "Hitting the Victory Trail", which outlines specific how-to information. Among the vote-getting devices described is a coffee booth for use at shopping plazas, football stadiums, commuter stations, factories, and any other high traffic location.

TARS who attended National Camps learned about the "Win Votes with Coffee"

program first hand at an hour-long seminar discussing specific coffee campaigning techniques and including the construction of a sample Campaign Coffee Booth. Following the seminar, delegates took part in a workshop during which they created a demonstration TAR Campaign Coffee House where they later relaxed and enjoyed fancy coffee house drinks. The program was also presented at as many State Camps as possible.

The manual and coffee booth kit are still available at TAR Headquarters and many TAR Clubs are using the booth to promote the GOP at State and County Fairs.

#### *A sign-in at the supermarket!*

Thousands of TARS participated in the Nixon-Agnew volunteers day and played a major role in making this program successful by blitzing neighborhoods and shopping centers.

TARS set up a series of shopping center blitzes and stationed teams of TARS both inside and outside the numerous stores. Many TAR Clubs used their "Campaigning with Coffee" booths, displaying the pennants, banner, and bunting. Others ad libbed with crepe paper, Nixon signs, and literature, and set up a half dozen decorated card tables in their local shopping areas. They decorated several "blitz boxes" so people would have a place to put their newly signed "commitment cards."

A total of one million five hundred thousand "commitment cards" were distributed by TARS in all fifty states.

#### *Certificates of appreciation*

Following the Election, TAR Headquarters supplied to all TAR Club presidents special "Certificates of Appreciation" which were presented to the many, many deserving TARS who had put forth that "extra bit of effort" in helping to elect Republicans to local, state, and national office.

## INTELLIGENCE REPORT ON TODAY'S "NEW REVOLUTIONARIES"

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, those who viewed the program "The FBI" last Sunday evening saw Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., as Inspector Erskine, give information at the end of the regular program concerning Cameron D. Bishop, a member of Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—who is currently being sought by the Bureau. The case of Bishop is illustrative of the severe threat posed by two organizations, the SDS and the Black Panther Party, to the peace and order of our Nation.

The average citizen has neither the time nor the facilities to keep abreast of the activities of these and other violence-prone organizations whose excesses have made headlines in the recent past. Consequently, the October issue of the Reader's Digest renders the public a service by providing a compact and easily readable rundown of recent cases of terror and destruction not unlike the guerrilla tactics of the Vietcong in present-day Saigon.

The article, "Intelligence Report on Today's 'New Revolutionaries'" compels the reader to realize with a shock that the hate-filled violence of today is not confined to Vietnam, but now occurs in the law-based society here at home. The author, William Schulz, long familiar

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 7, 1969

with the workings of subversive and disruptive elements of the home-grown variety, has availed himself of the "documented findings by congressional probbers, U.S. law-enforcement agencies, and State and local authorities" to sound a note of warning to those understandably engrossed in the more peaceful exigencies of everyday living.

The maintenance of a free and ordered system is, in varying degrees, everyone's business. But no longer can we content ourselves with faithful compliance with the laws alone. The adequacy of law-enforcement facilities, the judgments of parole boards and local and Federal judges, permissiveness and individual culpability—these are but a few of the areas which require public involvement.

A thoughtful reading of the above-mentioned excellent article by William Schulz in this month's Reader's Digest should help engender added public concern toward eliminating these anarchistic elements from our midst, and for this reason I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

## INTELLIGENCE REPORT ON TODAY'S "NEW REVOLUTIONARIES"

(By William Schulz)

At New York University, members of the Students for a Democratic Society slip into an auditorium where the Ambassador from South Vietnam is scheduled to speak. At a given signal, they storm the stage, manhandle the Ambassador and flee the hall. The young activists then proceed to another room, batter down the doors and forcibly prevent *New York Times* columnist James Reston from delivering his speech.

During a period of agitation by student radicals in Claremont, Calif., a secretary at Pomona College removes a bulky package from a college mailbox. As she does, the box explodes, blinding the woman in one eye, causing loss of two fingers and badly disfiguring her face.

At Tougaloo College in Mississippi, students from Negro colleges in the South and East attend a closed-door "defense workshop," discuss the elimination of mayors and police chiefs, the kidnaping of college authorities, the instruction of ghetto residents in the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and use of firearms.

These recent incidents, by no means isolated, are graphic illustrations of a new breed of revolutionary violence that is gravely threatening America. Its iron-fisted methods, often masked behind a shield of legitimate concerns, are doing severe disservice to honest protest in our society. "This has gone beyond the issues," says Prof. Harvey Mansfield of strife-torn Columbia University. "It is naked force against the democratic process."

The FBI supplies grim statistics: in 12 months more than 225 campuses were rocked by organized terror and violence; campus radicals accounted for more than \$3 million in damages as research labs, ROTC buildings, even auditoriums were bombed; police in more than 40 cities were the target of guerrilla attacks.

Not surprisingly, apprehensive citizens in all parts of the country are asking: Who are the New Radicals? How do they operate? Who is financing them? How extensively are they assisted from abroad?

Here, then, is an intelligence report based upon months of nationwide research and the accumulation of documented findings by Congressional probbers, U.S. law-enforcement agencies, and state and local authorities. In the words of Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.), whose U.S. Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee has conducted extensive hearings: "The public now deserves to be acquainted with the cold, irrefutable facts."

*Alliance of Terror.* The revolutionary menace consists of a highly dangerous minority of perhaps 20,000 activists embedded within an overall movement of 200,000 radical dissidents. At the core of the movement, security officials agree, are two groups, one white and one black, both with grandiose plans for the overthrow of a "decadent" American society. They are:

The Students for a Democratic Society, activated in 1962 by a handful of students from less than a dozen campuses. Today, SDS claims 70,000 followers on 350 campuses, and its national leaders—virtually all non-students—proudly rattle off a string of revolutionary victories scored last year at schools from Havard to San Francisco State.\*

The Black Panther Party, a virulent, self-styled "armed revolutionary vanguard." In less than two years, the Panthers have mushroomed from a 125-man contingent based solely in Oakland, Calif., to a nationwide operation with 60,000 sympathizers and chapters in two dozen cities. "Schooled in the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the teachings of Mao Tse-tung," reports the FBI, "Panther members have perpetrated numerous assaults on police officers and engaged in violent confrontations with police throughout the country."

Throughout the early part of 1969, national leaders of SDS and the Black Panther Party held top-secret strategy sessions to discuss plans and coordinate strategy. The meetings were hardly surprising, for the extremist blacks and the revolutionary whites have much in common: a hatred for present-day America, and idolization of Fidel Castro and Mao Tse-tung, and abiding faith in violence as the means of destroying American society.

Bombs and Bombast. Thus, last fall, activists attending the SDS national council meeting at Boulder, Colo., were supplied copies of a pamphlet that set forth detailed instructions on the manufacture of fire bombs, train mines, even hand grenades. This and other manuals were circulated widely among SDS and other activists from coast to coast—with predictable results.

At Washington University in St. Louis, a 22-year-old SDS member, Michael S. Siskind, was arrested and convicted of the attempted fire bombing of an ROTC installation. At Ann Arbor, Mich., a bomb ripped through the local offices of the CIA causing extensive property damage, and SDS claimed credit. Finally a 26-year-old Army deserter, SDSer Cameron D. Bishop, became the first campus radical to make the FBI's Ten Most Wanted List—charged with the dynamite sabotage last January of defense-plant transmission-line towers near Denver. "It's not reform we're after," one SDSer told reporters at last summer's national convention in Chicago. "It's the destruction of your stinking, rotten society—and you better learn that fast."

The pronouncements of Black Panther leaders are strikingly similar. "Let us make it clear that the Panthers do not seek the objective of civil or legal rights," announced the party's minister of education, George Mason Murray, while visiting Cuba in August 1968. "We are organized like guerrillas," he said. Their purpose: to assassinate police, blow up bridges, burn factories.

This is not mere rhetoric. Panther members receive detailed instruction in the revolutionary use of "anti-property and anti-personnel grenades and bombs." Senate testimony reveals that last year, in Mobile, Ala., Panther Field Marshal Donald Lee Cox held classes for young Negroes in the manufacture and use of acid bombs. Result: a wave of terrorist bombings, mostly of Mobile business establishments. At least 58 of the bombings were attributed to such explosives.

*From Havana With Hate.* Substantial quan-

tities of revolutionary propaganda are imported from China and Cuba by the Panthers and various New Left groups. One widely circulated tract, originally published in Cuba, advocates extensive sabotage, the derailing of trains, the use of fire bombs, homemade flamethrowers and explosive booby traps. Finally, "advanced instruction" in the revolutionary arts is available outside the United States.

Twenty-year-old Christopher Z. Milton told the SDS national convention this year that he spent three years behind the Bamboo Curtain, where he was a member of the revolutionary Red Guard. New Yorker Robert Steele Collier, 32, visited Cuba in 1964 as part of a tour organized by the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party and paid for by the Castro government. While in Cuba, Collier is reported to have received training in explosives from a major in the North Vietnamese army. He returned home, established contact with Cuban U.N. diplomats, and was a leader of a Black Liberation Front set up to carry out terrorist acts.

Collier mapped ambitious plans to blow up the Statue of Liberty, the Washington Monument and the Liberty Bell—but was "betrayed" by an undercover policeman who had infiltrated his group. Convicted of conspiracy in June 1965, he was sent off to federal prison—only to be released with time off for good behavior in March 1967. The "rehabilitated" Collier went on the New York City payroll as a recreation supervisor and moved into the Black Panthers. In April 1969 he was behind bars again—one of 21 Panthers charged with conspiracy to bomb department stores and to murder police. Collier is only one of hundreds of young Americans who have traveled to Cuba in recent years. In August 1968, for instance, 34 SDS members made their way to Cuba via Mexico. Part of the group of SDSers met with Huynh Van Ba, of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, who urged them to marshal U.S. anti-war sentiment, organize draft resisters, and solicit funds for the Vietcong.

*Fat cats and foundations*

The dollars that fuel the New Left and Black Power movements come from a variety of sources—foreign and domestic, legal and illegal. Many New Leftists come from affluent homes with indulgent parents whose generous allowances cover travel and minimum living expenses. Operating costs of the movement are high, however. Just to maintain the SDS national office, for instance, costs more than \$80,000 a year.

Some of this is covered by membership dues and the sale of literature. But nearly 60 percent of the SDS budget comes in the form of contributions—including substantial amounts, curiously, from wealthy benefactors. As FBI director J. Edgar Hoover told Congress, four individuals—a Cleveland industrialist, the wife of a millionaire Chicago attorney, a New England heiress, and a wealthy New York lecturer and writer—have contributed a total of more than \$100,000 to New Left activities.

Several tax-exempt foundations have helped finance the New Left. Hoover disclosed that one such group, located in New York, has supplied more than \$250,000 during the past seven years to individuals and groups, most of which have had close ties to the New Left or Communist Party-U.S.A.

*Piece of the action*

All too frequently, report experts, campus unrest is also financed by unsuspecting students and taxpayers. For example, at San Francisco State College (enrollment 18,000), several hundred student radicals took advantage of campus apathy and captured the student government in a little-noticed election.

Once in control of the \$400,000-a-year associated students fund, derived from required student fees and some bookstore profits, the radicals ousted the business

\* See "SDS: Engineers of Campus Chaos," The Reader's Digest, October '68.

manager and his staff, slashed allocations for traditional activities—athletics, service clubs, various extracurricular groups—and embarked on a wild orgy of revolutionary spending. From then until State Attorney General Thomas Lynch impounded the fund last February, they approved pay and allowances for each other, purchased guns, commissioned "Hate Whitey" movies for ghetto showings, hired Panthers as lecturers.

The militants discovered other sources of money, including funds available from government agencies to Bay Area colleges, which were to enable them to conduct Community Action programs in the slums. College radicals promptly maneuvered themselves and their allies into many of the 300 to 500 work-study student jobs, each paying up to \$3.50 an hour. These work-study students, operating in pairs throughout the ghetto, organized protest marches and school boycotts, picketed defense plants, fomented rent strikes and promoted "lie-ins" to halt troop trains.

The use of anti-poverty funds for disruption and violence is not confined to the Bay Area. Indeed, from coast to coast, black and white extremists of all descriptions have managed to grab a piece of the action:

*Item:* Black Panther leaders Bobby Seale, Huey Newton and George Murray all spent time on the anti-poverty payroll. In Jersey City, that city's chief Panther kept his anti-poverty job even after he was arrested for assaulting a policeman.

*Item:* In New York City, officials put up \$30,000 for a "Free Store," designed to aid hippies and other "alienated youth." Free Store facilities were used to distribute leaflets on the manufacture of fire bombs and to recruit demonstrators for the 1968 Democratic national convention in Chicago.

*Item:* Little more than a year ago, Cleveland police walked into an ambush in the steaming Glenville ghetto—and were cut down one by one by trained marksmen. In 30 minutes, two patrolmen and a lieutenant were dead, 14 more were wounded. The leader of the uprising, black militant Fred (Ahmed) Evans, had received nearly \$7000 in local anti-poverty funds—and boasted he had used part of the money for purchasing the murder weapons.

Capacity for Chaos. The largest source of Panther funds is not the poverty program, however, but the armed robberies and the shake downs committed in the name of revolution. The Panthers' so-called "Breakfast Program" is a perfect example.

Tough young recruits swagger through the ghetto informing merchants that the Panthers are running pre-school chow lines for underprivileged black kids. Contributions—in the form of foodstuffs or money—are demanded. "You wouldn't want someone to burn down your store," smiled one Los Angeles Panther.

The merchants get the message. In the San Francisco area, an auto dealer who refused to give the Panthers money arrived at work the next day to find his plate-glass window shattered. A Chinese grocer in Oakland who refused to continue donations saw his place badly damaged by fire. In Harrisburg, Pa., "uncooperative" merchants were firebombed. "Most merchants are petrified," explains an East Coast police official. "So they kick in—\$25, \$50, \$100 a week."

Such "voluntary contributions" finance an insidious program of revolutionary indoctrination. Impressionable school-age children—second, third and fourth graders—are fed not only bacon and eggs (usually in church basements) but massive doses of racist propaganda. A coloring book that shows blacks mutilating policemen with guns, knives and hatchets has been distributed in at least five different programs.

Other Panther projects are financed by armed robberies, as ex-Panther Larry C. Powell told the McClellan Subcommittee. As a member of the elite black guard, Powell

related, he had been assigned to one of the "rip-out" squads that carried out the daily robberies ordered by the Black Panther Party Central Committee. Stores were carefully targeted—"A place wasn't worth robbing unless it had \$500 or more"—with one third of the take going to the Panther treasury and the other two thirds split among the robbers.

The Panthers are no more representative of American blacks than the Students for a Democratic Society are of the country's seven million collegians. But both groups have a capacity for disruption that far exceeds their numbers. By carefully selecting issues—from the Vietnam war to "police brutality"—and by exploiting them fully, they have stirred to action thousands who would not normally become involved. And the havoc they have wreaked has had far-reaching consequences. It has jeopardized the struggle for civil rights, severely disrupted the normal processes of our academic system and posed a major threat to the continued existence of our democratic system.

#### COURT VACANCY FOR THE SOUTH— NO ACCOMMODATIONS FOR JEWISH REPRESENTATION

#### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed myself on several occasions to the well-displayed prejudices of the present administration. Racism, when practiced in its true form, knows not just color distinctions. Citizens of Jewish heritage are acutely aware of the nature of discrimination and their sufferings—as a result of it, are tragically documented throughout history.

It was proclaimed a milestone when President Wilson appointed Justice Brandeis to the Court in 1916—a Justice who set an incredibly high standard for any who aspire to that office of this Government. He was nobly followed by Justices Cardozo, Frankfurter, Goldberg, and Fortas.

Now, to that seat, the Senate is asked to place Clement Haynsworth. Judge Haynsworth's nomination is being weighed against only the general requirements for Court service, and his record clearly falls short. But should we judge this aspiring justice in terms of the record, character, performance, and contributions of the men whose seat he hopes to occupy, we must conclude with greater dismay the irresponsibility of this appointment.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the views of the NAACP as reported in the Kansas City Call of September 26, 1969:

#### FAILURE TO APPOINT JEW TO SUPREME COURT DECREED BY NAACP

NEW YORK.—President Nixon's failure to appoint a Jewish American to the United States Supreme Court "was a sad blow to the aspirations of all Americans for full participation of all of our people in the affairs of government," the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People charges in a resolution adopted by its board of directors at its regular quarterly meeting here on Sept. 8.

The text of the unanimously adopted resolution was made public by Bishop Stephen Gill Spottswood, chairman of the Association's 64-member National Board, after he

had dispatched a copy to the President on Sept. 9. The resolution also reaffirmed and ratified the statements issued and steps taken by Executive Director Roy Wilkins in opposition to the President's selection of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth for the Supreme Court.

The NAACP board's objection to the appointment encompasses more than opposition to Judge Haynsworth's "lamentable record in civil rights matters" and his anti-labor decisions. In addition to these considerations, the board's opposition is based "on the refusal of the President of the United States to follow the tradition of his eminent predecessors . . . of recognizing the vast political and social contributions, particularly with respect to our legal institutions, made by Jewish Americans."

The resolution cited the records of Justices Louis D. Brandeis, Benjamin N. Cardozo, Felix Frankfurter, Arthur Goldberg and Abe Fortas as "major developments and contributions to the legal and political structure of the United States over the past half-century."

President Nixon, the resolution points out, passed over two opportunities within the last three months to extend the tradition initiated by President Woodrow Wilson in 1916 with the appointment of Justice Brandeis.

"We fear, or at least we suspect," the resolution continues, "that this cavalier treatment of a group of persons who have been in the forefront of the fight for the protection of the rights of all Americans is thought to be justified because, after too long a denial, a Negro American has been appointed to the Supreme Court."

Rejecting such political reasoning and "cynical politics," the resolution decries the apparent effort "to require us to compete with our fellow defenders on the rights of all people for a place on the Supreme Court."

The resolution questions Judge Haynsworth's "apparently distorted views of the propriety of the use of legal institutions for the purpose of imposing a regressive notion of society on this nation" and warns "the country, and particularly the President of the United States, that no people, black or white, can be 'kept in their place,' by the use of force. Under the guise 'law and order,' the country will not tolerate an effort to establish a 19th Century class structure with its inherent discrimination against black people, poor people and working people of whatever color."

"We regard the appointment of Judge Haynsworth as aimed in that direction," the resolution concluded.

#### PEACE IN VIETNAM IS U.S. GOAL BUT MUST BE PEACE WITH HONOR

#### HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it is alarming and disturbing to me that prominent leaders are supporting the Vietnam moratorium. Even though peaceful rallies are scheduled, there are many militant students planning to turn them into violent demonstrations.

The vigils, teach-ins, and rallies are pointed in the wrong direction. They should be directed toward Hanoi—not Washington. It is Hanoi which is prolonging the war. It is Hanoi which is mistreating American prisoners. It is Hanoi which is bringing death and destruction to the innocent people of South Vietnam.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington's objective is peace. Hanoi's objective is continued war.

I support President Nixon in his dedication to peace with honor. Instant surrender of gradual surrender should be rejected.

The Jackson, Miss., Clarion Ledger carried an excellent editorial on this subject on October 1, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

**PEACE IN VIETNAM IS U.S. GOAL BUT MUST BE PEACE WITH HONOR**

President Nixon's policy concerning further troop withdrawals makes it abundantly clear that the United States sincerely desires peace in Vietnam, but that it must be peace with honor. Our government obviously will not negotiate away the right of South Vietnam's people to determine their own future, free of Communist dictation.

Our government has renounced an imposed military solution, has proposed free elections under international supervision and has said we will retain no military bases if the Reds will make a similar pledge.

President Nixon's statements and actions show he is walking the extra mile in quest for peace. It is up to Hanoi to see that he does not walk it alone or wait in vain.

Americans of both parties and in all walks of life are elated that there will be 60,000 fewer troops in South Vietnam at the end of this year than there were at the beginning. They are relieved because it has signified the President is determined to de-escalate and eventually end the long, bloody, costly war.

At the same time, Americans are also relieved because the Administration has made it clear that our desire for peace does not mean a unilateral and craven retreat which would amount to unconditional surrender to Hanoi, as its delegation at the Paris Peace talks seemingly expects.

Peace is the American objective, to be sure—but it must be peace with honor for us and justice for those who are pledged to help. This is the kind of peace most Americans want, we believe, and it is the kind of peace the United States is determined to achieve.

President Nixon has shown his sincerity. It is now time that his opponents at home pledged their full support to that effort, and time our enemies abroad became aware that responsible Americans are behind this quest for peace with honor.

**CORAL GABLES JAYCEES' GOOD-WILL MISSION**

**HON. DANTE B. FASCELL**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, over Labor Day weekend a group of citizens from my district engaged in a most commendable gesture of good will toward other people. In an unofficial capacity, yet representing the true spirit of friendship existing between all Americans and our Latin American brothers, more than 70 Coral Gables Junior Chamber of Commerce members and their wives visited Quito, Ecuador, and Panama City, Panama.

The trip, under the direction of Richard Kelly and the Coral Gables Jaycee president, David Christianson, Jr., was coordinated with the Jaycees in Quito. The president of the Quito Jaycees, Manuel Sans, acted as an unofficial guide insuring that the group had a memorable stay in Quito.

The Coral Gables Jaycees did not go empty-handed. Their major purpose in visiting Quito was to bring gifts and clothing to hospitalized children and to supply approximately \$15,000 worth of medicine and medical supplies to a children's hospital. The group also presented to the mayor of Quito a resolution from the Coral Gables City Commission and a key to the city of Coral Gables.

The Ecuadorians expressed their appreciation for the gifts. The President of Ecuador, Jose Maria Velasco Ibarra, honored the Jaycees at a reception and the Quito Jaycees honored them with a banquet. Representatives of the Coral Gables Jaycees also appeared on a national TV show with political commentator Edison Taran.

The group from Coral Gables felt the trip to be very rewarding. Dave Christianson said:

There was tremendous hospitality and good will all around our visit, and I know our gift to the hospital was tremendously appreciated. We have as a country a big stake in the friendship of the Ecuadorians and a visit like this keeps that friendship strong.

The Coral Gables Jaycees have now added Quito, Ecuador, to the list of countries and cities they have visited as ambassadors of good will. Some of their past good-will missions were to Caracas, Venezuela; Cartagena, Colombia; and Guatemala. Dave Christianson tells me that Ecuador has invited them back next year at the expense of Ecuador for the purpose of bringing additional medical supplies and foods needed in two other hospitals in Quito.

As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and as the Congressman representing these citizens, I feel especially proud of the Coral Gables Jaycees' undertaking. Aid to our Latin American friends is a very important implementation of our foreign policy. In an official capacity loans, agricultural and technical assistance, Peace Corps activities, and other programs play an essential role in aiding people and providing some understanding of the United States. But perhaps this form of people-to-people sharing of material and ideals, though it often goes unnoticed, expresses best the real community of man which is so essential for a world of peace and brotherhood.

I commend the Coral Gables Jaycees and wish them continued success in their endeavors toward international peace.

**AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS STRONG MERCHANT MARINE**

**HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since the American merchant marine is essential to our Nation's economic health and national defense, its continuing decline should be a matter of concern to every American citizen. Unfortunately, many Americans are blithely unaware of the crisis confronting our maritime industry, and it is extremely difficult to convey this message to our citizens.

October 7, 1969

One of the most effective methods of spreading the word is through individual organizations which have large memberships. The American Legion, which has a membership of over 2 million, has always been a powerful ally of the merchant marine, and it has set an example which other organizations would do well to follow.

During its 51st annual convention which it held in August of this year, the American Legion adopted two resolutions urging that certain actions be taken by Congress and the administration to revitalize the American merchant marine.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the American Legion for its outstanding record of patriotism; it should also be commended for its persistent efforts to educate both its membership and the general public as to the urgent need for a healthy and viable merchant fleet. If enough organizations launched similar educational programs, they might generate sufficient public concern to force rapid implementation of a comprehensive program to revitalize the American merchant marine. The American Legion should be commended for its efforts in this direction.

I have just received copies of the resolutions adopted by the American Legion, and I insert them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The resolutions read as follows:

**RESOLUTION NO. 482**

Whereas, The American Legion has long been aware of the declining status of our Merchant Marine fleet which now numbers less than 1000 vessels, 80 percent of which are more than 25 years old and, the normal useful life of such ships is 20 years; and

Whereas, we recognize the superiority of the Soviet merchant fleet comprised of modern vessels, two-thirds of which are less than 10 years old, with accelerated new ship construction at an alarming rate to further increase their superiority; and

Whereas, The American Legion has long despaired our second rate position to the Soviet Union and feels that this vital Fourth Arm of our National Defense should be brought to a position of superiority; and

Whereas, The American Legion has consistently, year after year, urged the Congress and the Administrator to take required action to revitalize our Merchant Marine; and

Whereas, The American Legion feels that further delay in this revitalization will be disasterous to our national defense; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Atlanta, Georgia, August 26, 27, 28, 1969, that we urge the President and the Congress to take immediate action to rebuild and revitalize The American Flag Fleet to a position second to none in the world.

Whereas, the Maritime Commission today is a sub-division of the Commerce Department; and

Whereas, the Merchant Marine, as being a part of the Commerce Department, has not received recognition and financial support as our present world involvement demands; and

Whereas, due to the present and foreseeable future of the world situation, it is imperative that the United States maintain a strong and adequate merchant fleet to meet our commitments as a world power; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Atlanta, Georgia, August 26, 27, 28, 1969, that Congress enact legislation to establish an independent Maritime Department.

**TREATY BARRING NUCLEAR  
WEAPONS ON SEABED**

**Hon. PETER H. B. FREILINGHUYSEN**  
OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, a draft treaty agreement prohibiting the placement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed was agreed upon this morning, and has been submitted to the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, Switzerland. Agreement on the text of the treaty was reached by the United States and Soviet Cochairmen of the Conference.

This agreement, Mr. Speaker, represents a great step forward in the area of arms control. As a congressional adviser to the Disarmament Conference, I am aware of the many hours of hard work which have gone into the formulation of this draft treaty.

I insert the text of the seabed treaty in the RECORD at this time:

**DRAFT TREATY ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE  
EMPLACEMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND  
OTHER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION ON  
THE SEABED AND THE OCEAN FLOOR AND IN  
THE SUBSOIL THEREOF**

The States Parties to this Treaty,

Recognizing the common interest of mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of the seabed and the ocean floor for peaceful purposes,

Considering that the prevention of a nuclear arms race on the seabed and the ocean floor serves the interests of maintaining world peace, reduces international tensions, and strengthens friendly relations among States,

Convinced that this Treaty constitutes a step towards the exclusion of the seabed, the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof from the arms race and determined to continue negotiations concerning further measures leading to this end,

Convinced that this Treaty constitutes a step towards a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, and determined to continue negotiations to this end,

Convinced that this Treaty will further the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in a manner consistent with the principles of international law and without infringing the freedoms of the high seas,

Have agreed as follows:

**ARTICLE I**

1. The States Parties to this Treaty undertake not to emplant or emplace on the seabed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof beyond the maximum contiguous zone provided for in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone any objects with nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction, as well as structures, launching installations or any other facilities specifically designed for storing, testing or using such weapons.

2. The States Parties to this Treaty undertake not to assist, encourage or induce any State to commit actions prohibited by this Treaty and not to participate in any other way in such actions.

**ARTICLE II**

1. For the purpose of this Treaty the outer limit of the contiguous zone referred to in Article I shall be measured in accordance with the provisions of Section II of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

and the Contiguous Zone and in accordance with international law.

2. Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as supporting or prejudicing the position of any State Party with respect to rights or claims which such State Party may assert, or with respect to recognition or nonrecognition of rights or claims asserted by any other State, related to waters off its coasts, or to the seabed and the ocean floor.

**ARTICLE III**

1. In order to promote the objectives and ensure the observance of the provisions of this Treaty, the States parties to the Treaty shall have the right to verify the activities of other States Parties to the Treaty on the seabed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof beyond the maximum contiguous zone, referred to in Article II, if these activities raise doubts concerning the fulfillment of the obligations assumed under this Treaty, without interfering with such activities or otherwise infringing rights recognized under international law, including the freedoms of the high seas.

2. The right of verification recognized by the States Parties in paragraph 1 of this Article may be exercised by any State Party using its own means or with the assistance of any other State Party.

3. The States Parties to the Treaty undertake to consult and to cooperate with a view to removing doubts concerning the fulfillment of the obligations assumed under this Treaty.

**ARTICLE IV**

Any State Party to the Treaty may propose amendments to this Treaty. Amendments must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the States Parties to the Treaty, including those of all the States Parties to this Treaty possessing nuclear weapons, and shall enter into force for each State Party to the Treaty accepting such amendments upon their acceptance by a majority of the States Parties to the Treaty, including the States which possess nuclear weapons and are Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter the amendments shall enter into force for any other Party to the Treaty after it has accepted such amendments.

**ARTICLE V**

Each Party to this Treaty shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from this Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this Treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its Country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty and to the United Nations Security Council three months in advance. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it considers to have jeopardized its supreme interests.

**ARTICLE VI**

1. This Treaty shall be open for signature to all States. Any State which does not sign the Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of \_\_\_\_\_ which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after the deposit of instruments of ratification by twenty-two Governments, including the Governments designated as Depositary Governments of this Treaty.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited after the entry into force of this Treaty it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall forthwith notify the Governments of all States signatory and acceding to this Treaty of the date of each signature, of the date of

deposit of each instrument of ratification or of accession, of the date of the entry into force of this Treaty, and of the receipt of other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

**ARTICLE VII**

This Treaty, the English, Russian, French, Spanish and Chinese texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the States signatory and acceding thereto.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Treaty.

Done in \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_  
--- this --- day of -----

**SORRY COMMENTARY ON THESE  
TIMES**

**HON. RICHARD T. HANNA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I submit for some pondering on the part of my colleagues and as a warning to labor the following articles:

[From the Register, Sept. 24, 1969]  
**500 WILL LOSE JOBS; MORE LAYOFFS AHEAD?**

(By Kirk Wels)

The late-Tuesday announcement that Garden Grove's largest manufacturing employer will cease operations by Oct. 10 just brings closer to home . . . and in sharper focus . . . the warnings sounded in this column over the past several years.

And it underlines a Tuesday news item out of Washington which tells of a delegation of congressmen, businessmen and union officials meeting with President Nixon to seek voluntary limits on importation of shoes into the United States.

Randolph Rubber—formerly the California Rubber Co. locally—makes shoes and had \$37 million sales last year. Its products include Bob Cousy sneakers and other popular deck shoes which I wore happily.

The company announcement attributed the termination of more than 500 employees for many reasons.

But they all added up to one: an inability to remain competitive and profitable in the products handled at this location.

This is no snide comment, nor smear at management or anyone else.

It's a combination of things—all of which are nearing climax for most industries of this country.

The fact is that we've been pricing ourselves out of the worldwide market . . . through increased costs of money; labor; transportation; governmentally-required reports, actions, and legal staffs; by increasing requests for government services which increases the tax load; and by such judicial decisions as those jury verdicts which push insurance costs out the window by holding manufacturers liable for product reliability despite abuse or lack of common sense in consumer use.

As the old druggist said in "Somebody Up There Likes Me": . . . You can walk away without paying the check for the soda you just drank; but somewhere, sometime you'll have to pay that check.

As a nation, a state and a county of people, we've been walking away from too many "soda checks." We have been demanding and getting services, with the payment of check delayed.

The already-committed costs of govern-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ment which met the Reagan and Nixon administrations were far beyond our ability to pay . . . unless we materially cut our governmental and individual standards of living . . . or unless some tremendous technological advance increased production so extensively that unit costs would come down and we could compete internationally.

Workers—including myself—are feeling the pinch as costs go up and pay stays the same. It's only human nature to fight for more . . . to demand more wages for the job we're doing, in order that we don't have to cut back on what we offer our families.

But now we're seeing the fruits of demanding more without increasing production at least to the point of paying for that increased cost.

## DOLLAR LOSS WILL BE FELT

The loss of income to Garden Grove and other Orange County governmental units and commercial and service establishments will be considerable enough to create problems . . . just from this loss of 500-plus jobs. It isn't something which can't be absorbed, perhaps, but what happens if the individual units up prices a bit to take up the slack?

Will this increase pressures for higher "collective bargaining" settlements that help put more firms in the position of Randy?

Many intelligent people are making strong cases to put up trade barriers . . . all aimed at cutting down on "foreign" competition. That's another way of saying: Keep my business from going under and increase the costs of all people who now buy the item . . . whether it be shoes of shirts or steel or . . .

But, as other intelligent men have pointed out, this action also incenses people of other nations who might easily be led to do war against a country which tries to throw walls around its affluency. And the costs of such a war—"hot" or "cold"—also are high.

Out of just this were kings overthrown and dynasties felled by barbarians throughout history.

No . . . there's really only one answer . . . and that's the one of "paying the check," individually and collectively. It will be paid . . . one way or another, by all of us.

I remember 1929. Do you?

The delegation meeting with Nixon in Washington Tuesday was one led by Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, R-Maine. The group represented areas of the country which manufacture shoes and which complain that current imports are harming the domestic industry.

The tariff on shoe imports is generally about 8 per cent.

Mrs. Smith presented Nixon with a Senate petition calling for voluntary import limitations. It was signed by 72 of the Senate's 100 members, and represented 43 of the 50 states. Earlier this year Rep. James Burke, D-Mass., sent the White House a similar petition signed by about 300 House members.

## FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-TWO GG RUBBER WORKERS TO BE BOUNCED BY FIRM

Garden Grove's largest manufacturing employer—Randolph Rubber Co., 10631 Stanford—will terminate all 532 employees and cease operations by Oct. 10, officials confirmed late Tuesday.

An announcement to that effect will be posted on the bulletin board this morning at the plant which had its origin in Latvia in 1922 and was first opened in Garden Grove 21 years ago.

The notice, signed by Julian S. Weinstein, executive vice president, Randolph Rubber Co., said:

"We are sorry to have to announce that a decision has been made by the management of Randy Industries to cease all manufacturing operations in the Garden Grove plant by Oct. 10, 1969."

"As manufacturing operations are completed, department by department, employees

will be terminated. This is not a hasty decision, but was made necessary by increasing financial losses, changes in manufacturing processes such as injection molding, and marketing conditions, and foreign competition has caused the closing of the plant."

Rumors of the pending action circulated through the plant early this week before officials late Tuesday confirmed them after further telephone conferences with company headquarters back East.

The announced action will leave Air Industries, Inc. and Swedlow, Inc., each with something over 500 employees locally, as Garden Grove's largest employers.

Thus ends the Orange County chapter of a saga which began in Riga, Latvia, back in 1922 when the footwear enterprise was started by two Shrage brothers, Michael and David.

By 1930 the Shrages were employing 2,500 workers in three plants—Riga, Latvia; Lodz, Poland, and Kaunas, Lithuania.

In 1938, the firm was confiscated by the Hitler regime. In 1940 the brothers started anew in Cuba and, eight years later, opened a plant on a 12-acre site at 10633 Stanford Ave., Garden Grove.

Meanwhile, in 1959, the Castro regime confiscated the Cuban plant.

Two years later, Imperial Commodities of New York acquired a controlling interest in the company.

Known as Rubber Corp. of California, the firm was acquired next by Randolph Manufacturing, Randolph, Mass., in October of 1963 when president Jack Smith reported employment at 320 persons.

In July of last year the Garden Grove plant employed about 800 people when the parent firm, including plants in Randolph and in Derry, N.H., was acquired by Tel-A-Sign, Inc., Chicago-based sign manufacturer, and became a Delaware corporation.

Randolph was described as one of the largest manufacturers of canvas footwear, with such brands as the Randy Boatshu and the Bob Cousy basketball sneaker.

In almost constant confrontation with some type of union action since 1963, the firm in 1965 appealed an NLRB order that it bargain with the AFL-CIO United Rubber Workers. Finally, late this summer, "Randy" employees voted to accept union representation in an NLRB-supervised election.

## A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

## HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am not an admirer of many of President Nixon's policies. However, I must say that I was impressed by the observations of David S. Broder in his column in the October 7 issue of the Washington Post. The main point Mr. Broder makes is that the only honest approach to breaking a President is the constitutional avenue of impeachment. Indirect and, often devious and violent guerrilla tactics, usually clothed in self-righteousness and real or pretended moral fervor, are not legitimate techniques. It is always fair to criticize a President—"after all he asked for the job." But criticism should be based on issues, not on personality, and should be made in the context of the welfare of the country and not self-serving ends. Moreover, the tactics used against both President Johnson and President Nixon ob-

October 7, 1969

sure that necessary boundary across which political critics should not pass. It is one thing to criticize the President but it is quite another to let criticism maim the institution of the Presidency itself.

The article follows:

## A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title "The Breaking of the President" for the next big series of nonfiction best-sellers. It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again, for breaking a President is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired—even when the circumstances seem less than propitious. No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a President, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable. Critics of the President who are indecent enough to betray partisan motives are denounced. (That for you, Fred Harris.) Members of the President's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charlie Goodell.)

The students who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: The Harvard department of biochemistry and molecular biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next, a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best but the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District election will do as well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The President's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust. The Chief Executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

And then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job.

All this is no fiction; it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be—one of those tragic, cursed messes that destroys any President who touches it.

That being the case, any President interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam Moratorium Committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer for the job.

But he cannot. And that is the point the protesters seem to overlook. Assume that they and the President are both right when they assert the time has come end this war. Assume that the protesters know better than

the President how to do so—despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the President's policies in their current manifestos.

There is still a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally protected expression of dissent, aimed at changing national policy, and mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor can the Vietnam Moratorium's sponsors order home a single GI or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only the President can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a President at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as is being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Mr. Nixon has been in office for nine months should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months—unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course? Rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken President at its head for three years, would not their cause and the country be better served by resort to the constitutional method for removing a President?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

#### THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX—A PERSPECTIVE

#### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert has presented a very interesting discussion on the military-industrial complex in a speech made before the Defense and Contract Procurement Administration Conference. Mr. Zuckert served longer as Secretary of the Air Force than any other individual in U.S. history and his service in that important post was outstanding. I am glad to insert his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

#### THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX: A PERSPECTIVE

(By Eugene M. Zuckert)

For twenty-five years I worked in a variety of capacities to help build a proper and productive relationship between government and industry—a relationship necessary to meet the needs of our national defense. Today I am saddened. That relationship has been misunderstood, has been criticized, has been denigrated, and the term "military-industrial complex" has been used as a mark of opprobrium. This has been true even though it took the same skills and the same resources of the very same complex to produce the much-applauded Apollo 11!

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

How and why has this come about?

What I hope to do this evening is to give you some views, based on my own experience, what I believe lies behind the public controversy which now pours more heat than light on the problems of our national defense and defense establishment.

I am proud of the Defense Establishment of today, that I have had some share in building it to its present level of effectiveness. But, at the same time, I am not blind to the faults, the failings and the built-in inefficiencies that one can find in the Defense Establishment or in any huge organization, particularly one which does not have to sell its products to the public to stay in business.

I have spent a good part of a lifetime looking for those faults and for ways to correct them. I only wish that the current critics of the Defense Establishment were looking sincerely for genuine faults and positive corrections. But basically, that is not at all what the most vocal of the critics are after.

What is the thread of the allegations against the military and its supporting industry? It goes far beyond a concern for the proper level of military expenditures. There is an underlying charge that a conspiracy exists among our military and the defense industry that results in wasteful spending for arms with consequent profits to industry and an inordinately swollen military posture. From that running start, the charges fan out and derive nourishment from sensationalized treatment of a variety of examples of mistakes and inefficiencies, real or alleged.

At the same time, a whole host of newly qualified military experts spring up on all sides; there is a startling discovery that the military has run wild because of perfunctory scrutiny of the defense budget. That is particularly ironical to me because I recall the vigorous McNamara budget process. The fashionable criticism in those days was that our military suffered an excess of civilian control with a resulting downgrading of experienced military judgment.

It is my considered judgment that the current furor over the military-industrial complex is really an attack on an unpopular war. Wasn't it Arnold Toynbee, the great historian, who said that war weariness is a most useful tool for dictators and demagogues? The critics of the Vietnam war have been raging on the Potomac since 1965, and they are not likely to subside soon. The professors, politicians and pundits who are already in the fray are enjoying it immensely, and they have friends who also are bound to claim a piece of the action."

There is a long list of things which the storm over the military-industrial complex is not:

It is not—as advertised—a Great Debate over American Defense and Foreign Policy. A Great Debate, in my opinion, is desperately needed. But this isn't it.

It is not—as some claim—a popular uprising against militarism and procurement hanky-panky in the Pentagon. Waste there is and always will be. But these critics are opposed to the Defense Establishment no matter how well run.

Nor is it—as claimed—a "concerned dialogue" over national priorities. How can you have a "dialogue" on whether we should have obsolete weapons systems or higher vertical slums? The two serious problems deserve serious attention, not rhetorical flam.

What we're experiencing is not even a rational discussion of the weapons systems our current national defense posture requires. One cannot find in all the arguments an effort to define our needs and then measure the Defense Establishment against the requirements.

Superficially, the controversy over the mill-

tary-industrial complex might seem to arise from any or all of these issues, depending on what syndicated column or Washington newsletter you read.

But don't you believe it. All the sloganizing just doesn't add up: How we must reassess our national priorities by cutting back our defense expenditures; how we have to get the military under civilian control; how we are headed down the road to militarism and fascism.

The controversy over the military-industrial complex is the same tired old combination of *unilateral disarmament* and pious hopes that we have seen played on the Washington circuit off and on for well over a quarter of a century! The young ones don't know it, and the old ones too often have forgotten, but we've seen and heard it all before.

To be sure the format has been updated. Now it's a kind of ideological Western. The military-industrial complex is cast in the role of the bad guys. Forty years ago it was the "Merchants of Death"—but the plot was the same.

All reasonable persons can applaud conscientious dispassionate inquiry into and search for evidence of stupidity, incompetence, favoritism and waste in military procurement. Responding to such inquiries is a legitimate part of the job for the uniformed and civilian Defense leaders who must defend their management before Congress.

The cost of the C5A transport or blunders on the Cheyenne helicopter and the effectiveness of the supertank—these are all appropriate subjects for Congressional investigation by the able committees charged with that responsibility.

But what I regard as dangerous and illegitimate is the highly organized and furiously pressed propaganda assault on our defense institutions disguised as a selfless effort by "concerned" intellectuals to save the nation from takeover by an alleged combination of defense industry profiteers and a warminded military.

Some there are who may say this merely is symptomatic of the malaise of our times—part of the current attack on so many of our established traditions and institutions. Some there are who will insist that a better-educated and more enlightened populace has finally risen in righteous wrath and indignation against a long-time evil.

Actually, however, the scenario is old hat.

It was first staged in the early '30s by a curious combination of far-out Liberal intellectuals and a group of Republican isolationist Senators of that era. The isolationist Senators just did not want the United States in any more European wars. Some of the involved intellectuals believed that the French and British were about to join with Hitler in common cause against Russian communism. But whatever the motivations, and they were mixed, everybody in the combination wanted to make sure that Wall Street and the munitions-makers of World War I were blamed for whatever past, present or future problems could be claimed.

So what played the Washington circuit then was a truly memorable extravaganza. A Senate Committee (to become famous as the Nye Committee) set out to investigate the relationship between Wall Street and American War profiteers and munitionsmakers who stood accused of having dragged the United States into World War I. The production played to standing room only. It received tremendous publicity and developed a new "devil image" for Wall Street and American Big Business, the evil.

Congress rushed to pass the Neutrality Act of 1935. Free from the machination of the Merchants of Death we were all, presumably, safe.

Sure we were—until the roof caved in on us at Pearl Harbor.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Today, many of the players are different. But the archvillain is the same—something called this time the military-industrial complex.

But what the nation could endure in the peaceful, non-nuclear '30s becomes an irrational luxury in the nuclear, cold war '60s. We can see the danger now that a colossal demonstration of pacifist sentiment may well lead to hasty and ill-advised actions designed to fester our defense establishment and impair our defense posture. This, in turn, could be misread as a sign of our weakness, and it could trigger the very confrontation that the anti-military group presumably wants to avoid.

Does this sound far-fetched? I don't think so. Let's look at what happened in the '40s, the '50s, as a result of so-called "popular demand":

Remember the frantic demobilization of our fighting forces and the defense industry we had built to meet the needs of World War II? We paid heavily for that spasmodic reflex to strident, fomented hysteria. I had a ringside seat at the anti-military fights that went on before, during and after that struggle. (I was then Special Assistant to Stuart Symington, Assistant Secretary of War for Air.) The critics hastily cut the armed forces and just as hastily rebuilt them for Korea.

In 1949 I watched the late Defense Secretary, Louis Johnson—acting under Presidential orders to economize—cut the military budget to the bone. That was the year when Russia developed her own A-bomb, on which we were supposed to have a monopoly for at least twenty years!

It took the communist invasion of Korea in 1950 to teach us the hard way that the ill-considered demobilization and disarmament after World War II was a disaster never again to be invited.

That's when we started, painfully and expensively, to rebuild the defense establishment we had deliberately and ruthlessly wrecked.

The furious controversy over our development of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons compounded the difficulties of recapturing and rebuilding our initiative in nuclear technology. This was brought home to me when I served as an Atomic Energy Commission member from 1952 to 1954.

I went back to the Pentagon in January of 1961 as Secretary of the Air Force under a truly great Secretary of Defense—Robert S. McNamara. During that tour of duty, in the Administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, I saw the Defense Establishment revitalized in muscle and posture.

There was a sharp break with former Treasury Secretary Humphrey's insistence that a balanced national budget must be accorded priority over the requirements of national security.

A defense policy based on the Dulles doctrine of massive retaliation was replaced with President Kennedy's posture of "flexible response" to aggression.

He made a unique contribution of great permanent significance in substantially improving the quality of information that forms the basis of the decision process in the Pentagon.

And probably most important, Secretary McNamara made giant strides toward the nation's goal of actually unifying the missions of our armed forces which the Unification Act, as amended in 1958, called for.

Secretary McNamara put together a defense establishment under civilian control of which the nation can be proud. And he established the elements of the sound and proper relationship between our military leadership and the nation's defense industry which I devoutly hope will endure in the years ahead.

This is only part of what is being threatened today.

In Vietnam our soldiers fight in a war that

could well be won for the enemy on the propaganda front at home. Right here.

In the new concept of revolutionary warfare—between an open society like ours and the closed systems of Russia, China and North Vietnam—our public opinion environment becomes the decisive battleground. Both Ho Chi Minh and General Giap have repeatedly declared that the propaganda front of American public opinion will be the theater of the final and decisive communist victory in the Vietnam War. You may be sure they have taken great care to secure Hanoi's homefront against the kind of disruptive tactics which are a daily occurrence here.

In North Vietnam, offenses such as "disrupting public order," speaking against the war, staging student demonstrations or "undermining the solidarity of the people" draw penalties ranging up to life imprisonment and death.

None of us would want to see any of our freedoms so constrained. We must use self-restraint as we exercise our hard-won rights of free speech. And we must face realities. We must understand that a major war goal for Ho Chi Minh and General Giap is a psychological one—the dramatic and enduring humiliation of the United States with a significant influence on the shadow and substance of American power, particularly in Asia.

For the President (any President) and the Senate (any Senate) Vietnam presents an issue of American foreign policy which will not be solved simply by bringing our troops home in a blind rush.

Vietnam is a test of the Truman Doctrine, established in 1947 by a Democratic President with the solid approval of the Republican 80th Congress. A defeat for the policy in Vietnam will invite similar challenges elsewhere.

These are strange times indeed. The Democratic party seems to be abandoning the Truman Doctrine. The stance of many of its leaders in the fight against deployment of an ABM carried overtones of a reversion to the Dulles policy of "massive retaliation." Some of the Liberal intellectual rhetoric sounds like an echo of the old arch-conservative rallying cry of "Fortress America."

I don't get it.

One thing I do get. Inevitably and unavoidably, in the absence of clearly defined policies or clairvoyance of the future, the military establishment must plan to fight almost every kind of war that could be thrust upon us.

Another anomaly. So many ardent supporters of the late President Kennedy are now enthusiastic participants in the campaign against the Vietnam War and the offshoot crusade against the military industrial complex. Have they forgotten the words of President Kennedy in his Inaugural Address? He said:

"We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

I haven't forgotten.

You are all familiar with the government's long-established policy against undue concentration of economic power in our giant corporations and you are seeing the grim spectre raised of undue power in the military industrial complex.

But I have heard no such hue and cry raised against the undue concentration of propaganda power that results from the ideological interlock among our Liberal mass news media and certain faculty members of our universities, and the editors of most journals of opinion.

Yet all too often, in the name of free expression and academic freedom, we find this great concentration of propaganda power attempting to preempt the functioning of the Presidency and the Congress in the field of foreign policy.

October 7, 1969

Just as the interpreters of the Constitution have concluded that the economic freedom guaranteed to us does not include the power to monopolize or near-monopolize to the detriment of all of us, so I believe that the freedom of speech guaranteed to us by the Constitution does not intend that any group of like-thinkers should spawn a complex of propaganda power—a complex so potent in our kind of society today, that it makes the economic weight of the military and industry seem puny by comparison.

As a lawyer and a Liberal Democrat I am dedicated to the principle of free speech. As a longtime public servant I've taken the oath to support and protect the Constitution of the United States which guarantees that freedom. But I've also had some responsibility for the preservation of the security of this country and for equipping our young people for modern warfare and assigning them, men and arms, to battle in far-flung places.

Small wonder then that I cannot accept that "anything goes" under the banner of free speech and academic freedom.

In an age of instant and all-pervasive mass communications a pressure-group democracy such as ours should not, dare not, permit the exercise of a form of monopoly propaganda power over the public dissemination of information.

Since 1959, the propaganda power conglomerate has accomplished much. And much that is not good.

It has preempted the Constitutional role of the President as the nation's voice in its foreign affairs. Challenged and influenced by indirection the President's powers and responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief. Systematically eroded the nation's will to defend its interests and its capability to wage modern warfare. Convinced our enemies as well as our allies that our Constitutional anarchy is an open invitation to calculated aggression or institutional subversion.

We have seen an effective, powerful and liberal President practically driven from office, the Truman Doctrine discredited as a basic American bipartisan policy, the credibility of the Kennedy doctrine of flexible response to communist-supported "wars of national liberation" undermined.

And once again we have a defense establishment with morale impaired, its competence, integrity and effectiveness challenged.

There are those who profess to believe that it is the government, particularly the Defense Department, which is trying to monopolize public information. Persons who believe this do not understand the real world of information. A government can only make information available to the news media. It cannot hide information. There are no secrets from a hard-working press. The government, day-in-day-out cannot even communicate directly with the public. It must do so through privately owned news media which transmit the information or ignore it or reshape it as it sees fit. In our society, the government cannot monopolize information; only a combination of news media can do that.

I base my opposition to the concentration of information power on the danger it poses in our kind of open society, but I also would like to point out that the record of the people who enjoy this great power today is very poor on the basic foreign-policy challenge of this century. Our great problem is to survive with our free institutions in the face of a Communist movement that wants to change our institutions. It has been well demonstrated that alert and firm American leaders can check the Communist, but it also has been well demonstrated that too many of the persons who dominate the information media today are neither alert nor firm. To put it bluntly, they are starry-eyed in a world that is tough and realistic about power.

I believe that with strength and skill we can indeed negate the aggressive Communist power and gradually arrive at live-and-let-live agreements so indispensable in a world

of nuclear weapons. But it won't be easy and it won't be quick. And it won't come at all if we follow the lead of the writers, the professors and the politicians who seek us to disarm, be sweet, hope for the best.

What these people are really doing is assuring us that they can predict the future and that the future will pose no problems to us that cannot be handled with good will. No problems in our hemisphere, no problems in Europe or Africa or Asia which will threaten our interests and which cannot be handled with clever phrases.

That's just not the real world. The institutions of enlightened societies are all too often changed by the physical power of some group of men of ill-will. Often the power need not even be used. Its existence, its implied threat of use, can change the governments of other countries.

There is nothing in the record of the Communist countries to indicate that they are ready to bubble over with good will if only we will disarm ourselves and talk to them nicely.

The historic fact is that we have treated the Soviet Union with considerable generosity. In the early '30s we as a country tried to be decent to Stalinist Russia at a time when many other leading nations wouldn't recognize the Communist government. We helped defend the Soviet Union during World War II when we could have stood back and watched the Nazis and Communists chew each other to bits. We gave the Soviet Union a free hand in Eastern Europe. We offered to share our nuclear secrets with her.

It would be hard to convince anyone that our restraint has brought increased civil liberties, free speech, academic freedom and anything else good to any group of human beings. But firmness has. Those who remember way back into the late '40s will recall that some of the greatest democracies in Europe were about to lose their freedoms under Communist pressure. There were no overt threats of Soviet invasion, merely the existence of power on one side of the Iron Curtain and weakness on the other. By placing our power on the side of Western Europe we blunted the threat.

Now, some of the critics of the defense establishment may well claim that this is not what the so-called dialogue is all about. They don't want to knuckle under to Communist pressure; they merely want to deprive American militarists of unneeded money.

One would have to be very young, quite oblivious to history or short on common sense to believe this. The campaign of these intellectuals adds up to isolationism and pacifism or it adds up to nothing. If they were sincere about wanting to improve the military establishment, wanting to get the best defense for the dollar, wanting to tailor our arms to our potential needs, then the current debate would be changed drastically.

Let me emphasize that I believe that the military establishment does need change and improvement. And let me also offer some specific areas in which truly concerned people can carry on fruitful discussion. I don't have instant answers to the issues which I will list here, but I can assure all of you that there will be profit to our nation and to our freedom if we address these issues in a responsible way.

**1. Our Foreign Policy Philosophy and Posture.** If our international role is to be one of *pacifism in isolation* the people of the United States should know that fact from their elected representatives. They should not have to rely on contrived consensus. If it is to be *isolationism in Fortress America* they should know the implications from their elected representatives.

If our elected representatives believe that our true course lies in a responsible *international* role, then a rational dialogue should include such questions as these: What values—material, moral, spiritual—are we

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

prepared to fight for? . . . Real estate? Access to vital resources? The values of the Judeo-Christian civilization? National honor?

This question—what are we prepared to fight for?—arises in many forms. In the Middle East, Israel, West Berlin, Africa and Latin America.

Rational dialogue would develop a viable and credible foreign policy, a realistic defense strategy and a stable defense planning and funding policy.

**2. Can we, in this day and age, develop a bipartisan foreign policy matrix?** The creation of West Germany, the Berlin Airlift, the Marshall Plan, the Japanese Peace Treaty are milestones of bipartisan cooperation. I believe it could work for us again. Perhaps a Special Commission, consisting of members appointed by the President, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House might be able to develop such a matrix by 1972.

**3. How do we avoid undermining the homefront in a real albeit undeclared shooting war?** The Founding Fathers just never had to consider the possibility of limited and undeclared wars in which the propaganda front is as vital as the military front. But these struggles constitute a fact of life in our times. Perhaps (when American Forces are actively engaged in some undeclared conflict) it might be possible to have, say, a "State of Belligerency" proclaimed. When our men are asked to risk their lives on a foreign field of battle, can the rules at home be the same as in peacetime?

**4. Should there be a ceiling on the Defense Budget?** There may be ways of stabilizing the Defense budget. There is merit in the idea that the President place his prestige behind a determination that there be allocated a certain percentage of the Gross National Product to national defense under conditions of "normalcy." In conditions short of formally declared war or a Special State (such as Belligerency) the percentage of GNP could then more likely be held firm, regardless of what political party may be in office.

**5. Why not periodic review of our Commitments and Contingency Plans?** Some steps are already being undertaken by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Senator Stuart Symington. It is a highly constructive idea, long overdue, and it can produce reasoned, dispassionate conclusions. After all, the level of our Defense expenditures is based primarily on the number and nature of our foreign commitments—not on the pie-in-the-sky desires of the generals and admirals.

**6. Why should not concerted effort be made to improve the military reality and thereby the Military Image?** Technology has changed the face of war. Propaganda has created a new dimension of war in a clash between our open society and a closed system. Our Armed Services should be encouraged to modernize their philosophy, doctrine and education curricula.

Perhaps impartial civilian review of procurement policies and practices on a periodic basis under any Administration would be a step forward in this direction. But, more important, starting with the Service Academies, the military services must make concerted effort to build leaders with an understanding of the separate and combined roles of all the Armed Services. The ability to communicate modern military values to men under their command should be encouraged and nurtured as an essential of military leadership.

**7. Report between the Business Community and the Intellectual Community.\*** In

what remains of the century there will be a reengineering of the nation's social, economic, educational, military and political institutions. Industry—the productive core of the "complex" we've been talking about—must help solve the problem of achieving equitable distribution of abundance while preserving basic free institutions.

Like industry, our intellectual community is indispensable to this effort. There ought to be a cease-fire in the cold war between the intellectuals and business which has been going on for much too long. Each needs the other in the common cause.

I could go on, but these few agenda items will show that there is real need for a concerned public discussion.

Because this is a world where widespread unrest and conflict are manifest against the background of the unsolved and growing problems of nuclear weapons, I close with a note of warning sounded by the late President Kennedy in his first State of the Union Message. Listen:

"I speak today in an hour of national peril and national opportunity. Before my term has ended we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain."

That test of our survival is now upon us.

## CONGLOMERATES—GOOD OR BAD?

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, within the past 6 months to a year, we have seen much to do about conglomerates, what they are, what they do, the amount of control they exercise over certain areas of our economy, and so forth. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Fortune magazine for July 1969:

PITCHFORK BEN, MEET WHEELBARROW JOHN (Sun, stand thou still upon Gilbeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon.—Joshua 10:12)

The Attorney General of the United States, John N. Mitchell, has thrown the weight of his office on the side of an extreme and simplistic interpretation of how antitrust law should be applied in merger cases. In so doing, he has used arguments that disclose, more unmistakably than any previous pronouncement of any federal official, the reactionary bias that underlies the trend of the Nixon Administration's antimerger policy.

The Department of Justice, Mitchell says, "may well oppose any merger among the top 200 manufacturing firms or firms of comparable size in other industries." Moreover, it "will probably" oppose a merger between any of the top 200 with "any leading producer in any concentrated industry." These candid new formulations contradict all those passionate denials by previous antitrust enforcers who said that they were not opposed to bigness as such. Under Mitchell's policy, antitrust enforcers will no longer feel it necessary to engage in those tortuous analyses that purported to show how a given merger, because of "vertical" relations or "horizontal" overlap of markets, would diminish competition. Henceforth the Antitrust Division, never noted for acute or diligent research, will be obliged to prove only size—which it can do by buying a copy of FORTUNE or asking a man who owns one.

\* This subject was considered in detail in my Stanford Business Conference speech of February, 1967.

The Attorney General's reasoning is even more alarming than the conclusions that emerge from it. After reciting that the top 200 manufacturing companies now "control" 58 percent of U.S. manufacturing assets (up from 48 percent twenty years ago), Mitchell says this fact "leaves us with the unacceptable probability that the nation's manufacturing and financial assets will continue to be concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer people."

This is unacceptable in a way that Mitchell doesn't mean. In the first place, nobody knows whether the recent trend he notes will continue or be reversed; some observers of business, for instance, believe that "deconglomeration" will be the trend of the 1970's. More significantly, an arithmetic concentration of assets by a number of firms does not by any means imply concentration in the hands of "fewer people." Most of these 200 companies, especially the conglomerates at whom his aim is directed, are highly decentralized operations; thousands of individual managers and experts participate in their decisions.

The 200 top manufacturing companies have millions of stockholders, with newly reinforced influence derived from mutual funds, take-over bids, and the general liveliness of the capital markets. Nearly all of these companies sell in increasingly competitive markets where technological improvement and consumer discretion sharply reduce the security of any product line; moreover, competition from foreign firms in the U.S. market is becoming more vigorous.

#### A POPULIST ECHO

Consumers, whose protection (as Mitchell notes) is the ultimate aim of the antitrust laws, are in a stronger position than ever before, because prosperity and the widening range of choice enables them to postpone purchases or to shift purchases from one industry category to another. A nationwide market, subject to world competition, has long since broken the concentrated power that many local monopolists, some of them small if measured on a national scale, formerly exercised over the necessities of life.

In the same speech (to the Georgia Bar Association) Mitchell disclosed that one of the objectives of his antitrust policy is to preserve the small town and city from what he regards as a growing concentration of power in metropolitan centers. "Most of you," he said in a direct appeal to the prejudice of his audience, "represent economic interests—distant from the centers of financial and managerial power—which may be injured by the current merger trend." Just in case any members of the Georgia bar were too obtuse to get the point, Mitchell added that lawyers outside metropolitan areas "should have the opportunity to act as counsel." He continued: "We do not want our middle-sized and smaller cities to be merely 'branch store' communities; nor do we want our average consumers to be 'second class' economic citizens."

This sentiment, of course, is not novel. Playing upon the fear of large corporations and of metropolitan centers was the stock in trade of such Populist orators as William Jennings Bryan, Pitchfork Ben Tillman, Sockless Jerry Simpson, Huey Long, and Alfalfa Bill Murray. When they denounced overconcentration, in many cases using "Wall Street" as its symbol, they had the excuse of not being able to foresee that the rise of large-scale business would in fact become a great liberating movement, dispersing power, generating competition, and giving consumers more and more influence over the allocation of the economy's resources.

But in 1969 an Attorney General of the United States, himself not a crossroads demagogue but a Wall Street lawyer, has no excuse for failure to take cognizance of American business as it actually is. If Mitchell

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

keeps on making these countryboy speeches, somebody is going to call him Wheelbarrow John.

#### A CHOICE OF HAUNCHES

The anti-bigness, anti-metropolitan bias in American politics has Thomas Jefferson's revered name attached to its origin. For a long time this bias was the chief asset and the chief liability of the Democratic party, whose grip upon the South loosened only when that region began to catch up, thanks to the belated presence there of corporations of national scale. Georgia, where Mitchell spoke, today exemplifies two societies: one of the most backward rural and small-town areas of the U.S. surrounds Atlanta, one of the most progressive metropolitan areas in the U.S. Where are the "second class" economic citizens of Georgia to be found? Are they around Atlanta, which teems with educated, independent decision makers (whether working for "branches" or for local entrepreneurs who wouldn't be there except for the "branches")? Or are "second class" economic citizens to be found in those red-clay counties where most of the people have very little choice about anything except which haunch to scratch?

At the very beginning of his Georgia speech Mitchell revealed a defective premise that may account for his policy. Noting a twelve-fold increase in the U.S. national income (in current dollars) since 1890, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed, he went on to say that this economic growth "strongly supports our belief that the antitrust laws have served us well." It's true that the antitrust laws, enforced during most of those eighty years with respect for the free and legitimate evolution of business, have served the nation well. But to speak as if these laws were the main cause of the growth of the nation's prosperity is surely a ludicrous example of the logical fallacy known as *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. (A caused B to happen because B happened later than A.)

#### A CHOICE OF JEFFERSONS

If the ex-officio prophets of antitrust think that antitrust created the present U.S. economy, then naturally they will assume that they can now bid the economy, as Joshua bade the sun and moon, to stand still. Mitchell prefers the sun to pause over Gibeon; he likes the look of the moon as it shines upon the valley of Ajalon.

But John Mitchell isn't Joshua. If government is to determine the proper size and shape of economic and social units, then the American people would probably prefer to have such decisions made by the likes of Pitchfork Ben rather than the likes of Wheelbarrow John. Any effort to freeze the 200 leading American corporations into their present shape, any effort to freeze the community structure of the U.S., can only result in a most un-Jeffersonian society where the police power of the central government becomes the concentrated site of economic and social decision making. We have here a conflict between two Jeffersons, the one who believed in a free society not shaped by government and the squire of Monticello who believed in small-scale economic units and who hated cities. Mitchell is backing the wrong Jefferson.

## CONSUMERISM

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Commerce Secretary Stans recently expressed concern about growing "consumerism" in this country.

October 7, 1969

It seems a strange warning to sound at a time when the consumer needs more and not less support from all levels of Government. If consumerism appears to him the "wave" he said it did, Mr. Stans must be viewing consumer protection through a magnifying glass.

I am inserting in the RECORD a column by Mr. Art Buchwald, whose comments, I think, reveal how close to fantasyland the remarks of the Secretary of Commerce really lie. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

#### FREE ENTERPRISE ENDANGERED BY WAVE OF "CONSUMERISM"

(By Art Buchwald)

Is the consumer revolution doing more harm than good? Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans seems to think so.

In a recent meeting with trade association officials in Washington, he expressed the fear that the consumer revolution—in which consumers demand more protection from the federal government—could get out of hand. He said the country should evaluate where it was heading, and ask "... whether we are going to let the wave of consumerism move too far and destroy the freedom of choice of the consumer."

It was the first time any high official of the government had mentioned the dangers of "consumerism" which, if allowed to go unchecked, could destroy the free enterprise system.

FBI statistics show that there are more unhappy consumers in this country than communists, and efforts must be made to eradicate "consumerism" before it spreads throughout the nation.

The best way to do this would be to hold hearings in front of the House Anti-Consumerism Committee. Harold Feldkamp, an unfriendly witness, is called to the stand.

"Feldkamp, we understand that on Jan. 20, 1969, you showed up at the Godfather Motor Company and made a scene in front of the customers. Is this true?"

"Yes, sir. You see, I bought a new car and the first day I drove to work the door fell off it."

"We didn't ask you to make a statement, Feldkamp."

"But I paid \$4,500 for the car, and I figured the door shouldn't have fallen off it... at least not the first day."

"You realize, Feldkamp, that this is the kind of thing that breeds consumerism."

"I'm sorry."

"All right, let's proceed. Feldkamp, have you now or have you ever been a member of the Consumer Party?"

"No, I've never been a member of the party."

"But you have flirted with consumerism."

"Let's say I've been on the fringes. I'm not for the violent overthrow of the National Association of Manufacturers. But gee whiz, you'd think you could get a car with a door that would stay on. I'd also like to say I'm not too thrilled with tires either."

"Feldkamp, I must warn you again that you are not here to make speeches. Now, how many consumers are in your cell?"

"I don't belong to a cell."

"Don't tell us, Feldkamp, that you operate alone. We all know that consumerism is a worldwide conspiracy."

"I'm not a member of any conspiracy."

"Do you know a Milton Orshesky?"

"Yes, I play poker with him."

"Did you know he was a consumer?"

"No, I didn't."

"Did you know he bought a new washing machine and when the lint filter on it wouldn't work, he threatened to sue the company that manufactured it?"

"No, I didn't know that."

"Do you know a Frank White?"

"Yes, he was in my car pool until the door fell off my car."

"Did you know his wife went to school with Ralph Nader?"

"No, I didn't? He never talked about his wife."

"Does the name Dmitri Kessel mean anything to you?"

"I played golf with him once or twice."

"Did you know that Dmitri Kessel's wife bought some bad hamburger at a supermarket and reported the store to the health authorities?"

"I wasn't aware of it."

"Feldkamp, it would be easier for you if you told us the names of all the consumers

you know. If you confess, the Department of Commerce will show some leniency towards you."

"I'm innocent."

"All right, Feldkamp. You've had your chance. We're turning over your file to Secretary of Commerce Stans. He's not as broad-minded about these matters as we are."

## SENATE—Wednesday, October 8, 1969

(*Legislative day of Tuesday, October 7, 1969*)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Most Rev. John S. Spence, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Washington, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, from whom all blessings flow, we implore Your special blessing upon the Members of this great legislative body. In the past Your guidance has been manifest in the skill with which they have found solutions to so many complex problems affecting the well-being of our Nation. But, dear Lord, never has any Congress had to grapple with such gigantic, ramified, and fundamental issues as does this present Senate. We beg You to fill every lawmaker with Your gifts of wisdom and prudence, in upholding justice and charity in all of their deliberations and conclusions. Dispel upon them some of Your celestial light, through which they may be enabled to choose those things which are of primary importance and which demand immediate action, and those which can be allowed a lower priority, all according to Your most holy will.

You, who created all men and who know all men and their needs, pilot our Senators rightly and safely between the urgencies of domestic and foreign issues, between the dangerous eddies of a just and lasting peace on the one hand, and a prolonged and devastating war on the other; between the costly conquest of space and the even costlier neglect of human needs on this planet. In all of their dilemmas, O God, we implore Your omnipotent and never failing guidance, so that whatever they do may be in accord with Your will and the world's happiness. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 7, 1969, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) is now recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the

distinguished Senator from Iowa yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. HUGHES. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

### THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to note that today is the 25th anniversary of the death of Wendell Willkie; that the hearts of many of us are filled with the warmth of recollection, with an awareness of how much this one man contributed to one world, and with a sense of indebtedness for the inspiration which he gave to all of us, particularly those of us who—like myself and like President Nixon, who today has written me a letter, which I will later include in the RECORD, in observance of this anniversary—began our national political lives as advocates and earnest speakers in the cause of Wendell Willkie.

When Wendell Willkie died, a magazine said his death had run like a seismic shock through the populace, a feeling of half angry disbelief, a shudder, and a realization. And then the people said, "There was a man."

So it is an honor for me to recall the passage through this life of a really great man and a great inspiration to mankind, and to note the presence in the Capitol of Wendell Willkie's widow, the very lovely Mrs. Wendell Willkie.

At a later date I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings at a breakfast of commemoration which was held in the Capitol this morning.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from President Nixon.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, October 7, 1969.  
Hon. HUGH SCOTT,  
Minority Leader,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HUGH: My very first personal connection with national politics came in 1940, when I made a number of local speeches in California for Wendell Willkie. I have always regarded his words, his life, and his character as an important source of personal inspiration.

I am pleased to know that the twenty-fifth anniversary of Wendell Willkie's untimely death is being observed on Capitol Hill this

Wednesday. At such a time, it would be appropriate, I believe, for all of us to think—and think seriously—about the philosophy that Willkie called his creed, and which he expressed in words that are now inscribed on a marker near his grave in Indiana.

"I believe in America," he said, "because in it we are free—free to choose our government, to speak our minds, to observe our different religions. Because we are generous with our freedom, we share our rights with those who disagree with us. Because we hate no people and covet no people's lands. Because we are blessed with a natural and varied abundance. Because we have great dreams and because we have the opportunity to make those dreams come true."

At a time when many in our nation are preoccupied by our problems, Willkie's words remind us of our strengths. When many dwell only on what is wrong with America, his words speak as persuasively today as they did a generation and more ago about what is right with America. And, finally, his words remind us of the great challenge which still is ours—the challenge of realizing ever more perfectly the ideals which he expressed so well and worked for so ardently, the challenge of "making those dreams come true."

"I would rather lose in a cause that I know some day will triumph," Wendell Willkie once said, "than to triumph in a cause that I know some day will fail." How important those words are for all of us. I am happy to join you in saluting the memory of a great American.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa is more than honored to join the distinguished minority leader in this tribute to Wendell Willkie.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 268—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CERTAIN MEASURES SHOULD BE TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I submit a resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.