

Rogers, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Self, Robert G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shapiro, Stephen R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shirley, Louis A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stell, Joe S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turk, Robert P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Urban, James G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanvonderen, Vernon R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vause, David. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Voyagis, Constantine M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weber, Carl H., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitcomb, Ned J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Ariel L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, Edward H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Workmon, Frederick C., Sr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wyatt, Wendell I. xxx-xx-xxxx

## NURSE CORPS

Abeles, Lila R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bailey, Mary J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ball, Evelyn F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barry, Mary E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bennett, Leland R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boatright, Mary A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borden, Mary B. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Byron, Lois J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Calvert, Dorothy C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cantwell, Martha E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cater, Lucy R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conroy, Sara J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corbett, Joan E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dean, Charlene R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deffner, Mary R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ellis, Pauline V. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Engle, Raye C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farrell, George E., II xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farrell, Patricia A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Florence, Susie A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Flowers, Patricia M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Frederick, Brooks V., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Furfure, Joseph A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Garza, Juanita xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gilbertson, Joan C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Giniewski, Mary T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Googe, Marjorie C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harris, Nancy Susan xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hause, Helen E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Health, Lois M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hettinger, June M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hosmer, Marilyn E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huffman, Marcia C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Florence L. xxx-xx-xxxx

Jorgenson, Mary C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 King, Norda M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirby, Dennis J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Klajnowski, Martha G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lane, Jerry xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lawrence, Annie L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Logan, Bertha A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lynch, Mary C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maine, Hugh C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martinsen, Margaret M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matheson, Billie G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matheson, Joan A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McAllister, Biddie R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McFarlin, Margaret R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McIlquham, Corrine J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLaughlin, Mary L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Merrow, Jean T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miyagawa, Cora H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moran, Barbara M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moyer, Donald S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mumper, Monna L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nakatani, Lilly A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Navarro, Pete xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Newman, Lawrence S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Obarr, Joyce E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ohrt, Valerie A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Overacre, Robert C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parcells, Phyllis P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pratt, Leroy O. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richardson, Evelyn G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Santacrose, Anthony F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sargent, Arlene M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spirek, June J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Staudenmaier, Herbert V. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steiner, Marion H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swansburg, Russell C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thornburg, Colleen xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watson, Herbert T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welsh, Dorothy M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wetherby, Shirley M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Betty J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whittemore, Earl C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Ethel M. B. xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bauer, Robert A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collom, James D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corley, Horace A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corum, B. H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 DeMuth, William J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dickson, Lonnie J. xxx-xx-xxxx

Dunn, Norwood C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farringer, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Garron, Leonard J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grady, Eddie L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Graves, Frederick J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greaser, Robert C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harman, George W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hegele, Jack D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hentz, David E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaplan, Burton xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelley, Ronald L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelsey, Donn R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kratzsch, Paul F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lensch, John P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lund, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McAfee, Charles A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pence, James M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Penner, Norman R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pomeroy, Gary J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reevesman, Sanford L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rosenbaum, Samuel F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schusselle, Jerry H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Snyder, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tager, Robert M. xxx-xx-xxxx

## VETERINARY CORPS

Blackman, Daniel A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Britz, William E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Richard J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Norman D., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKinney, Hubert E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Olson, Roland C. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pryor, William H., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shannon, Robert D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Malcolm C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sturges, Dewey V. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tom, Henry K., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx

## BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Burns, Carol H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Casimiro, Paul S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chipser, Joseph F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gallagher, James T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gunter, James J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hartley, James E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hill, Sherwood S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kellogg, Robert S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Margolis, Hannah S. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maxwell, Muriel O. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKinney, Vernon L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meade, John P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Page, Carolyn T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rubin, Martin G. xxx-xx-xxxx

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 13, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
 The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch,  
 D.D., offered the following prayer:

*There will be glory and honor and peace  
 for everyone who does good.—Romans  
 2: 10.*

Eternal God, our Father, without whose  
 blessing all our labor is in vain, grant  
 that in the decisions we make we may  
 be mindful of Thy presence and eager to  
 do Thy will. Inspire us with a faith  
 that never falters, a faithfulness that  
 never fails, and a fidelity that never  
 fades as we endeavor to do our duty for  
 the good of our country.

Kindle in the hearts of all men a  
 true love for peace, a sincere desire for  
 the triumph of truth, and an increasing  
 concern for the welfare of all mankind.  
 So may Thy kingdom go forward, Thy  
 will be done, and love live in the hearts  
 of Thy children.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of  
 Thursday, October 9, 1969, was read and  
 approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the Presi-  
 dent of the United States was communi-  
 cated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of  
 his secretaries, who also informed the  
 House that on October 10, 1969, the Presi-  
 dent approved and signed bills of the  
 House of the following titles:

H.R. 4152. An act to authorize appropriations  
 for certain maritime programs of the  
 Department of Commerce; and

H.R. 10420. An act to permit certain real  
 property in the State of Maryland to be used  
 for highway purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Ar-  
 rington, one of its clerks, announced that  
 the Senate had passed with amendments  
 in which the concurrence of the House is  
 requested, a bill of the House of the fol-  
 lowing title:

H.R. 12829. An act to provide an extension  
 of the interest equalization tax, and for other  
 purposes.

The message also announced that the  
 Senate insists upon its amendments to  
 the bill (H.R. 12829) entitled "An act to

provide an extension of the interest  
 equalization tax, and for other purposes,"  
 requests a conference with the House on  
 the disagreeing votes of the two Houses  
 thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr.  
 ANDERSON, Mr. GORE, Mr. WILLIAMS of  
 Delaware, and Mr. BENNETT to be the  
 conferees on the part of the Senate.

REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF  
CONFEREES ON H.R. 12829, EX-  
TENSION OF INTEREST EQUALI-  
ZATION TAX

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unan-  
 imous consent to take from the Speaker's  
 table the bill (H.R. 12829) to provide an  
 extension of the interest equalization  
 tax, and for other purposes, with Senate  
 amendments thereto, disagree to the  
 Senate amendments, and agree to the  
 conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to  
 the request of the gentleman from  
 Arkansas?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving  
 the right to object, this bill has come  
 over from the other body and it provides  
 principally for interest equalization, but

there has been tagged onto it an utterly irrelevant provision. That is a practice that has been used by the other body on quite a number of our bills; that is, the other body frequently takes a bill we passed in the Chamber and adds to it, as an amendment, another bill which has nothing to do with the measure we passed.

When that is done, when an utterly irrelevant bill is tagged onto a bill we have passed, the bill then goes to conference. By this technique this House is deprived of the opportunity of holding hearings, for example, on the bill that was offered as an amendment to the measure we originally passed.

The appropriate committee that would have jurisdiction over the amendment is bypassed. The Members, in a certain sense, buy a pig in a poke. They do not know exactly what is contained in the amendment offered, which is really a new bill offered by the Members of the other body.

This kind of a practice has been going on for quite a number of years. It is time to call a halt. We should strike a blow for liberty, as it were, rebel against this practice. We are either men or mice. We are either lions or sheep. We should not be any longer dumb-driven cattle to bow under and knuckle to this kind of a practice. The two bodies are coequal. This is not equality. It is making us vassals and the Members of the other body masters.

I have spoken with the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), and he agrees with me that the rules of the House should be changed so that we would not be presented with a bill which we passed, on which there was added an utterly irrelevant and nongermane provision.

We provide in this Chamber that one cannot amend a bill unless the amendment has some relevancy. That rule does not, unfortunately, prevail in the other body. The fact that it does not prevail is used by Members of the other body to put their pet measures into bills that we have passed.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I must reluctantly object to the bill going to conference. I hope the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will reject the so-called ammunition amendment, which has naught to do with interest equalization and refers to a change in the Gun Control Act.

Let the process be normal. If the chairman rejects the so-called gun control amendment, I pledge here and now suitably to hold hearings on that ammunition amendment and permit the House to work its will normally and not in the contemplated "shotgun" manner.

I therefore object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12781, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill

(H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make the reservation merely for the purpose of asking the gentlewoman from Washington whether or not this request has been cleared with the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois may I say that the ranking minority member conferred with me at some length. We went over all matters to be discussed. The gentleman is in his district today or would be present. It has been cleared with the ranking minority member and all members of the subcommittee.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for that explanation, and I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentlewoman from Washington if, within her knowledge, there are any amendments attached by the other body to this bill which may not be germane to the bill?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, there are no nongermane amendments proposed by the other body which are pending for consideration by the conference committee.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. HANSEN of Washington and Messrs. KIRWAN, MARSH, FLYNT, MAHON, REIFEL, McDADE, WYATT, and BOW.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1689, CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1689) to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal

hazards and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, MOSS, MURPHY of New York, SPRINGER, and KEITH.

#### TAX REFORM

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer of America must be chagrined at the "happenings" on the Senate Finance Committee on tax reform. The first decisions protect tax privilege at every turn.

It would be a shame if the reasonable efforts of the Ways and Means Committee and the House of Representatives to close tax loopholes were subverted. If our efforts to close loopholes are imperfect—the burden for creating acceptable alternatives must shift to the Senate Finance Committee.

The entire Nation is watching.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE REPORT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 13950, the Coal Mine Safety Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT REFORM

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I received a message from President Nixon urging that Congress and the administration work together on a series of programs.

On page 5 of his message he says:

The Federal city has been a federal colony far too long. Months ago I presented to Congress a program to bring about the orderly transfer of political power to the people of this community.

The President then goes on to state that he has presented to Congress bills for a nonvoting delegate, for a charter commission on self-government and a proposal for a constitutional amendment to grant to the city representation in Congress.

I have joined with a number of my colleagues in support of the constitutional amendment to give voting representatives in Congress to the District of Columbia and this bill is presently pending in Judiciary Committee.

I was particularly concerned, however, with his statement that work should be

completed before the end of the year on the nonvoting delegate bill and the charter commission bill, both of which have passed the Senate.

There are 25 members authorized on the District of Columbia Committee. On the nonvoting delegate bill, I joined with four of my Democratic colleagues on the committee and 10 Republican members on the committee to introduce this bill. This makes 15 votes for the bill, which I count as a majority.

On the charter commission bill, six of us Democratic members on the committee joined on this bill with 11 Republicans on the committee which made 17, and I count that as a majority of 25.

Since receiving the message this weekend, I have been attempting to contact my colleagues to be certain their position is still the same. I want to state this morning to the President and to the Republican leadership that I have already been able to reach the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DRIGGS) and we publicly state today that we will vote this day or any other to pass out the charter commission bill and the nonvoting delegate bill from the House District of Columbia Committee.

There is presently one Republican vacancy on the committee so there are only 24 members. As I count, there are at least 10 Republicans for each bill, and therefore if the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DRIGGS), and I vote for this bill, that gives a majority this morning for each of these bills if the Republican leadership wants to pass them.

Rule 4 of the rules governing procedures of the Committee on the District of Columbia provides:

No bill or other matter shall be brought up for hearing or other consideration except with the approval of the chairman or by a majority vote of a quorum of the committee. A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum, except that less than a quorum shall be competent to hold hearings.

I would suggest to the President that he contact the Republican members of the committee and tell them they can pass the bill this week. In fact, if he gives me a little more time, I am certain I can obtain support from three or four more of my Democratic colleagues and he will have an overwhelming majority.

Mr. President, the next move is up to the Republican leadership.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13194, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS ON INSURED STUDENT LOANS

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13194) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 91-560)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13194) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969'."

#### "INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ON INSURED STUDENT LOANS

"SEC. 2. (a) (1) Whenever the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that the limitations on interest or other conditions (or both) applicable under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329) to student loans eligible for insurance by the Commissioner of Education or under a State or nonprofit private insurance program covered by an agreement under section 428(b) of such Act, considered in the light of the then current economic conditions and in particular the relevant money market, are impeding or threatening to impede the carrying out of the purposes of such part B and have caused the return to holders of such loans to be less than equitable, he is hereby authorized, by regulation applicable to a three-month period specified therein, to prescribe (after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the heads of other appropriate agencies) a special allowance to be paid by the Commissioner of Education to each holder of an eligible loan or loans. The amount of such allowance to any holder with respect to such period shall be a percentage, specified in such regulation, of the average unpaid balance of disbursed principal (not including interest added to principal) of all eligible loans held by such holder during such period, which balance shall be computed in a manner specified in such regulation; but no such percentage shall be set at a rate in excess of 3 per centum per annum.

"(2) A determination pursuant to paragraph (1) may be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis and the regulation based thereon may, accordingly, set differing allowance rates for different regions or other areas or classifications of lenders, within the limit of the maximum rate set forth in paragraph (1).

"(3) For each three-month period with respect to which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare prescribes a special allowance, the determination required by paragraph (1) shall be made, and the percentage rate applicable thereto shall be set, by promulgation of a new regulation or by amendment to a regulation applicable to a prior period or periods.

"(4) The special allowance established for any such three-month period shall be payable at such time, after the close of such period, as may be specified by or pursuant to regulations promulgated under this Act. The holder of a loan with respect to which any such allowance is to be paid shall be deemed to have a contractual right, as against the United States, to receive such allowance from the Commissioner.

"(5) Each regulation or amendment, prescribed under this Act, which establishes a special allowance with respect to a three-

month period specified in the regulation or amendment shall, notwithstanding section 505 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, apply to the three-month period immediately preceding the period in which such regulation or amendment is published in the Federal Register, except that the first such regulation may be made effective as of August 1, 1969, and notwithstanding other provisions of this section requiring a three-month period, may be made effective for a period of less than three months.

"(6) (A) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine, with respect to the student insured loan program as authorized under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and this Act, whether there are any practices of lending institutions which may result in discrimination against particular classes or categories of students, including the requirement that as a condition to the receipt of a loan the student or his family maintain a business relationship with the lender, the consequences of such requirement, and the practice of refusing to make loans to students for their freshman year of study, and also including any discrimination on the basis of sex, color, creed, or national origin. The Secretary shall make a report with respect to such determination, and his recommendations, to the Congress on or before March 1, 1970.

"(B) If, after making such determination, the Secretary finds that, in any area, a substantial number of eligible students are denied a fair opportunity to obtain an insured student loan because of practices of lending institutions in the area which limit student participation, (i) he shall take such steps as may be appropriate, after consultation with the appropriate State guarantee agencies and the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students, relating to such practices and to encourage the development in such area of a plan to increase the availability of financial assistance opportunities for such students, and (ii) he shall, within sixty days after making such determination, adopt or amend appropriate regulations pertaining to the student insured loan program to prevent, where practicable, any practices which he finds have denied loans to a substantial number of students.

"(7) As used in this Act, the term 'eligible loan' means a loan made on or after August 1, 1969, and prior to July 1, 1971, which is insured under title IV-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or made under a program covered by an agreement under section 428 (b) of such Act.

"(b) The Commissioner of Education shall pay to the holder of an eligible loan, at such time or times as are specified in regulations, a special allowance prescribed pursuant to subsection (a), subject to the condition that such holder shall submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may deem proper, such information as may be required by regulation for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner to carry out their functions under this Act and to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"(c) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for special allowances as authorized by this section not to exceed \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary.

"(2) Sums available for expenditure pursuant to appropriations made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, under section 421(b) (other than clause (1) thereof) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall be available for payment of special allowances under this Act. The authorization in paragraph (1) shall be reduced by the amount made available pursuant to this paragraph.

**"INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM**

"Sec. 3. Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '\$275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and, \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$325,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$375,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971'.

**"INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM**

"Sec. 4. Section 401(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out '\$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971'.

**"INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM**

"Sec. 5. Section 441(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out '\$250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$285,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$320,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize special allowances for lenders with respect to insured student loans under title IV-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 when necessary in the light of economic conditions in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, and to increase the authorizations for certain other student assistance programs."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,  
EDITH GREEN,  
JOHN BRADEMAS,  
HUGH CAREY,  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,  
PHILLIP BURTON,  
FRANK THOMPSON,  
JAMES H. SCHEUER,  
LOUIS STOKES,  
WILLIAM L. CLAY,  
WILLIAM AYRES,  
ALBERT H. QUIE,  
OGDEN REID,  
JOHN N. ERLENBORN,  
MARVIN L. ESCH,  
JOHN DELLENBACK,  
WILLIAM STEIGER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CLAIBORNE PELL,  
RALPH W. YARBROUGH,  
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,  
HARRISON WILLIAMS,  
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
WALTER F. MONDALE,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
WINSTON L. PROUTY,  
J. JAVITS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**STATEMENT**

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13194) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the

conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the text of the House bill and inserted in lieu thereof a new text. It also amended the title of the House bill. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agrees to the same with amendments to the text of the bill and to the title. This statement describes the recommendations of the committee of conference with respect to each of the substantive differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The House bill and the Senate amendment differed as to the type and manner of computing the allowances to be paid under the bill. The House bill made the payments dependent on a determination by the Secretary that the limitations on interest or other conditions have caused the return to the lender "to be less than equitable." The Senate amendment made the determination of the Secretary depend on whether limitations on interest or other conditions "are impeding or threatening to impede the carrying out of the purposes" of the insured student loan program. The agreement reached in conference requires that the criteria in both the House bill and the Senate amendment must be met.

The House bill provided that the allowances which will be paid would be called market adjustment allowances. Under the Senate amendment, they would be called incentive allowances. The substitute agreed upon in conference provides that they will be called special allowances.

Under the House bill, the amount of the allowances would be fixed retrospectively with respect to the 3-month period preceding the publication in the Federal Register of a regulation prescribing the amount of the allowance. The Senate amendment provided that the amount of these allowances would be prescribed prospectively for the 3-month period beginning with the first day of the calendar month following the publication in the Federal Register of a regulation prescribing them. The conference substitute provides that these allowances will be prescribed retrospectively as in the House bill.

The House bill and Senate amendment differed as to the duration of the period during which the program would be in effect. The House bill provided that an allowance could be paid on loans made after June 30, 1969, and before the regular expiration date of the Higher Education Act of 1965—that is, June 30, 1971. The Senate amendment provided that payments could be made with respect to loans made after August 15, 1969, and prior to July 1, 1970. The conference substitute provides that the beginning date of such period shall be August 1, 1969, and that such period would have a duration coextensive with that of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as in the House bill. The House bill, unlike the Senate amendment, authorized the continuation of allowances for loans made during such period for the duration of such loans. This authorization is retained in the conference substitute. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of \$15 million for payment of allowances during fiscal year 1970. The House bill authorized for fiscal year 1970 and succeeding fiscal years such sums as are necessary to carry out the program. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of \$20 million for fiscal year 1970, and \$40 million for fiscal year 1971. In addition, as in the House bill, appropriations are authorized to pay allowances over the life of loans made during such period.

The House bill amended the existing Higher Education Act of 1965. In contrast, the Senate amendment was a new and independent enactment. The conference substitute adopts the approach of the Senate amendment in this regard, which results in

a number of minor technical differences. For example, the Senate amendment, unlike the House bill, did not explicitly state that the right to receive a market adjustment allowance is a contractual right. This provision of the House bill is contained in the conference substitute. The House bill relied on the authority already contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965 with respect to the right of the Commissioner to require the submission of information. The Senate amendment contained a new provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision on this matter.

The Senate amendment contained a provision requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe procedures which would prohibit lenders from requiring as a condition, precedent or subsequent, for making an insured student loan that the student or a member of his family must carry out any other business activity with the lender. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must determine whether there are any practices of lending institutions participating in the insured student loan program which may result in discrimination against particular classes or categories of students. The Secretary's review of lending practices is to be comprehensive and include, but not be limited to, determinations with respect to practices which may result in discrimination on the basis of sex, color, creed, or national origin and determinations with respect to the practice of requiring a student or his family to have a business relationship with the lender, and to the practice of refusing to make loans for a student's freshman year. The Secretary will make a report to the Congress with respect to his determinations and his recommendations on or before March 1, 1970. In addition to any recommendations for legislative or administrative action, the managers on the part of the House expect the Secretary's report to provide a detailed analysis of such lending practices and the consequences of such practices. If after making his determination with respect to such practices the Secretary further finds that there are a substantial number of eligible students who are denied a fair opportunity to obtain an insured student loan because of such practices, he is required to take appropriate steps (after consulting with appropriate State guarantee agencies and the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students) relating to such practices, and to encourage the development in the area of a plan to increase the availability of financial assistance opportunities for students. He is also required, within 60 days after making the determination referred to above, to adopt appropriate regulations pertaining to the student insured loan program to prevent, where practicable, practices which he finds have denied loans to a substantial number of students.

The Senate amendment amended title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to raise the amount authorized to be appropriated for contributions to student loan funds from \$275 million for fiscal 1970 to \$325 million; and for fiscal 1971 it raised the present authorization of \$300 to \$375 million. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment also amended title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to raise the authorization of appropriations for college work study programs from \$250 million for fiscal 1970 to \$275 million, and also raised such authorization for fiscal 1971 from \$285 to \$320 million. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate provision.

The Senate amendment also amended title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to raise the authorizations of appropriations for educational opportunity grants from \$100

million for fiscal 1970 to \$150 million. For fiscal 1971, it raised such authorizations from \$140 to \$200 million. The conference substitute raises the authorization for fiscal 1970 to \$125 million, and for fiscal 1971 to \$170 million.

The committee of conference amended the title to reflect the above-described action of the committee.

CARL D. PERKINS,  
EDITH GREEN,  
JOHN BRADEMAM,  
HUGH CAREY,  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,  
PHILLIP BURTON,  
FRANK THOMPSON,  
JAMES H. SCHEUER,  
LOUIS STOKES,  
WILLIAM L. CLAY,  
WILLIAM AYRES,  
ALBERT H. QUIE,  
OGDEN REID,  
JOHN N. ERLBORN,  
MARVIN L. ESCH,  
JOHN DELLENBACK,  
WILLIAM STEIGER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### IS A LITTLE BIT OF PREGNANCY ACCEPTABLE TOO, MR. PRESIDENT?

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that the 515,000 Americans who lost their jobs in the last 60 days paid close attention to the recent Senate testimony by Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy. He stated that a 4-percent rise in unemployment was "acceptable" to the administration. He also said the administration believed it was necessary to continue its disastrous policies that might force unemployment even higher.

Here we have a picture of more than half a million Americans thrown out of useful employment in a very short period, and the Government of our country blandly dismisses this as acceptable. What would we say if a doctor dismissed a little bit of cancer as acceptable? Or a smidgin of cholera morbus? Or a touch of heart disease? Or just a teensy-weensy bit of pregnancy? How does a 4-percent rate of leprosy strike you?

I wonder if our profound Secretary of the Treasury has any realization of how his "acceptable" level of unemployment will strike people who have lost their jobs. Well, after all, the men now running our Government have little knowledge or understanding of the daily struggle for life. The unemployed are only working people, are they not? Forgotten Americans, I believe the President called them during his campaign. They are forgotten, all right.

One representative of the Government, Mr. Weidenbaum, expressed his pleasure over soaring unemployment figures, while a White House spokesman says, "We are not happy with the increase in unemployment." Take your choice. Both are as solid as empty jugs.

Are they unhappy or happy over the highest interest rates in a generation? Are they dancing joyfully in the White House over the disaster overtaking housing, the stock market, and the average worker? Or do they sit in sackcloth and ashes, dolefully mourning such turns of events? Do they clink champagne glasses as unemployment lines lengthen?

Is it all part of their master plan? Let us in on the secret. Perhaps it is just like the President's secret method for ending the war.

In the President's war against inflation, the only casualties are working people across the land. Their wounds and agony are his success in the battle against too much prosperity. Some war. Some success. We shall end inflation, all right. And when millions upon millions of Americans are without work, money or hope, President Nixon will triumphantly stride the ruins of our economy and joyfully proclaim "We have won the war against inflation." And against full employment and national well-being, too. And the massed bankers, corporation presidents, and boards of directors will cheer him to the echo. And the average working person? What will they say in their millions? Why, they will be too busy to say anything. There is no time when you are on your way to the polls to vote.

#### CAPT. JAMES M. SPRAYBERRY, THIRD ALABAMIAN TO RECEIVE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL FOR HEROISM IN VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday President Nixon awarded the Nation's highest military award to four Army men. One of those who received the Congressional Medal of Honor was a young man from my hometown of Sylacauga, Ala. Capt. James M. Sprayberry is only the third Alabamian to receive the Congressional Medal for heroism in the Vietnam war, and the first to live to receive it.

I know I speak for all Alabamians and all Americans when I say we are proud of this young man and the part he has played in the fight against communism. The actions for which Captain Sprayberry received the Congressional Medal are outlined in the citation which accompanied the award. Mr. Speaker, I include that citation in the RECORD at this point, and also editorials from the Sylacauga Advance and the Birmingham News lauding Captain Sprayberry:

#### CITATION

The President of the United States of America, authorized by act of Congress, March 3, 1863 has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor to Captain James M. Sprayberry, United States Army for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

Captain (then First Lieutenant) James M. Sprayberry, Armor, United States Army, distinguished himself by exceptional bravery on 25 April 1968 in the Republic of Vietnam while serving as Executive Officer of Company D, 5th Battalion, 7th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile). On this date his Company Commander and a great number of the men were wounded and separated from the main body of the company. A daylight attempt to rescue them was driven back by the well-entrenched enemy's heavy fire. Captain Sprayberry then organized and led a volunteer night patrol to eliminate the intervening enemy bunkers and to relieve the surrounded element. The patrol soon began receiving enemy machine gun fire.

Captain Sprayberry quickly moved the men to protective cover and without regard for his own safety, crawled within close range of the bunker from which the fire was coming. He silenced the machine gun with a hand grenade. Identifying several one-man enemy positions nearby, Captain Sprayberry immediately attacked them with the rest of his grenades. He crawled back for more grenades and when two grenades were thrown at his men from a position to the front, Captain Sprayberry, without hesitation, again exposed himself and charged the enemy-held bunker killing its occupants with a grenade. Placing two men to cover his advance, he crawled forward and neutralized three more bunkers with grenades. Immediately thereafter, Captain Sprayberry was surprised by an enemy soldier who charged from a concealed position. He killed the soldier with his pistol and with continuing disregard for the danger neutralized another enemy emplacement. Captain Sprayberry then established radio contact with the isolated men, directing them toward his position. When the two elements made contact he organized his men into litter parties to evacuate the wounded. As the evacuation was nearing completion, he observed an enemy machine gun position which he silenced with a grenade. Captain Sprayberry returned to the rescue party, established security, and moved to friendly lines with the wounded. This rescue operation, which lasted approximately seven and one-half hours, saved the lives of many of his fellow soldiers. Captain Sprayberry personally killed twelve enemy soldiers, eliminated two machine guns, and destroyed numerous enemy bunkers. Captain Sprayberry's indomitable spirit and gallant action at great personal risk to his life are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

[From the Sylacauga (Ala.) Advance, Oct. 9, 1969]

#### OUR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT

All Sylacauga can indeed be proud of its first Medal of Honor winner, Capt. James Michael Sprayberry. Wednesday he received the nation's highest award for valor from President Nixon at the White House.

Capt. Sprayberry, 22, is a graduate of B. B. Comer School and attended Alexander City Junior College. His parents are the O. H. Sprayberrys and his wife is the former Nancy Herd.

Already a recipient of the Silver Star and Purple Heart medals, Capt. Sprayberry was recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor for his efforts in Vietnam April 25 and 26, 1968.

His daring night rescue of an ambushed platoon was called by the 1st Cavalry Division's commanding general, "the bravest single act that I have heard of during the time I have commanded the 'First Team'."

A report of the incident stated:

"The action began late in the afternoon when the company's 1st Platoon and the company post (CP) started down a thickly vegetated finger of a steep mountain. The platoon had almost reached a major enemy supply route, when enemy automatic weapons fire rang out from two sides.

"Sprayberry, working on a Medevac pad some 300 meters east of the pinned-down platoon, sent the 3d Platoon forward to relieve pressure on the 1st Platoon. Murderous enemy fire drove the platoon back and Sprayberry decided to attempt the rescue under darkness.

"Around 8 p.m., the young lieutenant loaded himself down with as many fragmentation grenades as he could carry, and led a volunteer rescue party up the road. They moved only a short distance before they came under machinegun fire from a bunker alongside the road.

"Sprayberry spotted the flashes and, after making sure his men were under cover, he crawled toward the bunker. When he got within 15 meters of the bunker, he hurled a grenade at the enemy. He then spotted several spider holes along the road and threw grenades into these until his supply ran out.

"Without Sprayberry's personal courage and his initiative the entire first platoon and the command element would have been in a critical situation."

Capt. Sprayberry lay down his life for his friends just as surely as if he had lost it . . . and "greater love has no man." We applaud him for his valor and rejoice with his family and friends that it is being recognized in a fitting manner. Sylacauga will also want to honor him when he returns home.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News]

#### ABOVE AND BEYOND

Most men, when called to the service of their country, serve it honorably and courageously. Now and then, cast into a role which the heat of combat dictates, a man in uniform will perform acts of valor which surface without premeditation, but are a measure of the human instinct to survive and to protect those nearby.

Sheer chance, more often than not, casts a man into circumstances from which particular acts of courage emerge. Few men become heroes by deliberate choice. But a special few do respond in ways, when the heat of battle rises, that set them ever so slightly apart from their fellows.

Such a man is Capt. James M. Sprayberry of Sylacauga, decorated this week by President Nixon with the Medal of Honor, the nation's highest award for valor in combat.

Capt. Sprayberry, we would guess, did not set out to become a hero. But he was a willing one when the need arose for him to perform acts which mark him as an honored member of a legion that has answered above and beyond the call of duty.

#### MANIFESTATIONS OF DISLOYALTY: AMERICANS ARE WATCHING

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention once again to the Red-directed general strike called for Wednesday. This shameful betrayal of our fighting men in Vietnam is weakly camouflaged as a "moratorium" or a "protest" or a "dissent," but it all adds up to a deliberate effort to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

The Vietcong "foreign minister" in Paris joins other Communists to praise the organized disruptions.

Americans are not fooled. The great silent majority who work, who pay taxes, who fight our wars, and who elect public officials, are watching. They understand that when Americans are dying in combat, aid to the enemy is immoral and treasonable—not patriotic. Let us all understand that Wednesday marks a polarization, when those who support our fighting men and those who aid the enemy are sorted out and identified.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have called on loyal Americans to fly the flag on Wednesday in a silent show of support of our men in Vietnam. The American War Dads have called on President Nixon to demand unconditional enemy withdrawal from South Vietnam, and in the alternative to remove the political handcuffs from our forces and permit them to

end the war and bring peace through victory—in the American tradition.

I include current news clippings summing up these very plain divisions between Americans and the enemy as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 9, 1969]

#### BITTERNESS IN VIETNAM MAKES WAR CRITICS "ENEMY"

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

SAIGON.—It is distressing, though not particularly surprising, that many of those who are fighting and working in Vietnam have come to refer to parts of the American press and some political leaders as "the enemy." They mean it, furthermore, just as literally as when they speak of the Viet Cong in the rice paddies and the government in Hanoi.

This is not a military-civilian or even a hawk-dove antagonism. The differences are much deeper than these terms would imply. And the enmity, quite certainly, is mutual.

The bitterness encountered in Vietnam is the bitterness of men who feel that they have been betrayed. They have come to believe in the job that they were sent out here to do. Far beyond the rhetoric of any political speech or newspaper editorial, they understand what has been accomplished here—and at what cost—and what remains still to be done. For them, "the enemy" is anyone who stands between them and the objective.

Anti-war sentiment they understand well enough, particularly among the young people who are being asked to bear most of the sacrifices that the war entails. Other aspects of American policy such as the stopping of the bombing of North Vietnam, the peace talks in Paris, the Vietnamization of the war and the withdrawal of American troops, they have accepted dubiously as elements of a higher diplomacy.

But it has been hard for them to accept the fact that some Americans—including some who hold positions of authority—should be actively working against the success of the American effort here.

It is only recently that they have come to realize that there are a considerable number of Americans who pray that the war in Vietnam may be lost for what they consider to be the most high-minded and patriotic reasons. The main reason, quite simply, is the hope that a defeat in Vietnam will demonstrate once and for all the futility, if not the immorality, of using American power to change the political and military equations in such areas of the world as Southeast Asia.

This is perhaps a tenable point of view in Washington, but it is not congenial to people who are fighting a war of survival. And since the objectives of the two groups are directly contradictory, it is inevitable that they should have very different ideas about the course American policy should take in the future.

To the overwhelming majority of people in Vietnam—regardless of their nationality—the ideas of the American opposition add up to sheer lunacy.

As they see it, the United States, after four years and an immense sacrifice of blood and treasure, has achieved a position of clear military and political superiority over an implacable and determined enemy. To them, it is simply unthinkable that this position should be abandoned in the illusion that the chances of a peaceful settlement of the conflict would be improved.

Nor is the military position by any means the only one being threatened.

In the course of the same four years, the political strength of the government in Saigon has been significantly increased. After a long series of military coups following the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, the present government has remained in power since 1965.

During this time, a national constitution has been promulgated, a national assembly

and other democratic institutions have been created, and elections have been held on both the national and local levels.

With all this, it may be that the regime presided over by Nguyen Van Thieu is something less than a model of liberal democratic government.

Below the top level, there is undoubtedly some corruption, as there is in most governments. Newspapers and politicians who have been sympathetic to communism have been dealt with severely. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the most competent observers here, the Thieu government is the most secure, the most effective and the most widely supported of any that South Vietnam has ever had.

And the result is that this same government is now the object of the most unbridled attack from opponents of the war that has been seen since the days of Diem. People in Washington who know literally nothing about Thieu or the realities of Vietnamese politics rise daily to denounce the Saigon regime as corrupt, repressive and unrepresentative.

The common theme is that it is the Thieu government, rather than the leaders in Hanoi, Peking and Moscow, who represent the real obstacle to peace in Vietnam. In order to remove this obstacle, it is suggested that the Saigon regime must somehow be coerced into stepping out of the picture to make way for a "coalition" with the Communists, who would then, presumably, conclude an honorable peace.

Fortunately, nothing of the sort is likely to happen. At this point, it is most improbable that the Thieu government can be forced by anyone into surrendering South Vietnam to Communist rule, no matter how loudly and insistently "the enemy" may demand it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 13, 1969]

#### VC WOMAN ENCOURAGES U.S. PROTEST

PARIS, October 12—Nguyen Thi Binh, who serves as foreign minister for the Vietcong, said today that President Nixon had reneged on his pledge to the American people to bring peace to Vietnam, and that American anti-war forces were fighting to save the honor of their nation.

"I am sure that American mothers and women whose sons and husbands have been pushed into this unjust war of aggression in Vietnam and all other people will never accept President Nixon's tortuous arguments" that he cannot announce in advance details for the U.S. troop pullout, she said in an interview with United Press International.

She said American troops must leave "totally and unconditionally" and that this was a "legitimate demand conforming with our national rights as well as with the aspirations for peace of the American people and other peoples."

"Monsieur Nixon declared during the presidential campaign that if he were elected President, he would end the war in Vietnam in six months," she said: "Now eight months have elapsed and Monsieur Nixon has spared no effort to violate the security and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of (north) Vietnam."

"Nixon's promise to end the war is no different from the words of Monsieur Johnson some years back when he claimed that he could 'see the end of the tunnel.'"

Mme. Binh hailed the antiwar movement in the United States as standing "for the happiness of the American youth and the honor of the United States."

#### NEWS RELEASE OF DEPARTMENT OF LOUISIANA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Veterans of Foreign Wars Department of Louisiana today urged that all citizens fly the United States Flag on Oct. 15 as a "silent" counteraction to demonstrations planned that date by a vocal minority of

dissidents opposing President Nixon on the issues of the Vietnam war.

Speaking for V.F.W., Department Commander Leonard Gray, Alexandria explained that "the Vietnam Moratorium Committee Movement for Student Protest Throughout the Nation" has asked for student protest, disruptive actions and other demonstrations keyed toward immediate capitulation to the Communist demands in Vietnam."

Commander Gray said "these demonstrations will seek to undermine the bargaining position of the President in the Paris talks and thus will further endanger the lives of our fighting men in Vietnam. The demonstrators will be joined by a minority coalition of Senators and Congressmen who will deliver the dissenters' message of surrender in the halls of Congress."

Termining the planned demonstrations as "shameful", Commander Gray urged "the 'silent majority' of patriotic Americans to prominently display the Flag of the United States before their homes, at their business and on the streets."

"The Flag has always been a symbol of patriotism, loyalty and courage. By flying it on Oct. 15, Americans will be showing they still have confidence in our government and are willing to show it publicly."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Oct. 12, 1969]

#### END OR WIDEN VIETNAM ROLE, WAR DADS ASK

St. JOSEPH, Mo.—The national convention of The American War Dads has adopted a resolution calling for a speedy end to the Vietnam war.

The resolution urges President Nixon to demand a ceasefire and immediate withdrawal of North Vietnamese and American troops from South Vietnam.

If a cease-fire and troop withdrawal are not agreed to within a specified time, the resolution says, military action should be taken to crush Communist aggression against South Vietnam.

Failing that, the resolution suggests blockading the Communist port at Haiphong and resumption of U.S. bombing of military targets in North Vietnam.

Delegates attending the organization's 27th annual convention yesterday also urged the President not to yield to those advocating a coalition government for South Vietnam.

The new national president of the organization, Charles Hodges of Macomb, Ill., has been empowered by the convention to seek the cooperation of other patriotic groups and veterans organizations to seek a conference with President Nixon and present the resolution to him in person.

#### THE RISING TIDE OF FOREIGN FOOTWEAR IMPORTS

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to report to the Members of the House that the August imports of leather and vinyl footwear totaled 13.9 million pairs, an increase of nearly 15.5 percent ahead of last year.

Leather and vinyl imports were 28.9 percent of an estimated domestic output of 48 million pairs. Shipments from Japan and Italy, in excess of nearly .7 million pairs each over last August, counted for most of the gains in men's and women's leather and vinyl footwear.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in this statement the statistics put out by the Foreign Trade Committee of the National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., which indicates where these imports are coming from and the high percentage of imports generally from

Spain that have risen by 62 percent, and Taiwan by 72 percent, and other countries by 20.4 percent.

The growing problem of the importation of footwear is a real threat to the footwear industry in this Nation, and I trust and hope and pray that the meeting we had with President Nixon at the White House a few weeks ago will bear fruit, and bring some relief to the footwear industry in our country.

The statistics follow:

#### U.S. FOOTWEAR IMPORTS, JANUARY-AUGUST 1969

August imports of leather and vinyl footwear totaling 13.9 million pairs were nearly 15 and a half percent ahead of last year. Leather and vinyl imports were 28.9% of an estimated domestic output of 48.0 million pairs. Shipments from Japan and Italy, in excess of nearly .7 million pairs each over last August, accounted for most of the gains in men's and women's leather and vinyl footwear.

To-date imports of leather and vinyl footwear of 139.1 million pairs have increased to nearly 14% ahead of last year. Average value per pair (f.o.b.) increased by 15.7% to \$2.06 per pair. Shipments from foreign ports were 36% of domestic output, estimated at 390.8 million pairs and 26% of new supply (domestic output plus imports).

August gains of 23% for Spain and 7% for Taiwan indicate a softening of pace. Italy's increase of 24% indicates her grip continues strong in the market place. Japan's increase of 13% over last August has moved her another notch closer to last year's record. Details are shown below.

Shoes and slippers (leather and vinyl)	January-August			
	1969 pairs (thousands)	1968 pairs (thousands)	Percent change pairs 1969-1968	Percent share of total 1969 1968
From—				
Japan.....	45,212.4	45,770.9	-1.2	32.5 37.4
Italy.....	44,329.3	42,361.3	+4.6	31.9 34.7
Spain.....	14,513.5	8,948.3	+62.2	10.4 7.3
France.....	2,144.2	2,210.4	-3.0	1.5 1.8
China T. (Taiwan).....	17,457.0	10,149.3	+72.0	12.6 8.3
Other countries.....	15,425.5	12,812.6	+20.4	11.1 10.5
Total pairs.....	139,822.0	122,252.7	+13.8	100.0 100.0

#### TOTAL IMPORTS OF OVER-THI-FOOT FOOTWEAR

[In thousand pairs; thousand dollars]

Type of footwear	8 months, 1969					
	August 1969 pairs	Percent change August 1969/August 1968	Pairs	Dollar value	Average dollar value per pair	Percent change 1969/1968 Pairs Dollar value
Leather and vinyl, total.....	13,238.8	+13.9	134,438.6	282,248.2	\$2.10	+13.0 +31.3
Leather excluding slippers.....	6,227.3	+20.3	69,628.1	231,543.9	3.33	+15.4 +32.3
Men's, youths', boys'.....	2,111.0	+15.7	20,480.8	84,466.0	4.12	+29.1 +42.0
Women's, misses'.....	3,654.7	+27.4	43,238.3	132,723.7	3.07	+6.8 +25.8
Children's, infants'.....	181.6	-6.8	4,086.8	6,338.3	1.55	+94.2 +115.1
Moccasins.....	61.4	+30.1	450.9	547.0	1.21	-2.5 +9.1
Other leather (including work and athletic).....	218.6	-9.7	1,371.3	7,468.9	5.45	-2.1 +13.6
Slippers.....	44.6	-4	224.3	443.1	1.98	+3.2 -6.5
Vinyl supported uppers.....	6,966.9	+8.9	64,586.2	50,261.2	.78	+10.5 +27.5
Men's and boys'.....	797.3	+31.7	6,608.6	7,465.0	1.13	+22.1 +40.8
Women's and misses'.....	5,454.2	+7.0	50,989.9	38,243.5	.75	+6.9 +24.0
Children's and infants'.....	551.0	-2.5	5,753.1	3,918.8	.68	+35.4 +42.8
Soft soles.....	164.4	+28.3	1,234.6	633.8	.51	+13.7 +17.3
Other nonrubber types, total.....	652.8	+55.1	4,643.4	4,677.0	1.01	+41.2 +87.6
Wood.....	88.9	+391.2	662.7	1,578.7	2.38	+271.9 +300.6
Fabric uppers.....	468.9	+25.0	3,435.3	2,477.1	.72	+22.2 +33.2
Other, not elsewhere specified.....	95.0	+245.5	545.4	621.2	1.14	+82.8 +160.0
Nonrubber footwear, total.....	13,891.7	+15.4	139,082.0	286,925.1	2.06	+13.8 +32.0
Rubber soled fabric uppers.....	3,252.0	-12.9	30,773.0	23,028.1	.75	-11.0 +10.3
Grand total, all types.....	17,143.7	+8.7	169,855.0	309,953.2	1.82	+8.3 +30.1

Note: Details may not add up due to rounding. Figures do not include imports of waterproof rubber footwear, zories, and slipper socks. Rubber soled fabric upper footwear includes non-American selling price types.

Source: National Footwear Manufacturers Association estimates from census raw data. For further detailed information, address your inquiries to the association, room 302, 342 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017.

### THE AMERICAN FLAG SHOULD BE FLOWN ON MORATORIUM DAY

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge that on Wednesday, October 15, all citizens fly the American flag, including those who participate in moratorium day events.

In addition to display at all homes and business places, our flag should be given the greatest possible prominence in parades and gatherings related to Vietnam policy.

This would demonstrate visibly the unity that exists among almost all Americans in support of troop withdrawals from Vietnam. While some differ over the timetable and other details, they are united behind the basic objective.

Each march protesting the war and calling for disengagement should be led by someone carrying the flag, and as many following as are able should also carry flags. By this means, every marcher would proclaim that the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam accords with our highest patriotic traditions, and reaffirms all that the flag stands for.

Americans gathering in prayer for our young men who have been killed by hostile action should certainly have in their midst the flag of the country for which these men sacrificed all. The courage, conviction, determination, and devotion of these young heroes should be honored by displaying the colors of the country which elicited the supreme sacrifice from them. If these men are not to have died in vain, it is because America will live on all the stronger, renewed, and secure in the knowledge of her limited but vital role in the world.

Each American should also display the flag at home. Traditionally, we have reserved this for Independence Day, Memorial Day, and Veterans Day, when we honor others who have sacrificed on behalf of their country. We cannot do any less for the brave men of the Vietnam war who have certainly given nothing less.

As on so many occasions in our history, our National Emblem would thus become the unifying symbol of national will and purpose in a time of critical decision.

The flag display I suggest would bring under common bond our President, who has clearly expressed his own determination to withdraw all combat troops at the earliest practicable date, and those who wish to encourage him in the fulfillment of this objective.

Those who support troop withdrawal act in the highest patriotic traditions of America. Therefore they should proudly display the flag that, through the years, has been recognized worldwide as the standard of peace.

I have today wired this suggestion to the moratorium committee.

### THE 12TH OF OCTOBER

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

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, historians the world over have long engaged in controversy over who was first to cross the ocean from what is now Europe to the Western Hemisphere. But who first crossed the Atlantic is obviously not as important as who first left Western man's footprint definitely marked upon the sands of our shores. There is no question that this was done by a man who was born and bred in Genoa, who sailed the Atlantic under the sign of the Cross, leading the Spanish crews of a Spanish fleet of three vessels sailing under the flags of Ferdinand and Isabella. This man, known to his contemporaries and to all of the Spanish-speaking world as Cristóbal Colón, and to most of our countrymen as Christopher Columbus, not only crossed the Atlantic and discovered this hemisphere on October 12, 1492, but he founded the first settlement in the island of Hispaniola.

Our fellow citizens of Italian ancestry are rightly proud of the Italian birth and breeding of Cristóbal Colón, and annually commemorate his feat. All of the Hispanic peoples of America, including millions of American citizens celebrate October 12 annually as the "Día de la Raza", the "Day of the Race." The race that they are talking about is not ethnic, it is cultural. It includes blacks, Indians, whites, and yellows. They are speaking of the Hispanic race, which simply means the peoples of Spanish language and culture, the descendants of the men and women whom Cristóbal Colón first brought to America, and those who for centuries have followed him across the Atlantic to settle in what were once the domains of Spain and the descendants of the people who were already here.

The 12th of October, thus, is not only an anniversary of the extraordinary feat accomplished almost five centuries ago under the leadership of a man of great tenacity and faith, but also a day in which hundreds of millions of people of different nationalities and colors, throughout the world, can rejoice in the bonds of a common culture and a common language: the language and the culture which Cristóbal Colón and those who followed him brought to this Hemisphere. Among these hundreds of millions are my constituents, your fellow-citizens from Puerto Rico—the only place under the American flag, incidentally, where Columbus ever trod—and the many thousands of constituents of dozens of my colleagues in this body, in the Southwest and the Northeast, in the South, and the Middle West, and in the Rockies and the Pacific coast. Theirs is a language and a culture which enriches the heritage of our Nation, a language and culture of which we are proud, which now contributes, in a measure, but can contribute immeasurably, if only we would make use of it, to the mutual understanding and the mutual respect of all of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

### AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION RE-AFFIRMS SUPPORT OF JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association's Committee on the Judiciary has reaffirmed its position in support of the nomination of Clement F. Haynsworth to the U.S. Supreme Court. This apparently came as something of a shock to the press which has appeared to take great joy in viewing the nomination with alarm. The action of the bar should also undercut those in the other body who continue to deal in innuendo and unfounded accusations.

But, Mr. Speaker, some members of the press do not give up easily. All the way to town this morning I heard the WTOP-CBS news announcers continue to refer to the fact that the bar committee had "reluctantly" approved Haynsworth. What kind of yellow journalism is that? What is "reluctant" about a "substantial majority" of a 12-man bar committee approving a nominee? When did the bar committee ever say anything about being "reluctant?"

It has been no secret that the flaming liberals have been disappointed because Judge Haynsworth has been unwilling to bend the Constitution to suit every radical who comes into court. Consequently, they have been out to get him ever since the rumor leaked out that he was being considered.

Mr. Speaker, the only real crime of which Judge Haynsworth stands guilty is the plain and simple fact that he is a moderate from South Carolina in the heart of the southland. For this crime he is being made to suffer the worst character assassination imaginable.

The whole episode is disgraceful and sickening. The bar committee has approved him twice. The Senate Judiciary Committee has approved him. It is now time for the Senate to promptly affirm Judge Haynsworth and allow him to take his seat on a Supreme Court that is in great need of his services.

### BILL TO AMEND NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING ACT OF 1952

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today on a most urgent matter.

Last Thursday and Friday, several articles appeared in the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star concerning another attempt by the executive branch to usurp the powers of the Congress by Presidential Executive order.

These articles report the plans of the administration, drawn up by Mr. Daniel P. Moynihan, the President's adviser on urban affairs; Mr. Phillip G. Hammer, recently resigned Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; and Mr. James Banks, the principal housing adviser to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to dissolve the National Capital Planning Commission.

The Commission these gentlemen propose to dissolve by Presidential edict or by "fait accompli" was established by

Federal statute in July of 1952. As cited in section 1-1001 of the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, the purpose of the act is to "aid in providing the Congress from time to time with information and advice requisite to legislation." It says further:

The general objective of this chapter is to enable appropriate agencies to plan for the development of the Federal establishment at the seat of government in a manner consistent with the nature and function of the National Capital and with due regard for the rights and prerogatives of the adjoining States and local governments to exercise appropriate to their functions.

The act directs the Commission to develop a comprehensive plan for the Nation's Capital, which plan shall include the Commission's recommendations or proposals for Federal and District developments or projects in the District of Columbia and its environs. It also requires the Commission to report to Congress annually on the first Monday of December the lands acquired during the preceding fiscal year, the method of acquisition, and the cost of each tract.

Mr. Speaker, in preparing the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, the Congress in its wisdom also provided that the Commission be composed of, in addition to other designated persons, the chairmen of the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives, and five eminent citizens appointed by the President.

It appears that it was clearly the intent of Congress in creating the National Capital Planning Commission that it should be an instrument to serve the purposes of the Congress to insure that the city retained a Federal character.

The announced purpose of Mr. Moynihan and company, on the other hand, is to remove the congressional influence on preserving the character of the city by planning for the Nation's Capital. Instead, they propose to turn over the bulk of the planning powers to the purely local District of Columbia government.

Mr. Moynihan has not yet decided the fate of the Federal interest. His concern, it seems, is to redefine the intent of the Constitution and the acts of Congress and to put his own brand of government in control of the planning affairs of the Nation's Capital.

It is this kind of reasoning that disturbs me, Mr. Speaker. Does not Mr. Moynihan realize that the purpose of this city is unlike that of all other cities in the United States? Washington, D.C.'s main business is government; it is the Seat of Government of the United States. Washington, D.C., is a city designed as the Capital City, not a business city like New York or San Francisco, or an industrial city like Birmingham or Detroit. People in Oshkosh, Wis., or Albuquerque, N. Mex., have no desire to plan the city of Boston or Seattle, but they do have a definite interest in the city of Washington, D.C. It is their city; their Capital City. It was established by the Constitution, not for the citizens of Washington, but for all the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of this Congress know too well the problems besetting this city. We know them better than Mr. Moynihan. We represent the

interest of citizens all over this country, and we are charged by our electorate to know what goes on here. Those of us on the District of Columbia Committees are vitally concerned with what goes on here. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, about this proposal for several reasons.

First, we know that we have tried to give the citizens of this city more voice in their own local affairs. A good example is the act of Congress which created an elected School Board for the District of Columbia. The antics of this Board has been a shock to the Congress and a sad experience personally to me, as I sponsored the legislation which created it.

Second, we have had the bitter experience of trying to separate the Federal functions from local functions. We know that planning for this city is an extremely frustrating and confusing affair. Based on the present ineptness of the local city government, we cannot foresee the wisdom of turning over more responsibilities to a government that has yet to master the affairs it presently has. I feel that my views on this point are shared by many of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the anxiety of Mr. Moynihan to make bold social changes in urban life and to use Washington, D.C., as a model. But I would suggest that Mr. Moynihan first study the history of the Federal City, examine the problems of other capital cities, and finally come to the Congress and consult with some of the Members here who are charged with the responsibility of providing funds for his pet social projects, before he goes off into left field again.

In a letter to the President on Friday, October 10, I urged him to cancel Mr. Moynihan's project to dissolve the National Capital Planning Commission. Today, I am introducing a bill to amend the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 to provide for additional ex-officio Members of Congress on the Commission. I have long been of the opinion that new life should be breathed into the Commission, and that this infusion should come from area Congressmen from Maryland and Virginia. My bill will provide for two Members from each State, from the two specified congressional districts in each State closest to the Nation's Capital, whose congressional districts are now included in the planning district included in the act. The bill also provides for changes in redistricting and elections at large of these Congressmen, should that come about.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the proposed action to dissolve the National Capital Planning Commission should be nipped in the bud. I see no better way to express the opposition of the Congress to this proposed arbitrary change in the law, than a strong interest by the Congress in strengthening the Commission as embodied in my bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge early consideration and adoption of this legislation.

#### PRESIDENT OUTLINES NATIONAL NEEDS WHICH MUST BE MET

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, in his call for a "working partnership between a Congress heavily Democratic and a Republican administration," President Nixon has set forth in detail the need for early action on a long list of urgently needed programs. Tax reform, social security benefit increases, draft reform, and reform of the welfare system deserve the very highest priority now.

Although the President did not say it in his even-tempered message, the Congress has been dragging its feet on the administration's requests for the tools which are needed now to fight the Nation's shameful and growing crime rate. The law-abiding citizens of America are outraged at the shocking rate of crime, both organized and unorganized. They want the illicit narcotics trade stopped and the "pushers" placed in prison. They are tired of the flood of pornographic mail which finds its way into their mail boxes. The people want an all-out war on crime and the criminal now.

Because the present farm program runs through 1970, the President may have decided not to include a plea for new or revised agricultural legislation. Nevertheless, it is not too early to start putting together a farm program for the 1970's. The House Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, has been working diligently on this and I am hopeful that we can report out a sound, workable program within the next few months.

All in all, I think the President has done an excellent job of cataloging the national needs which must be met. It is a call for action which must not be ignored.

#### ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

(Mr. MACGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's influence on the question of electoral college reform is being seen as an important factor in the outcome of that vote in the Senate.

An editorial in the Baltimore Sun for October 2 cites reasons for that paper's support of the reform proposals, and discusses the President's role in this issue.

I insert that editorial in the RECORD:

#### ELECTION AMENDMENT

President Nixon's endorsement of the constitutional amendment providing for the election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote may help some of his fellow Republicans in the Senate to make up their minds in favor of it, too. The House of Representatives has approved the proposal by the strong vote of 339-70, well above the required two-thirds majority. The House majority, moreover, was drawn from Republicans as well as Democrats.

The amendment now is in the Senate Judiciary Committee, and its sponsors intend to bring it before the entire Senate within the next several weeks. It is clear, as Mr. Nixon said, that unless the Senate follows the House's lead "all opportunity for reform will be lost this year and possibly for years to come."

The direct election amendment is clearly

preferable to the proposal to count electoral votes by congressional districts, which was advanced in the House as an alternative to the popular vote and was rejected. It is preferable also, in our view, to the proposal to divide each state's electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote in the state, a method which Mr. Nixon had first supported as the amendment most likely to be ratified by the states. The manner in which Mr. Nixon now has revised his position to one of full support for the direct election plan indicates that it is gaining momentum steadily.

### 3M ITEM'S A STAR-SPANGLED SELLER

(Mr. MacGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those few who would like to have us believe that patriotism is dead in America, I am placing in the RECORD today the text of an article from the Minneapolis Tribune last week entitled "3M Item's a Star-Spangled Seller." This article provides considerable evidence that the patriotic spirit is still very much alive in America.

The Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing—3M—Co., using only a word-of-mouth advertising campaign, has sold in 5 months almost 1.26 million small reflectorized American flags suitable for sticking on car windows or bumpers.

These flags, which have been distributed at cost, were originally produced as a gift for the 3M Co.'s 37,000 domestic employees. But the word soon spread and others expressed an interest in obtaining quantities of the flag sticker.

As President Harry Heltzer said in his personal message to the 3M employees which accompanied the flag:

It is not old-fashioned to be patriotic.

Given the tremendous demand for this item, most Americans would seem to agree with Mr. Heltzer's judgment.

The article follows:

#### 3M ITEM'S A STAR-SPANGLED SELLER

(By Dick Youngblood)

Good old-fashioned patriotism is alive and doing a land-office business at Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing (3M) Co.

Without benefit of any but word-of-mouth advertising, the company since late May has sold upwards of 1.26 million little reflectorized American flags suitable for sticking on car windows or bumpers.

It hasn't meant a lot of money, mind you—3M says it's selling the flags for cost—but a gross of nearly \$60,000 in less than six months is nothing for anybody to dissent about.

What's more, 246,570 copies of a small brochure containing the words of the "Star-Spangled Banner" and the Pledge of Allegiance, along with statements of some famous Americans about the flag, have brought in another \$2,000 or so.

"The results amazed us," said J. C. Landen, head of the traffic-control products department in 3M's Reflective Products Division. Why the hefty response, he was asked?

"People are taking a position for or against something more than ever before," he reasoned. "I think a lot of people who have taken this country for granted for so long are now saying, 'Put me on record, I love America.'"

Whatever the reason, something that

started strictly as an internal employee program has blossomed into a going, nationwide operation.

Each spring, all of 3M's 37,000 domestic employees receive some kind of sticker, bearing such messages as "Safety Pays," from the company.

What with "the flurry of American-flag activity this spring," Landen said, including Reader's Digest's successful program of sending a small flag with each of one month's issues, it was decided that the flags would be nice for the employee enclosure this year.

President Harry Heltzer sent along a personal message:

"It seems to me that it is not old-fashioned to be patriotic," the message said in part. "I invite you, as an American, to display the enclosed American flag as an expression of respect for what the flag signifies."

More than 500 letters of appreciation poured into 3M headquarters in St. Paul.

"It gives me personal gratification to know I am employed by a leader, not only of industry, but also in promoting America," wrote one female employee.

Largest purchase was made by a major aircraft and missile manufacturer, Lockheed Aircraft Corp. in California, which bought an initial 24,000 flags and had so much employee response that it ordered another 30,000.

Based on such response, the company determined in May to make the flags generally available. The only advertising was spread word-of-mouth by the sales force and other employees.

Within three weeks, sales had mounted to about 850,000.

### NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR MONTH

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, the gentleman from Kentucky, TIM LEE CARTER, introduced House Joint Resolution 911 which would authorize the President to proclaim January of each year as National Blood Donor Month.

I am reintroducing the resolution, with cosponsors, for him today, as he found it necessary to be in Kentucky.

One of the most vital community services millions of our citizens perform is donating blood through the American Red Cross and other blood donor programs.

When blood is needed, following natural disasters, accidents, or during the treatment of diseases, time is paramount. If blood is not available, and has to be brought in from elsewhere, the few hours can often mean the difference between life and death.

Fresh blood has a short life—21 days. Although it can then be fractionalized and its component parts used in the treatment of various medical problems, the large new supplies of fresh blood must be supplied constantly. Its need cannot be anticipated—it must be available when disaster or illness strike.

By giving the President authority to proclaim 1 month of each year as National Blood Donor Month, attention can be focused on this need, to make Americans aware of the obligation they have to keep the blood banks supplied. January is a month which normally finds many donors unable to give blood because of colds and the like. But, because

of accidents and illness, it is a time of great need. So it was selected as the month which should be designated as the National Blood Donor Month.

To show my support for this resolution, I donated a pint of blood this morning at the District of Columbia Blood Donor Center, 2025 E Street NW. I encourage my colleagues to also support this resolution with action, as well as your votes.

### VIETNAM

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has asked for 60 days, as I understand it, for a sort of respite in order to give him time to try to work out a solution in Vietnam. As one of the ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Democratic side, I am going to support the President in his request. I think he has a right to have some time to work on this. Frankly, I am debating. I am supposed to leave very shortly for Brussels, as chairman of the House delegation to the North Atlantic assembly, and I am debating whether I should go or whether I should stay here and singlehandedly break up the design of a few self-appointed emissaries of Hanoi to make it appear that the House of Representatives is on their side; that is, on the side of Hanoi, and if I decide to go, I hope that somebody is left behind who will make a test vote as to whether the House supports this position by simply moving to adjourn when the time comes.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. I happen to be one of the people who expect to take part in the special orders tomorrow. Is the gentleman suggesting that I am an emissary of Hanoi?

Mr. HAYS. No, I would not suggest that. I think you are just an unwitting tool in an effort which is to their advantage, because the only people who can get any benefit out of this kind of performance, trying to make it appear that the majority of this House supports that position, are the North Vietnamese, because it is certainly doing something that Hanoi wants done. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Mr. MIKVA. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. HAYS. I suggest that the gentleman should get his own time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. As a member of the NATO delegation and as a member of the distinguished gentleman's committee or delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, if you cancel your plans, count me in with you.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. I do not think it will be necessary because I think there are a few Members here who

will make sure that if this performance goes on, there are 218 Members who are here to listen to them at all times, and I do not think there are 218 of them in this Congress who want to listen to it.

#### CRITICISM OF VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the preceding speaker, who seems to be the self-appointed guardian of the House with respect to the motives of Members when they get up to speak their convictions. I have listened to that Member before, and I know the House is able to judge his words appropriately.

I just want to say that is the kind of plea we have heard before that has left this Nation in the situation it is today. We have heard this kind of statement made for the last 4 years, that if anybody criticizes the conduct of this war or questions the premises of the war, what he is doing is helping the other side.

I think the time has come for us to accept our responsibility as representatives of the people of the United States by speaking our minds honestly and without fear of those who react as the gentleman who just spoke here in the well of the House reacted.

I, for one, was uncertain as to the role I would play tomorrow afternoon, but the gentleman has settled it for me. I shall participate and say what I think needs to be said in order to help protect the security and protect the interests of the people of this Nation.

#### PRESIDENT SHOULD BE SUPPORTED IN HIS EFFORTS TO OBTAIN PEACE

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of the House who are so gung ho about what is going to happen tomorrow evening might better understand the situation, I want to show the other side of the coin. I do this by reading a letter that came to my desk this morning, from a constituent. The writer speaks as one who really has something at stake in this business:

OCTOBER 10, 1969.

Representative LESLIE ARENDS,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ARENDS: We are the parents of three sons—two of them of prime draft age and one currently serving in the Air Force. This tells you that we are vitally concerned in the swift termination of the Vietnam War.

However, neither we nor our sons feel that a unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam is any solution to the problem, nor does it do anything to ensure the peace and freedom of either Americans or other nations. We are strongly opposed to the stand of some senators and representatives to support the protest for peace next week, especially the activities for Wednesday. This is tying the hands of our president and weakening whatever strength our government may have had at the peace talks. Hanoi interprets this peace pressure on our president as a clear indication that they can demand any terms they

want and afford to wait for them. We have much greater confidence in the wisdom, understanding, and integrity of the president in this trying situation than we do in the many self-styled experts in and out of Congress who undertake to undermine his position and sabotage his efforts. We urge you not to be among those who are either so undiscerning as to be inadvertently helping the enemy or so unethical as to use this vital issue as a political screen.

We do not know what your stand on next week's protests is. The papers merely mention the numbers of senators and representatives who are supporting it, but do not list names. However, no doubt a careful reading of the news coverage next week will reveal them. We would like you to know that we do not intend to support at the polls you or any other senator or representative from the state of Illinois that knowingly or unknowingly persists in playing into the hands of the Communists or anarchists by trying to force a peace-at-any-price settlement in Vietnam. Had our president been given the support he should have, we feel he could by this time have negotiated an acceptable peace, or at least been much closer to it. Only a very stupid enemy would make any concessions at the peace table with a vociferous minority working as a fifth column within the country accomplishing its purposes for it.

We see in these peace protests at best an unreasoned, unthinking, unintelligent pressure that can ruin any real progress towards peace, and at worst a determined and wilful participation of the insidious plans of the subversives, radicals, anarchists, and Communists who are so much in control of things in our country these days. We urge you to take a constructive, patriotic stand on this and all other issues.

Sincerely,

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a good letter.

I think it is fair to say that the so-called student leaders, the protesters, the SDS crowd do not want peace in Vietnam, and when they say they do, they are lying through their teeth. They want something to raise hell about. If there were to be peace in Vietnam tomorrow, they would be protesting something else, because they are Communists and anarchists and want to bring down this Government.

Mr. ARENDS. I could not agree more with the gentleman.

I want to say this letter came from a very dedicated and patriotic American. These parents have something at stake—they have three boys. Who else can say the same thing?

#### THE PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 216]

Abbott	Ford	Moorhead
Anderson, Tenn.	William D. Foreman	Morse
Annunzio	Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Ashley	Frey	Nelsen
Aspinall	Fulton, Pa.	Nichols
Barrett	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Beall, Md.	Gallifanakis	O'Hara
Berry	Gallagher	O'Konski
Bevill	Garmatz	O'Neill, Mass.
Blaggi	Gaydos	Ottinger
Biester	Glaime	Patman
Blatnik	Gibbons	Patten
Bolling	Goldwater	Pepper
Bow	Gray	Philbin
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Pickle
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Pollock
Brinkley	Griffin	Powell
Brock	Griffiths	Pucinski
Broyhill, N.C.	Grover	Quillen
Burke, Fla.	Hagan	Railsback
Burleson, Tex.	Haley	Randall
Burton, Utah	Halpern	Refel
Button	Hanna	Rhodes
Byrne, Pa.	Harrington	Roberts
Cabell	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Cahill	Hastings	Rooney, N.Y.
Camp	Hathaway	Rostenkowski
Carey	Hechler, W. Va.	Roth
Carter	Helstoski	Roudebush
Casey	Henderson	Roybal
Cederberg	Hollifield	Ruth
Chappell	Hosmer	St. Germain
Chisholm	Howard	St. Onge
Clancy	Hull	Sandman
Clausen	Hunt	Saylor
Don H. Cleveland	Hutchinson	Scherie
Cohelan	Jarman	Shibley
Collier	Johnson, Calif.	Skubitz
Collins	Jones, Tenn.	Smith, Iowa
Conte	Kee	Snyder
Conyers	King	Staggers
Corbett	Kirwan	Steiger, Ariz.
Coughlin	Kluczynski	Stokes
Cowger	Koch	Sullivan
Culver	Kuykendall	Symington
Cunningham	Kyros	Taft
Dawson	Landrum	Taylor
Delaney	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Dent	Lipscomb	Thompson, N.J.
Dickinson	Long, La.	Tierman
Diggs	Long, Md.	Tunney
Donohue	Lowenstein	Udall
Dorn	Lujan	Ullman
Eckhardt	Lukens	Van Deerlin
Edmondson	McCarty	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Calif.	McDonald, Mich.	Vigorito
Edwards, La.	McEwen	Waggonner
Eilberg	McKneally	Watkins
Esch	Macdonald, Mass.	Watson
Eshleman	Madden	Watts
Evans, Colo.	Maillard	Weicker
Evins, Tenn.	May	Whalley
Fallon	Meeds	White
Fascell	Melcher	Wilson,
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Charles H. Wolf
Fish	Minish	Wold
Flynt	Mizell	Wolff
Foley	Mollohan	Wydler
Ford, Gerald R.		Wyman
		Zion
		Zwack

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 220 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-178)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and was referred to the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In the nine months since Inauguration, a number of issues have arisen clearly calling for the Congress and the Administration to work together.

One such issue was the extension of the surtax, where our economic security was involved. Another was authority to build the Safeguard ballistic missile defense, where the national safety was the issue. On both occasions, when the time came to be counted, Congress subordinated partisan concerns and voted the country's interest.

The continuance of this working partnership between a Congress heavily Democratic and a Republican Administration, on occasions where great issues are involved, is imperative for the good of our country. I hope this partnership will survive the "spirit of party" that grows more evident weekly in the national capital. Yet, in recent days, the call to partisan combat has grown more compelling.

I am aware that members of the Administration have criticized the Democratic-controlled Congress for "dragging its feet" in the enactment of legislation, for holding hearings thus far on only half the Administration proposals before it, for having enacted but a single appropriations bill for fiscal 1970, a full quarter of the way through the fiscal year. From Capitol Hill there have come similar charges—that the Administration has been laggard in proposing legislation, that the Executive Departments have been slow in giving the Congress the reports it has requested, that some of the most far-reaching Administration proposals have only lately been sent to the Congress, and so cannot be acted upon by the end of the year.

If a working partnership between men of differing philosophies and different parties is to continue, then candor on both sides is required. There may be merit in both charges; neither the Democratic Congress nor the Republican Administration is without fault for the delay of vital legislation.

But, in my view, the American people are not interested in political posturing between the Executive Branch and Capitol Hill. We are co-equal branches of government, elected not to maneuver for partisan advantage, but to work together to find hopeful answers to problems that confound the people all of us serve.

Both the President and Congress have been commissioned by the same American people, for a limited time, to achieve objectives upon which the great majority agree. For our part, we are willing to travel more than half-way to work with Congress to accomplish what needs to be done. The time for staking out political claims will come soon enough.

Let us resolve, therefore, to make the legislative issue of the 1970 campaign the question of who deserves greater credit for the 91st Congress' record of accomplishment, not which of us should be held accountable because it did nothing. The country is not interested in what we say, but in what we do—let us

roll up our sleeves and go to work. Before us are urgent legislative priorities.

The legislative program of this Administration differs fundamentally from that of previous administrations. We do not seek more and more of the same. We were not elected to pile new resources and manpower on the top of old programs. We were elected to initiate an era of change. We intend to begin a decade of government reform such as this nation has not witnessed in half a century. Some months ago, a Washington columnist wrote in some pessimism that if ours is not to be an age of revolution then it must become an age of reform. That is the watchword of this administration: **REFORM.**

**REFORM OF THE DRAFT.** I have asked Congress to make the most extensive changes in the way we select young men for military service since the draft became an accepted feature of American life. We have the administrative power—and we will exercise it if Congress fails to act—to make far-reaching reforms in the selective service system, reducing the period of prime vulnerability for young Americans from seven years to 12 months. However, we need Congressional approval to shift from the inequitable requirement of choosing the "oldest first" to the more just method of random selection. I asked Congress five months ago for this power; I ask again today. Basic fairness to our young people is the prime reason for this recommendation. I see no reason why this vital piece of legislation cannot be enacted *now*.

**REFORM OF THE WELFARE SYSTEM.** Last summer I asked Congress to make the most sweeping changes in the American system of welfare since the beginning of the New Deal. Last week legislation went to Congress outlining the proposal I have made for a new family assistance system to replace the demeaning and bankrupt system that now exists.

Under the present system, sometimes a father must desert his wife and children to make them eligible for benefits. Under the present system, some mothers with three children must survive with only \$39 a month for the entire family to live on.

The family assistance system is built on a different set of principles. It provides incentives for families to stay together. It provides economic rewards for men and women on welfare who enter training programs and search out jobs. It provides a floor under income that assures the minimum necessary for food and clothing and shelter.

The present system has led this country into a morass. It has laid a heavier and heavier burden on the American taxpayer. It has loaded the relief rolls with more and more families even in times of rising prosperity and low unemployment. I ask that Congress begin hearings on the new family assistance system at once. The welfare system should be abandoned as quickly as we can discard it and a new system established in its place.

**REFORM OF THE TAX CODE.** In April I recommended to Congress the most comprehensive set of tax reforms in many years. Subsequently the House of Representatives responded with an

even more far-reaching proposal of its own. The national momentum behind tax reform—to make the code more fair and equitable, to shift part of the burden from those who have borne too much for too long to the shoulders of others who have not carried their fair share—must not be allowed to dribble away while a partisan wrangle goes on over who deserves the political credit. We will give Congress as much assistance and as many hours of labor as it requires to enact extensive and responsible reform in this calendar year.

I do ask, however, that Congress, in acting on this major reform, not compromise this administration's effort to combat the most unjust tax of all, inflation. Specifically, I ask that Congress not convert this historic tax reform legislation into a sharp tax reduction that would unbalance the Federal budget and neutralize our campaign to halt the rising cost of living. I ask again that Congress repeal the seven percent investment tax credit, and extend for another six months the income tax surcharge at one-half the present rate. To fail to take these steps would be an abdication by Congress of its vital role in controlling inflation.

**REVENUE REFORM.** For the first time in the history of this government, we have recommended a national policy of permanent sharing of the Federal income tax revenues with the States and lesser political units in the country. For years, political students and leaders have contended that governments at the State, county and local levels have lost their creativity and lost the capacity to respond because they lack access to the great source of growing revenues available to the Federal government. I have recommended that Congress set aside a rising portion of Federal revenues each year and transmit them directly back to the States and communities to spend as they see fit and not as Washington sees fit. This concept has been debated by both parties and recommended by their majorities for years. The time has come to move it off the plain of discussion to make it a reality. I urge the Congress to move.

**POSTAL REFORM.** For more than a decade the American people have complained increasingly of the rising cost of postal service accompanied step by step with declining service. Today the United States postal system is inferior to that of many countries of Western Europe; it is grossly inadequate to the needs of our society. The nation has known this for years. I have acted in that knowledge—recommending that the existing postal system be scrapped, that a government-owned corporation replace the United States Post Office, that business principles replace partisanship in its management, and that merit and performance—rather than political affiliation—be the new criteria for appointment and advancement. Three years ago this month the Chicago postal system, a microcosm of the national system, collapsed under a flood of mail. The rapid delivery of mail is not a partisan issue. Distinguished leaders, of both parties, have endorsed the precise reform I have

recommended. There is no reason why the Congress cannot enact the most complete reform of the United States Post Office in the nation's history—by the close of this session.

I am aware of the setback which postal reform sustained in a House Committee on October 8. That action must be reversed. I shall persist in behalf of both the taxpayers and the mail users in this country to press for this urgently needed reform. I still believe enactment should come by the end of this session of the Ninety-First Congress.

Here I must again urge responsible congressional action, and promptly, on the proposed increase in postal rates for all three classes of mail. When this Administration entered office in January, it confronted a deficit in the postal budget for fiscal year 1970 of more than \$1.2 billion. We are already three months into that fiscal year—and this deficit is being underwritten by the taxpayers, rather than the users of the postal service, who should rightly bear the cost. I recognize that such a measure is hardly a political delight. Yet it is required in the interest of equity and fiscal integrity. I request the Congress to face up to this task.

**MANPOWER REFORM.** The history of the 1960s chronicles an intense political debate that has resulted in the old centralism of the thirties losing converts to the new federalism of the seventies. More and more progressive men in both parties have become convinced from the failures of programs run from Washington that important areas of government decision-making must be returned to the regions and locales where the problems exist.

I have attempted to take that conclusion out of the forum of debate and into the arena of action—Congress. I have recommended that management of a Federal program—the multi-billion dollar manpower training program—be consolidated, and turned over in a three-stage operation to the States and communities to run in a way that fits the needs of the immediate areas involved. No reform of this magnitude has been attempted since centralism became the dominant national trend at the depths of the depression. This recommendation represents the beginning of a revitalized federalism, the gradual transfer of greater power and responsibility for the making of government decisions to governments closest to the people. I urge swift Congressional action.

**SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.** I have requested an across-the-board increase of ten percent in Social Security benefits to compensate elderly Americans for the losses they are suffering because of an inflation they could do nothing either to prevent or avoid. In addition, I have proposed a new reform, an escalator in Social Security to insure that benefits will rise correspondingly whenever the cost of living goes up. When this reform is enacted never again will those Americans least able to afford it be made to bear the brunt of inflation. These necessary steps can and should be taken by Congress before the end of this year.

One word of caution. I know the politi-

cal temptations here. Why not balloon the benefits now, far above 10 percent, for political rewards in 1970? I remind the Congress that it is long since time that we stopped the political over-reactions which fuel the inflation that robs the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes. I urge Congress to hold to this ten percent figure—and let the new escalator protect older Americans against the possibility of future inflation.

A second reform I have proposed is to alter the system of social security to encourage and reward the workers who want to go on working past age 65—rather than discourage them. I ask Congress to enact this measure without delay.

**REFORM OF THE GRANT-IN-AID SYSTEM.** Among the first major pieces of legislation I asked of Congress was authority to make uniform the requirements for participation in many grant-in-aid programs that have proliferated in the last five years. If we are granted the power to draw these programs together, to group them by function—setting far more simple regulations—then States and communities will participate more and Congress' original purposes will be better served. We need that authority now. I know of no reason for delay.

**ELECTORAL REFORM.** While I originally favored other methods of reforming the electoral college system, I have strongly endorsed the direct popular election plan approved by the House. I hope the Senate will concur so that final favorable action can be completed before the end of this session. This must be done if we are to have this needed reform amended to the Constitution in time for the presidential election of 1972.

**D.C. GOVERNMENT REFORM.** For years there has been broad support for granting the people of Washington, D.C. the same right to Congressional representation other Americans have always prized, and the right to conduct their public business themselves. The Federal city has been a federal colony far too long. Months ago I presented to Congress a program to bring about the orderly transfer of political power to the people of this community. I recommended a constitutional amendment giving the District of Columbia at least one representative in the House and such additional representatives as Congress may approve, and providing for the possibility of two United States Senators. I urged Congress further to grant the city one non-voting Congressional representative in the interim, and recommended creation of a commission to prepare and present to Congress and the President a program to improve the efficiency and competence of the District Government—looking to the day of complete self-government. Favorable action has been taken by the Senate. I ask that this work be completed before the end of the year.

**OEO REFORM.** I have provided the Office of Economic Opportunity with a new director, a new structure, and added responsibilities as the research and development arm of the nation's effort to deal with the problems of the poor. OEO is now strengthening its present operat-

ing programs, including the Community Action Agencies, VISTA, Legal Services, Neighborhood Health Centers, Family Planning, Emergency Food, Rural, Older Persons, Indian and Migrant Programs. In addition, there is new emphasis on research, the evaluation of existing Federal social programs, and developing and testing new approaches in community and economic development, manpower and education, to assist the poor to move into the economic life of the nation. I have asked for a two-year extension of the existing legislation, without crippling amendments. I believe that a reformed OEO has a major and continuing role to play in our national life. Here again, there is no need or justification for further delay.

In recent years the Federal Government has suffered a precipitous decline in public confidence. The reason can be found in the chronic gap that exists between the publicity and promise attendant to the launching of a new Federal program—and that program's eventual performance. If confidence in government is to be restored, the gap must be closed.

This is the purpose of the foregoing proposals and great goal of this Administration—not to establish some new arithmetical record for the number of programs proposed, but to do more than other Administrations have done—to devise new approaches, to make the worthy old programs work, and to make old institutions responsive. It is for this that we prize the mechanics and engineers of government who retool and improve its machinery as much as we do the planners and the idea men who develop new programs and new agencies. There is little publicity and less glamor in the labor of the mechanics and engineers of government but, with billions in tax dollars invested in scores and scores of on-going Federal programs, the need is certainly greater. Let us together make government's performance and responsiveness more commensurate with its size.

**REFORM OF FOREIGN AID.** Our foreign aid program, sent to Congress in May, differs from earlier programs in three significant ways. First, it would place greater emphasis on technical assistance, especially in the areas of agriculture, education, and family planning, where the return would be greatest when measured in terms of national and human development. Second, the new program would create an Overseas Private Investment Corporation to provide a greater thrust for the channeling of private investment to the low-income countries. Third, it would increase the share of our assistance contributed through multilateral institutions.

I know of the economic miracles which foreign aid has helped create in Western Europe and in parts of Asia. I know also that our program is far from perfect. With this in mind, I have recently appointed a Presidential Task Force on International Development, charged with proposing new approaches to aid for the 1970s.

One fundamental question must be faced as Congress prepares to vote on this issue: will we in the United States

live out our lives in comparative affluence, while denying reasonable help to those who are our neighbors in the world community and who are struggling to help themselves achieve a better life? To enable us to answer this question positively, I have requested \$2.7 billion—the smallest request in the history of the U.S. aid program but an amount vitally needed to maintain our relationship with the developing world.

In addition to the reforms already cited, I have made other recommendations that call for new commitments by the Federal government, and offer more hopeful avenues of progress than the paths of the past.

Specifically, I have asked Congress to:

—establish a national computer Job Bank, which would enable the unemployed and the employer to come together through a computer matching system. The bank would have "branches" in every major labor market in the country. No longer would men have to go without work solely because they did not know where to find jobs.

—commit this country to the most extensive improvement of the Nation's air facilities in history. Under this program, the annual Federal appropriation for improving air facilities will rise from \$93 million a year—the average of the last decade—to \$250 million annually over the next decade. I have proposed further aid for airport development of \$2.5 billion in Federal funds in the next ten years to be matched dollar-for-dollar by the States and local governments. This will mean an added \$5 billion in funds for airport development. It will mean a running start on the national effort to build for the doubling of airline traffic expected by 1975 and its tripling by 1980.

—commit this country to the redevelopment of the nation's deteriorating public transportation system by providing an unprecedented measure of Federal support. In the six-year period ending with fiscal 1970, some \$800 million will have been authorized by Congress to aid the nation's deteriorating public transit industry. I have proposed raising that commitment to \$3.1 billion over the next five years and to a total of \$10 billion over the next twelve.

—enact the most extensive improvements in the Federal-State unemployment system in a decade, with coverage extended to an additional 4.8 million workers, mostly low-income, with an automatic extension of benefits to workers during times of high unemployment.

—enact the strongest mine health and safety bill in history, one which empowers the Secretary of the Interior to upgrade health and safety standards for coal mines as the technology develops.

—establish a national occupational health and safety board, with power to set standards to protect workers.

—empower the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to bring suit in a Federal District Court to enforce federal laws against discrimination.

—ban literacy tests as a prerequisite for voting throughout the United States.

#### NEW INITIATIVES

**THE HUNGRY.** For many years, in this richest of societies, we have heard

rumors of malnourished children and hungry men and women. Now we know these rumors are true. This realization has prompted us to a commitment—that we eliminate every vestige of hunger and malnutrition from America. I have asked Congress to help us assure that every American family can have a nutritionally complete diet; I have asked that the poorest members of our national community be provided with food stamps free of cost.

The Senate has shown a willingness to join in this commitment and has acted with dispatch. I urge the House to move so as not to prolong any further the day when the ancient curse of malnutrition and hunger is eliminated in this most modern of nations.

**POPULATION.** There is a widely-recognized correlation between population growth and poverty in the under-developed nations of the world. I have asked Congress to support our endorsement of those individuals and organizations seeking voluntary answers to this global question in other lands.

To approach this question as it applies at home, I have called on Congress to create a national commission to undertake now a study of how the nation is to provide for the 100 million new Americans expected before the turn of the century.

Beyond this, I have asked that a new philosophy become American government policy. We will interfere with no American's freedom of choice; we will infringe upon no one's religious convictions; but we shall not deny to any American woman the family planning assistance she may desire but cannot afford. That is the goal I ask Congress to support.

#### THE CONTROL OF CRIME

There is no greater need in this free society than the restoration of the individual American's freedom from violence in his home and on the streets of his city or town. Control and reduction of crime are among the first and constant concerns of this Administration. But we can do little more unless and until Congress provides more tools to do the job. No crisis is more urgent in our society. No subject has been the matter of more legislative requests from this Administration. Yet, not a single one of our major recommendations on crime has been acted upon favorably. I have not even received yet the budget appropriation for the Department of Justice for this fiscal year which is three months old. In light of the rising crime statistics in the country—and in the nation's capital—I again call upon Congress to become a full-fledged ally in this national campaign.

**ORGANIZED CRIME.** To intensify the national effort against organized crime, I have asked for an arsenal of new legal weapons:

—a doubling of existing resources for the organized crime effort;

—authority for Justice Department agents to enter any community and shut down large-scale gambling operations;

—a modern general witness immunity statute under which witnesses in Federal criminal cases could be compelled to testify under threat of a prison sentence for contempt;

—finally, because organized crime would shrivel up without its enormous gambling resources, and because illegal gambling on a large scale cannot go on without cooperation of corrupt law enforcements, I have asked Congress to make corruption of local authorities who are tied in with such gambling operations a Federal crime. I must stress the great urgency of these measures. Let the Congress act—*now*.

**D.C. CRIME.** To deal with the increase in crime in the District of Columbia I have asked for an expansion and strengthening of the entire system of law enforcement and criminal justice, including a fundamental reorganization of the courts. I have stressed the urgent need for more police, more judges, more prosecutors, more courtroom space, a new public defender's office, better penal and rehabilitation facilities and reform in the procedures for dealing with juvenile offenders. Crime in the District of Columbia continues to rise to new records with each month. We cannot contain or control it with existing resources; we need more men and money; we need a speedier trial system and, as important as any other measure, the power to keep hard-core criminal repeaters in the District of Columbia off the streets, so they are not committing five and six crimes before they are ever brought to trial. The Congress should act—*now*.

**NARCOTICS.** In the Federal effort against the illicit narcotics trade, I have submitted a major revision of all Federal narcotics laws and requested more men and money to deal with a problem that long ago outstripped the capacity of government at every level. Existing manpower and resources are stretched to their elastic limits—they are demonstrably inadequate. We have to have the cooperation of Congress to attack this terrible problem. Let's get at it—*now*.

**PORNOGRAPHY.** To prevent the use of the nation's postal system for the mailing of unsolicited sex-oriented materials to families that do not want the material and to children to whom it might do psychological harm, I offered three legislative proposals that will protect American citizens from the barrages of the filth peddlers, and will also be consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court interpreting the First Amendment. These bills are still in Congress. I ask that they be promptly enacted.

These are among my major legislative proposals in these first nine months in office. I believe they speak directly to the needs of a nation in distress. I can see no legitimate reason why—with good will and cooperation between us—we cannot make the great majority of these urgently needed programs law before the end of the year. We should have all of them—as well as the others now pending—on the statute books well before the Ninety-First Congress enters the history books.

To that end, I again pledge the cooperation of this Administration.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 13, 1969.

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Sunday was Columbus Day, but it should be with no sense of discovery that Congress receives President Nixon's message detailing the tremendous amount of work yet to be done by the 91st Congress.

It should, however, be with a sense of public-minded cooperation and a spirit of deep determination that Congress considers the tasks remaining as spelled out by the President.

I personally pledge that I will bend every ounce of my energies to the goals enunciated by the President, and I fervently hope that the Democratic leadership of the Congress will do likewise in a spirit that eschews partisanship in favor of what is best for the country.

I think the President has set a splendid example for the Congress by displaying in his message exactly the kind of nonpartisan spirit now needed to get the Congress moving on the President's program and to get this country moving ahead.

I agree with the President that—

Neither the Democratic Congress nor the Republican Administration is without fault for the delay of vital legislation.

It is because I wished to proceed affirmatively and positively with the President's program that I have repeatedly refused to call the 91st Congress a "do-nothing Congress" and have counseled waiting until the final scorecard is in before we judge the 91st.

The 91st Congress is potentially a great Congress, and the President has made clear how the 91st can achieve greatness.

The route to greatness for the 91st Congress is to enact President Nixon's excellent reform proposals—his proposals which would turn the country into new directions, away from centralism to a new federalism and away from recognizing failures to new successes.

I have spoken of the Nixon administration throughout the country as a reform administration—and that is what we must have at this juncture in our history. But we cannot have those reforms unless the Congress implements the President's program.

I therefore join with President Nixon in urging the 91st Congress to act on the administration program—and act now.

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard an appeal from our President for cooperation from this Congress effectuating his program of reform. I hope that this Congress will heed his appeal and be responsive by expeditious action on his recommendations. As he so well said, all of us were "elected not to maneuver for partisan advantage, but to work together to find hopeful answers to problems that confound the people all of us serve."

At the conclusion of the last Congress the majority leader of the other body said:

I think perhaps we have passed too much legislation, spent too much money. I think it is time to reorganize and tighten our belts.

This is precisely what the Nixon administration proposes we do. The premise of President Nixon's program is to do that which is fundamental. It is to revise, to eliminate, to consolidate and to coordinate that we may have a more efficient and more economical government responsive to the needs of our people.

Let us do that which is fundamental. Let us put first things first. While we may have our differences in matters of detail, there should be no difference between us for achieving the much-needed reforms that our President has recommended to us. On many of his recommendations there is no reason why we cannot proceed without further delay. I refer particularly to what needs to be done to combat inflation and to combat crime.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent us a message outlining a vast legislative area in which this Congress needs to get down to work.

He has done it without rancor and without partisanship, recognizing that the slow pace of this Congress can be blamed not only on the Democratic majority of this Congress, but also, to some extent, on the approach of his administration, which has been reasoned and careful; certainly less frantic than the opening sessions of recent administrations.

But, Mr. Speaker, regardless of who is at fault for the slow pace of this Congress, the fact remains that little has been accomplished in the way of substantive legislation.

And much remains to be done.

Without question, the President is right when he says:

The American people are not interested in political posturing between the executive branch and Capitol Hill.

And when he says that he and we "have been commissioned by the same American people to achieve objectives on which the great majority agrees."

Mr. Speaker, we now have much, in fact most of the President's legislative program for this year. We have had a great deal of it for quite a while.

I urge that the entire Congress be allowed to work its will on most of that legislation before the end of this session. The Nation will be better off and the Congress will have lived up to its obligations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent to this Congress a list of national priorities, priorities which if acted upon will benefit our Nation for decades to come.

They are measures on which reasonable men will find it difficult to disagree in principle.

They recognize that new problems and changing conditions in this age of rapid change demand new answers and new solutions.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a great opportunity. It can help the President chart the new directions this Nation must take or it can continue to attempt

to cope with the challenges of the seventies using the outmoded and never very successful methods of the thirties.

It can deal realistically with the needs of the people or it can continue to drift along the same old path, substituting new funds for new answers and bigger programs for better ideas.

Mr. Speaker, the times are too perilous, the need for new answers too great for any of us to be willing to settle for only a bigger status quo, for any of us to drag our feet, for any of us to put political considerations first. I urge that we join with the President now—today—and get on with the job the people have entrusted both to him and to us.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, by now most of us have read the message the President has sent to the Congress over the weekend outlining the issues he deems to be of greatest significance.

Mr. Speaker, there can be little disagreement over the importance of these issues, though reasonable men may differ over how best to deal with them.

It is the duty of the President to inform us of what he considers to be the Nation's problems, to send us the proposed legislation he thinks can solve these problems.

This he has done.

In some cases he has done it only recently. In others we have had that legislation for a considerable period.

Regardless, we now have it before us.

It is now up to this body to consider the proposals most carefully, and to send to him for signing as expeditiously as possible the legislation we think can best meet those needs.

Now is no time for partisan recriminations or dilly-dallying.

Now is the time to put our shoulders to the wheel and get on with the job.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a most conciliatory manner the President of the United States has asked the Congress to get on with the job of legislating the best answers he and we can devise to the problems besetting our land.

I earnestly hope this body can respond in kind, recognizing that the needs of the people come before politics or partisanship.

Mr. Speaker, there are grave problems to be solved in our land, and grave questions that seek meaningful answers.

We do need to reform the draft system to make it fair and equitable; we do need to reform the welfare system to provide incentives to work and incentives to keep families together, we do need to provide the States and localities with revenues adequate to meet their growing needs, we do need new answers to the problems of hunger, and population, and crime.

We do need to end the inflation.

We do need to reform our postal service.

We do need to extend OEO and enable the agency to fulfill its innovative role as set by the President.

We need to do these things and we need to do much more.

Mr. Speaker, the time is growing short. I urge that we get on with the tasks before us.

(Mr. McCLORY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I have been most interested to review carefully the message of President Nixon which we have received today in the House of Representatives. The President has drawn attention to a large number of legislative proposals upon which the Congress has failed to act. I am pleased to know, however, that the subject of tax reform and electoral college reform have already received action by the House. The delays which these measures are encountering in the other body require it to take action.

In reviewing the programs to which the President has made reference, I have taken particular note of those subjects which are pending before the House Judiciary Committee upon which I serve. While my committee has been diligent in covering the usual subjects to which it is assigned, I wish to call attention to the extensive hearings on such subjects as conglomerate mergers, the Newspaper Preservation Act, extension of the Voting Rights Act, and electoral college reform.

However, I am hopeful that in response to the President's message the committee can take up those bills relating to organized crime to which the President made reference. Also, I hope that revision of the Bail Reform Act may be considered, and that bills relating to pornography and to the District of Columbia government may receive early attention.

The subject of crime in America deserves top priority. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I note that the President's budgetary request for \$20.9 million for operation of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice was reduced by the House \$7½ million. It is my hope that the Senate will restore the full amount which the administration requested.

In connection with our efforts to reduce crime we must not lose sight of the fact that adequate funding of existing programs is perhaps even more essential than the establishment of new programs. Indeed, the President alluded to this subject in his message when he stated:

I have not even received yet the budget Appropriation for the Department of Justice for this Fiscal Year which is three months old.

The reduction of crime in America is essentially the task of local and State law enforcement officials. The National Institute provides the guidance and cooperative link between the Federal Government and local and State governments which can serve this objective.

Mr. Speaker, the President has spoken convincingly and fairly in outlining the tasks which lie ahead of him and us before the 91st Congress adjourns in December. I am confident that the Judiciary Committee will do its part in taking action on measures which the administration deems essential in fulfilling its commitment to the national interest.

#### SCHEDULED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IN DANGER

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on several past occasions I have brought to your attention the fact that our scheduled transportation system is in grave danger. You are well aware and join me in being justly proud that our country has the finest air transportation system in the world. However, I am most fearful that we will lose this leadership, and even in time destroy this system if we do not learn to live by the rules.

Supplemental airlines, so-called "non-skeds," are a great and growing threat to our aviation leadership. A broad authorization containing many loopholes, lax enforcement of regulations by Government agencies, and illegal promotional sales activities by tour and travel promoters have allowed these supplementals to skim the cream off some of the most profitable scheduled airline markets. With no schedules to meet, and no unprofitable routes to maintain, the "supplementals" have ceased to be supplemental to our scheduled airlines. They are now competitors for most of the world's air traffic on a most favored basis. And the continuing violations of CAB regulations by them have reached such a magnitude that organized crime—the Mafia—is alleged to have become involved.

Concern in this accelerating crisis has now spilled over into the international scene as evidenced by an article written by Robert Porter in the London Sunday Telegraph of September 28, which follows:

#### PROFIT OF £5,000 BY SHADY FLIGHTS (By Robert Porter)

An intensive Government inquiry is taking place into the alarming growth of air charter flights running close to the law. I understand that at least six charter flights have been stopped on the tarmac in the last two weeks by Board of Trade inspectors who have discovered irregularities.

Some flight operators and shady air brokerage companies are flouting the laws regarding group charter flying and are making up to £5,000 profit on each trip.

The companies are breaking the law because they totally disregard the strict regulations governing charter flying.

#### SPURIOUS CLUBS

Legally, these cheap group affinity flights are available only to clubs formed for at least two years, whose main purpose must be something other than flying. People taking part must have been members for at least six months.

The illegal operators run spurious clubs and allow individual travellers to join at any time. They issue back-dated membership cards and have networks of agents throughout the country who pass on to them the names of people wishing to join a charter flight.

They operate from back-street offices. These have no staff and only a telephone answering device on which would-be passengers leave details of their requirements.

#### MAFIA BACKING

The Association of British Travel Agents and the International Air Transport Association

are also conducting searching inquiries into the whole structure of charter flying operations. In Italy and America Mafia racketeers are reported to be involved.

One American charter airline is said to be financed by Mafia money. In Italy, International Air Transport Association investigating officers have helped crush a charter racket based in Rome that was also Mafia backed. The most common form of charter flying in Britain is group affinity travel.

The cost is remarkably low. The cheapest scheduled airline fare to New York is £125 return and at certain times of the year this can rise to as much as £212.

Compared with this, some travel groups offer flights for as little as £49 return.

Charter flying now accounts for between 25 and 35 per cent of transatlantic air travel. One British charter line already has five Boeing 707s, each able to seat 186 people, fully booked from May to September next year.

#### UNUSUAL TITLES

Clubs have sprung up all over the country with all kinds of unusual titles. An example of this is the Trowbridge Caged Bird Society, which arranged about a dozen charter flights to America last year on Boeing and V.C.-10 jets. For £74 return, passengers had free meals and free use of the bar.

The Canadian, American and Overseas Re-Union Association, operating from Manchester, is running more than 20 flights to America next year and other flights to Israel, Australia and South Africa.

The Midland Football and Sports Club has at least 20 flights to America planned next year.

These clubs and many others are all run properly and stay strictly within the law.

The boom in charter flying is so great that the crooked element has moved in to other clubs.

A leading London group travel organizer said to me that he had been approached by crooked agents and brokers. They sent him details of charter flights and asked him to refer passengers to them.

The passenger would receive his airline ticket, with a spurious club membership card backdated six months. The agent would have chartered the aircraft for about £52 a seat and would be selling these seats for up to £85.

#### AIRLINES WORRIED

An International Air Transport Association spokesman in Geneva said to me: "We are very concerned at the way the law is being flouted. We are on to these rackets and we are taking action."

"It may well prove necessary to tighten international regulations governing this kind of travel."

Airline members of the Association are meeting in New York this week to discuss the charter question. Many travel agents, who feel that group charter flying has provided wonderful opportunities for people with limited incomes, hopes that the reputable clubs will not be made to suffer because of the actions of racketeers.

#### PROFILE OF GEN. CREIGHTON J. ABRAMS, A GREAT FIELD COMMANDER

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an admirer of Gen. Creighton J. Abrams, our top field commander in Vietnam. He is a down-to-earth, no-nonsense, soldier's general, who believes in getting the job done efficiently, and without fanfare. He has been most effective

tive in Vietnam, though he has received a minimum of press attention or credit for his achievements.

It has been especially unfortunate that General Abrams should have received far more press attention, and that his name should have become far more of a household word, in connection with the recent Green Beret case, than in connection with the very sizable achievements he has made in bringing a difficult and unpopular war at a successful conclusion.

I have been particularly distressed to read some recent press accounts that are suggesting that now that the Green Beret case had been dropped—as I emphatically agree it should have been dropped—General Abrams may be sacked because of his role in pressing the original charges in this case.

I sincerely trust this will not be the case, Mr. Speaker. Whether General Abrams was right or wrong in this instance—and none of us still has all the facts, even in our Armed Services Committee—it would be a monumental mistake to pull him out of his field command just at the time when his special knowledge and skills are most desperately needed; that is, as we begin the very complex and dangerous retrograde movement of bringing our troops home from Vietnam without at the same time impairing the ability of the South Vietnamese people to defend themselves against aggression from the North and to determine by themselves the shape of their own political future. We would be cutting off our nose to spite our face to fire General Abrams.

Mr. Speaker, at the very moment this question is being mentioned in the press stories, it is perhaps providential that there should have appeared in the Sunday New York Times magazine section, for October 5, 1969, a brilliant article on General Abrams' accomplishments in Vietnam, and the unique contribution he has made to this difficult problem. Even the Green Beret case itself is mentioned.

I strongly recommend this article, by Kevin P. Buckley, to my colleagues as required reading, and under leave to extend my remarks, insert it at this point in the RECORD:

**GENERAL ABRAMS DESERVES A BETTER WAR**  
(By Kevin P. Buckley)

SAIGON.—A highly placed American civilian official sat talking with some friends recently after a day's work in Saigon. He was vaguely bothered—even more so than usual. Earlier in the day, he had taken part in a conference attended by Gen. Creighton A. Abrams, known in the military tongue as COMUSMACV, or Commander, U.S. Forces, Military Assistance Command Vietnam. Abrams had been only one of several Saigon luminaries at the meeting but hours later the general still fascinated the official. "Abrams is one of the most impressive men I've ever met," he said, swirling a martini. "You know, it's too bad, Abrams is very good. He deserves a better war."

That is an apt assessment of the man and his problem. There is a universal opinion in Vietnam that Abrams is an exceptional man. Even civilians who harbor a visceral mistrust of anyone in uniform are struck by his candor, humor, self-effacement and common-sense skepticism.

These qualities are especially striking considering the rough, tough, top-sergeant aura

that Abrams, at 55, projects. Sitting or standing, there is nothing of the ramrod about him. He slouches in a chair and fixes people with a beetle-browed stare from a weathered face. He moves about with a hunched gait that accentuates his short stockiness. There is always cigar smoke nearby. Physically, he evokes the military men of the "Grin and Bear It" cartoons. A former colleague at MACV said affectionately: "Chances are, if he was in civilian clothes, sitting on a park bench, a cop would tell him to move along."

Quite apart from his personal characteristics, he has displayed considerable brilliance in conducting the war. But at the stage at which he inherited command the problems were so thick and tangled that even brilliance could only dent them. Solutions demanded much more—indeed, the impossible: an undoing of all the wrong approaches, mistakes, and betrayals, military and political, going back to the early fifties, which constituted his legacy.

Abrams is not a man to complain about his inheritance. He insists that problems be faced in the present tense, without recourse to hindsight or regret. But recently he did comment privately on his difficult task. A close friend suggested to him that of all American commanders, going back to George Washington, he had the most awkward problems. Abrams grinned, drew on his cigar and said: "I try not to think about that too much. I have to avoid chronic depression."

If a West Point seminar were to examine present conditions in Vietnam, especially compared with conditions in June, 1968, when Abrams took over after more than a year as Gen. William C. Westmoreland's deputy, it would have to conclude that things are going well: American units—increasingly assisted by South Vietnamese forces—have the upper hand almost everywhere throughout the country. Nearly everywhere the enemy has been splintered into small groups. Constant allied pressure in the form of ambushes, interdiction of infiltration routes, raids on ammunition and supply caches and more accurate air strikes makes it increasingly difficult for enemy forces to group for an attack. Increased night patrolling has deprived (though hardly completely) the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) of hours which they once owned completely. Even the gloomiest prophets agree that there is much less chance now that the enemy could duplicate the countrywide military trauma he inflicted at Tet, 1968—at least in the near future.

Indeed, one measure of progress some commanders here like to cite is that the same North Vietnamese Army unit which fought inside Hue for a month in January-February, 1968, was last seen defending Hamburger Hill last May. From Hue to Hamburger Hill—that is certainly progress, military style. But is it really progress?

A high-ranking officer at MACV recently tried to explain how, in fact, the war had improved. He said that at the beginning of the American build-up American forces had to operate like fire brigades—dashing from one trouble spot to another. Now, he explained, there were forces everywhere and without hopscotching around the country they could inflict great damage on the enemy. He was asked what difference that made if the fire still smoldered—and occasionally flared—and could often kill 150 or more firemen a week. Was there a time in sight when the fire in any one place would be out for good?

No, he said, and explained: "You must realize this is a bottomless pit. It will take 10 years to finish it."

Abrams' tactical decisions as commander have changed the war very much. His personality and intellectual bearing have done so even more. The whole tone of the war—

in Vietnam at least—has changed since Abrams has been running it. Westmoreland's war was a monolithic, ever-growing, ever-confident enterprise filled with optimistic generalities. Westmoreland, a Central Casting West Pointer, set the tone for the whole chain of command. Critics of the war were "niggling," who would be proven wrong when "victory was achieved," which was just around the corner. Tet shattered that illusion. Abrams became commander six months later.

His personality suited the new era. In style, he was as typical of a squared-away West Pointer as U.S. Grant. He did not make optimistic predictions. The critics were even more plentiful and better-armed, but Abrams disarmed them by nodding slowly when they made their points, shrugging and saying, yes, there were plenty of problems. He talked about the importance of "price indices" in the city marketplaces, even though people were used to hearing only about "kill ratios" as measures of progress. One of his first rulings as commander was that there would be no air strikes by U.S. planes in urban centers without his personal approval. During the Tet and May offensives, officers far down the chain of command had called in air strikes in Saigon as if a block of civilian homes were a row of trenches. It was not his idea alone—nor completely altruistic. When things that had been going on elsewhere for years happened in Saigon they drew attention around the world. Civilians in Washington, joined by the Embassy in Saigon, had pressed for the ruling soon after Tet and again after the heavy bombing in May. But Abrams implemented these desires with a flat, no-exception order.

Soon the story went around about the briefing he had attended in I Corps for a recap of the Tet attacks. As usual, the briefers emphasized the positive. Abrams listened, then said: "Gentlemen, we got our hands to us," and left the room.

His skepticism, his broad approach to the complicated war began slowly to sift down through the whole structure. As time went on, it was clear that, for the first time, everyone in Vietnam had a hero.

The U.S. approach to the war has changed drastically since Abrams first arrived in May, 1967. Then, the rallying cry was Lyndon Johnson's exhortation to "bring back the coonskin." Now, thousands of deaths and billions of dollars later, the aims are less triumphant and the rhetoric is chastened. President Nixon has pledged self-determination for the people of Vietnam, even if the "enemy" is to have some say in the determination. When Abrams arrived, U.S. troops were still pouring in. Now that tide has turned, 25,000 have been withdrawn, another 35,000 soon will be, and Nixon has expressed the "hope" that one-half of the original U.S. troop strength will be withdrawn by the end of next year.

The Abrams era is marked by a new rallying cry for the war, the latest in the long succession of magic-ingredient terms such as "strategic hamlets," "winning the hearts and minds of the people," "war of attrition" and "coonskin." The word is "Vietnamization," or the gradual (and the pace is crucial) handing over of the burden of fighting the war from the Americans to the Vietnamese.

No one can say at this point exactly what it means because it is still in many ways a slogan. Its eventual content is being determined daily in the White House as the President weighs the immediate political cost at home of prolonged U.S. bloodshed against what something a good deal less than "victory" in Vietnam would mean eventually—both to the balance of world power and to U.S. domestic attitudes. (Will a national magazine, for example, someday run 12 pages of passport photos of the people who "sold out" Vietnam?)

At one extreme, "Vietnamization" is de-

fined as a disguised U.S. defeat—an attempt, as one observer here has put it, “to pull away the tablecloth and leave the whole table setting in place—on the first try. If something goes wrong, you can blame the wreckage on the instability and flimsiness of the crockery.” At the other extreme, “Vietnamization” is interpreted as a cover word for an even longer American involvement than Washington apologists now imply—a disguised affirmation of the supposedly forsaken policy of total military victory. The final resolution will probably be somewhere in the middle. And Abrams is at the center of the debate.

Abrams runs the war from a windowless office in the rambling prefabricated steel building which houses MACV headquarters, about 3 miles from downtown Saigon and adjacent to Tansonnhut Airport.

The headquarters complex, popularly known as “Pentagon East,” was built in 1965. Like the war, it is being constantly adapted. One can never be sure an office will be in the same place it was on the last visit. The baffling lettered corridors are filled with officers carrying attaché cases of sheaves of paper, striding briefly in starched fatigues. Vietnamese janitors dozing in the stairwells at lunch time are all that jar the otherwise perfect ambience of air-conditioned efficiency. The war can seem far away in some of the offices where desks are heaped with readouts from the computers which keep track of reports flowing in from the field. But a glance out the window at the concrete-coated, sand-bagged bunkers brings back the fact that MACV is the nerve center for a gigantic war, even if there are portable barbecue grills on the carefully tended grass.

The MACV over which Abrams presides is surely as efficient a headquarters as the U.S. can contrive at this time for a war effort. It embodies the might and sophisticated technology of the whole Vietnam war, which is, of course, waged against an enemy whose rudimentary headquarters are constantly on the move deep in the jungles of Vietnam or Cambodia. If wars were won on the basis of modern management, the coonskin would have been on the walls years ago. Publicly, MACV exudes nothing but optimism. Privately, there is considerable frustration.

Not long ago one staffer completed his tour at MACV and summed up his feelings: “Often it reminded me of the caucus race in ‘Alice in Wonderland.’ Everyone runs in circles, no one really gets anywhere, and when the race is over, everybody gets a medal.”

Abrams's office is Spartanly simple: an Army-issue desk, a long wooden conference table, flags of the U.S. and Vietnam and his own four-star flag. The walls are bare except for large maps of the four corps areas of Vietnam and an black and white aerial photograph of the instant of impact of a bomb on a bridge.

Abrams spends much of each working day (seven days a week) in that office and most of the crucial tactical decisions of the war are made there. His schedule is rarely firm. Fluid developments in the field usually keep a day from working out as it has been planned. But virtually every day he leaves MACV by helicopter or a small jet for short-notice visits to American or South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) bases in the field where he examines local conditions in great detail.

In the evenings, he sometimes has dinner in an officers' mess at MACV. More often, he dines in the small, sparsely decorated villa just off Tansonnhut which he shares with a colonel and a warrant officer on his staff. There, clad in sport clothes, he often entertains friends from the military and the diplomatic and press corps as well as visiting V.I.P.s.

Abrams has a reputation as an excellent

host and the dinners are usually distinguished by a good deal of humor originating with him. He enjoys ridiculing military foibles. Once he entertained a group of visitors with a long story about a budget meeting he had attended at the Pentagon. One participant had to leave for the lavatory during the discussion, “and while he was away, he lost several million dollars.”

His humor is often self-deprecating. He had to cut short an interview recently with a journalist to go to a meeting with Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. He jumped up, grabbed his hat and brief case and stormed out the door, saying he was sorry but he had to rush. Then he stepped back into the office and deadpanned: “If you'll excuse me.” (Abrams and Bunker, despite widely different lifestyles, enjoy a cordial relationship and agreement about approaches toward the war.)

Abrams's principal indulgence, aside from cigars, is music. He has an extensive, thoroughly indexed stereo collection at his villa—with plenty of Beethoven, Tchaikovsky and Mozart, as well as opera and Mahalia Jackson. Though he calls himself an “alley cat,” his taste is predominantly classical. Soon after he became commander, the Armed Forces Radio Network doubled its classical music programming. A diplomat who welcomed the change asked Abrams if he had been responsible for it.

“No, I wasn't responsible,” Abrams said, “I just gave them the benefit of my unwelcome advice.”

He also relaxes by reading. Recent favorites include “Responsibilities of World Power” by Senator Gale McGee, “The Lessons of History” by Will and Ariel Durant, “The First Circle” by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, “Never Call Retreat” by Bruce Catton, and an exotic cookbook by William C. Roux called “Fried Coffee and Jellied Bourbon.”

But his real love is music. “Listening to music relaxes me,” he says. “I can sit there and listen while all the fractious things of the moment subside and I can think without the pressures of all these things—just think, try to look ahead, try to look back and try to interpret what's happening.”

He often uses terms such as “orchestrate” and “achieve a harmonious blending” when talking about the way he runs the war. Soon after he became commander, he visited the Delta on an inspection tour and at the end of the day got together with his staff and the local commanders in an officers' mess. It was a vintage Abrams scene. The men discussed the patterns and techniques of the war, what was going right and what was going wrong. After a short silence, Abrams, with a gin and tonic in one hand, a cigar in the other, spoke: “You know, before I came over here this last time I was in Boston and saw Leinsdorf conduct Beethoven's Fifth,” he said. “Now that's the way the war should be run. He calls on his strings,” he said, gesturing with one hand, “and he gets a little bit of strings. He calls on his drums,” he went on, gesturing with the other hand, “and he gets a little bit of drums. That's the way we should do it. “A little bit or air support just when it's needed, not a ——— hour of air support, A little bit of artillery, not a ——— hour of artillery.”

But the musical comparison has its limitations, as Abrams is quick to point out: “It's very different. The war is pretty vicious, certainly noisy . . . and it's different because of the sorrow and anguish.”

Abrams will not have the luxury of most battlefield commanders in being judged solely as a tactician. Given the terms of the war in Vietnam, that would be challenge enough, but he must also cope with the enormously complicated and risky problems of the broader context of Vietnamization. Thus he is like a conductor who must strive for excellence against great odds and, at the same time, supervise the replacement of his

best musicians with others of inferior training and uncertain capacities.

On the battlefield, Abrams has succeeded in bringing the war under control to a degree it never was before. He has accomplished this largely by developing flexible tactics that are adaptable to the different kinds of warfare that go on in different parts of the country. When he took over, tactics were very much of a one-note variety from the whole orchestra: Kill the enemy. Abrams has altered the pitch for different places and different problems, and has even developed something like solo capabilities.

He did not invent the new tactics. They evolved over a period of time, sometimes as outgrowths of techniques begun by Westmoreland. In the jargon of MACV, Abrams has benefited from a variety of “rising curves.” For example, he has had considerably more helicopters at his disposal than his predecessor had, and therefore greater troop mobility. He inherited a rising curve of improved intelligence, which he then proceeded to develop. In the past, because of grievously imperfect intelligence, there was considerable “blind bombing”—targets were often selected days in advance of delivery, almost on a regional allocation basis. “It was like Orviato in ‘Catch 22,’” said one civilian who worked in the provinces three years ago. “They missed the target, but had a great bombing pattern.” Abrams recast the whole system so that now the B-52's can be redirected in flight to hit targets very soon after intelligence information produces them. They still often hit nothing, but much less often than in the past.

But Abrams has done far more than ride the crest of the rising curves. His greatest accomplishment has been to break the basic logic by which the war had been fought. Despite the rhetoric about its being a political war and a contest for people's hearts and minds, MACV usually went about it in strictly conventional military terms—as if they were fighting World War II all over again. Tactics were based on finding enemy forces, preferably in large groups, and fighting them. The kill count was all-important. Invariably, more enemy than Americans would be killed in the pitched battles, so all battles were judged as victories.

Abrams altered the basic approach. He discerned that there were several different wars going on in Vietnam. In each of them, the enemy had different objectives which must be answered by different tactics.

Thus when Abrams visited 101st Airborne Division units which were operating in the lightly populated flatlands outside Hue, he asked novel questions: How successful was tax collecting by the Vietcong? How many terror incidents, such as assassinations of hamlet chiefs, had there been? What success, or failure, had there been in identifying members of the Vietcong infrastructure? In turn, these units moved away from classical military operations to “cordon” tactics. They would seal off a large area and just wait while Vietnamese police combed the hamlets and barren surrounding countryside looking for hidden VC.

When he visited the 101st Division units which were operating in the thickly jungled mountains along the Laotian border, or the First Air Cavalry and First Infantry Divisions in the jungles along the Cambodian border west of Saigon, his questions usually concerned intelligence: Which enemy units were maneuvering in the area? What were their routes? What supplies had been found? What could be known about their whole system of movement from discoveries in the jungle, even when no enemy soldiers were seen?

Attempting to fight the war on terms that count often proves frustrating. Some months ago, Abrams visited a Marine unit in I Corps. The briefer set out with great enthusiasm to describe how Marine armored vehicles had

cornered a group of Vietcong in a paddy field and killed them all, thus producing a good "body count." There were even photographs to prove it. As Abrams scanned the photographs, he saw armored vehicles arrayed across a wide expanse of paddy and it was obvious that their caterpillar tracks had ruined a substantial harvest.

"How are the people in that area going to eat?" he demanded. There was no answer, of course. Abrams then assailed their "victory," telling them that killing a dozen Vietcong was not worth the damage they had done to the civilians whose food they had destroyed.

His flat could not, of course, change the whole system abruptly. But officers tend to pay attention to the criteria of the commander. Col. George S. Patton III, commander of the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, for example, had as his motto: "Find the — and pile on," meaning, "Find the enemy and bring in reinforcements to destroy them," but one day he sullenly told his staff the rules had been changed. The new motto, he said, was: "Find the — and win their hearts and minds."

(There is, however, such a thing as invincible ignorance. Last Christmas, Patton sent out cards which read: "From Colonel and Mrs. George S. Patton III—Peace on Earth." Glued to the cards were color photos of dismembered Vietnamese soldiers stacked up like cordwood. Abram's card was in the first mailing. He stopped Patton before he did it again. Patton likes to say he doesn't hate the enemy, but, "I do like to see the arms and legs fly." At his farewell party before leaving Vietnam, he frolicked with a peace medallion around his neck while he cradled the polished skull of a Vietcong with a bullet hole above the left eye in his arms. Patton, after only a year and a half as a colonel, is on the latest generals' list, and Army insiders say he is a sure bet to get his star.)

Abrams disdains the popular—but mostly outdated—terms that describe tactics such as "search and destroy" because they no longer fit the war as it is fought. Over the last year, a fairly constant pattern has developed. Much of the time, there is only "light and scattered action" reported in the MACV communiques. At times, the shooting matches are so rare that a military spokesman confirms that there is a "lull." At such times, peace hopes flare, the lull is discussed in Congress—and when it ends, there are the inevitable recriminations. Most of the hopes and the recriminations are baseless.

Even when there is little or no shooting, there is furious activity on both sides—mostly in the border areas or on infiltration routes leading toward cities or bases. In the populated areas of Vietnam, something like peace prevails most of the time. More accurately, it is stillness—in which the eventually conclusive political struggle is taking place. In the field, small bands of enemy soldiers constantly attempt to throw out forward supply lines by planting caches of ammunition, food and medicine. Other small groups maneuver through the countryside, trying to pick up the supplies and eventually coalesce into groups that are large enough to attack a town or a U.S. position.

Abrams calls his tactics "getting into the enemy's system," and they involve maneuvering just as intensive as that of the enemy. Indeed, "getting into the system" means matching enemy activity as much as possible, finding and destroying the supply caches before they can be used, extrapolating from the cache sites the routes used by the enemy, and then ambushing these routes.

In the past, U.S. battalions virtually joined arms with other battalions and swept through large areas often finding nothing, or just a few enemy soldiers who could not get out of the way. The target was always the enemy soldier and not so much the system which sustained him. Abrams has broken

the patrolling units down into companies (of about 100 men) or even squads (of as few as six men). He has sprinkled the busy areas of the country with hundreds of small "fire support bases" and "landing zones" (called LZ's). Carved out of the jungle or scrub underbrush in the middle of no man's land, these camps—enclosed by barbed wire and bunkers and equipped with artillery and mortars—serve as bases for patrols. The surrounding countryside for at least 100 yards is usually scraped clean of foliage so that enemy motion can be detected.

Other ground patrols originate from larger, more permanent bases. In all, hundreds of patrols fan out each day. This constant harassment all over the country usually succeeds in preventing the enemy from amassing enough strength for significant attacks. In all the clouds of semantics that emanate from the Pentagon and MACV, "preemption" probably comes closer than anything else to describing the effect of the Abrams tactics.

When the two milling forces, like giant insects with thousands of probing antennae, collide there is one of those obscure but bloody "contacts" that rarely attract any attention unless a correspondent happens to be along. But with thousands of troops involved in so many patrols each day—all necessary to prevent the enemy from starting something big—there are many collisions. Inevitably, there are many casualties, as well. Even in a week of "lull," more than 150 Americans have been killed. This slow accretion will soon put the total of U.S. dead over the 40,000 mark.

"The basic price of admission to this war is well over 100 U.S. casualties a week," said one of Abrams's fellow generals. He touched on one of the most important bitter truths of the war. Merely to stave off big trouble, casualties must run at a level that more and more Americans find insupportable.

It may seem paradoxical—or impossible—outside Vietnam, but Abrams's tactics, given the framework of the war, actually keep casualties at the barest minimum. Abrams has said that, if ordered to, he could reduce casualties to 50 per week—but he would insist on the option of resigning after a few weeks because the cost of abruptly lowering casualties by reducing American patrolling would very shortly be enormous casualties.

The case of Hamburger Hill illuminates the dilemma. The battle was consistent with prevailing tactics to the degree that, as usual, U.S. troops fought the enemy when they found him. It was just another collision—possibly harder than most because the enemy troops were fresh and strongly dug into almost unassailable positions atop a precariously steep hill—but basically the same. It was different—just as chain-reaction auto wrecks involving dozens of cars are different—in that vastly more troops than usual were involved on both sides. It was like 10 or 15 of the normal "contacts" compressed into one. Heavy casualties occurred in one small place in a brief time—and therefore the otherwise typical, obscure battle in the distant jungle became notorious.

Abrams is very sensitive to public reaction to episodes like Hamburger Hill. In its wake, he told his field commanders to persist in their hard fighting tactics, but he also ordered them to skirt, if at all possible, similar occasions of compressed "contact" which arouse strong passion in the press and the Congress and further erode the patience he feels is required for a satisfactory solution in Vietnam.

His tactics in defending the cities, especially Saigon, are also tuned to public opinion. Another enemy offensive into the capital or incessant rocketing from a distance would be disastrously embarrassing in the United States and in Paris—and could be calamitous in terms of public confidence in the Government here.

About the time he became commander, Saigon was being rocketed in many locations fairly regularly. There were dire rumors, unfounded but believed, about an enemy plan for "a hundred rockets a night for a hundred nights." People were jittery and sand-bag entrepreneurs made a quick killing.

On Westmoreland's last day in Vietnam, several Soviet-manufactured 122-mm. rockets, with 41-pound warheads, crashed into Tu Do Street. Others landed near the Presidential Palace and in working-class neighborhoods. Westmoreland was consistent to the last. He brushed them aside, saying the attacks were "of no military significance." They were not—to the extent that they did not hit military installations, just civilian homes. A few days later, in his single public prediction as commander in Vietnam, Abrams promised that the rocket attacks on Saigon would stop. Soon after, they did, though an occasional lucky round still comes in.

Abrams quickly revamped the defense organization for Saigon by creating a joint U.S.-Vietnamese command. He also directed sweeping military operations all around the city and on its approaches as part of what the Army calls a "zero risk" defense system. Zero will never be achieved, but Abrams has reduced the risk to a fraction of what it once was.

The war is filled with paradox. At present, the military tactics which sustain the U.S. position against disaster can also be accused of undermining America's best interests. Thus one of Abram's best tactical moves became one of his most controversial in political terms.

About the time of the total bombing halt last November, several North Vietnamese regiments withdrew from I Corps area into North Vietnam. At the same time, Abrams received firm intelligence that other enemy units were massing on the western approaches to Saigon. He hurriedly moved the entire First Air Cavalry Division with its more than 400 helicopters from I Corps, where it had been operating since the Tet offensive, to positions along the Saigon approaches.

That move was later denounced by Averell Harriman, who said that it strongly contributed to missing a chance for getting substantial peace talks started. In Harriman's view, the North Vietnamese withdrawal from the north should have been somehow reciprocated. Instead, Abrams had taken advantage of the NVA withdrawal to bring the First Air Cavalry south for more fighting.

In Vietnam, Harriman's view seemed uninformed. Abrams himself never commented on it. But one officer at MACV said: "We were bewildered. We sent him all the reports but I guess he just didn't believe them. He still doesn't." Bewilderment often became hostility. Diplomats shared in the resentment. They felt betrayed because they believed that Harriman knew better but glossed over facts to make his point. The controversy is an illuminating example of the contrary motions of U.S. diplomacy in trying to achieve a solution in Vietnam.

Abrams's tactics of "getting into the enemy's system" surely have succeeded for the most part in damping down potential trouble spots, but they are far from perfect. From time to time, the enemy troops succeed in eluding U.S. pressure enough to bring about what has come to be called a "high point." A "high point" means concerted attacks by rockets and mortars against many positions for two or three nights. Sapper attacks and ground probes often accompany the shellings. The shellings rarely do much damage, but consistently inflict enough casualties—a few here, a few there, in addition to the basic "price of admission"—to make the war all the more costly in American blood.

The ground assaults against hamlets, especially those recently pacified have often

been more successful. Local militia defend these hamlets, while U.S. units are posted near the border, and ARVN units are in between, bringing more hamlets under Government control. The ground attacks against heavily defended U.S. positions are invariably one-sided slaughters. In one case, almost 300 NVA were killed and only one American was wounded. But on most occasions, the sappers who try to breach the ferocious perimeter defenses succeed in killing a few Americans—and push the weekly death total that much higher.

However brilliant and rational the tactics, their execution in combat is basically not susceptible to reason. During one of the first large-scale American operations in the Ashau Valley, Saigon briefers marked the area on wall maps with their gleaming silver pens, which telescope out to become yard-long pointers. The purpose of the operation was to "devalue an enemy supply and staging area." In the Ashau, the maps were often propped against sandbags. Battalion commanders marked them with clean lines showing which hills the 1st Air Cav recon patrols would ascend.

On those hills themselves, things weren't so pat. The briefers rarely, if ever, cared to describe such scenes as the one when the young soldiers went about "devaluing" the place. One saw an NVA soldier emerge from a bunker yards ahead of him and dart off into the green darkness. Instinctively, as if he were throwing a rock, the soldier threw a hand grenade at the mouth of the bunker. It exploded on the lip—and he took the blast of his own grenade in his groin. The most carefully drawn plans often go askew, as when combat squads are inserted by helicopter into canals where the water is neck-deep on the tallest soldier and fatally deep for his shorter companions.

Indeed, battles in Vietnam often seem ancient, despite the centuries of military history studied by the men who designed them. In small-unit actions in thick elephant grass, the men often fight as well as fighting with swords, and sometimes they do fight with knives. Flak jackets are little more than suits of armor with a different design because of improved metallic technology. When fire bases are attacked, the U.S. Army, the most modern, scientific and well-equipped in the world, must engage in sieges that have been repeated since the beginning of warfare—with some modern but basically unessential variations. The bases are all equipped with "starlight scopes" and PSP radar, which Abrams says have been the most helpful bits of technology to be developed during the war. These costly products of laboratories very often do spot enemy. More often they do not. The NVA or VC run at the barbed-wire ramparts under cover of barrages from "catapults," the most modern mortars developed by China and the Soviet Union. Instead of scaling ladders, they carry wire-cutting shears. The U.S. fights them off with boiling oil—and virtually pours sheets of hot lead on their heads. The defenders ignite "phu gas," 55-gallon drums of jellied gasoline resembling napalm, planted just outside the wire. Overhead, there are "cauldrons" in the form of helicopters and airplanes armed with "miniguns." The miniguns can saturate an area the size of a football field with bullets in a matter of seconds. Artillery inside the camp fires cannister rounds at point-blank range, filling the air with the equivalent of millions of hot darts.

The slaughters are often the source of amazement to American field commanders. "I don't know why they want this place so badly," said one colonel after a two-day siege in which hundreds of NVA and 17 Americans had been killed. "They must want it. There must be something important about it. So we'll stay here and they'll never get it."

Will this "attrition" break the enemy? Sooner or later it must. But the best intelligence analysts say that if the Hanoi leadership is willing to take the losses, it can go on for a long time. Indeed, it may happen that the "attrition" of American will go on fighting the war may outrace the "attrition" of the enemy's ability to go on waging it.

The American leadership in Vietnam, both civilian and military, believes it has a winning strategy—with the familiar caveat of "just a little more time." "We can still pull this off if we don't have a French reaction at home," said one senior U.S. diplomat.

When Abrams was named commander, the pessimists were jubilant. Most of the evidence indicated that his tactics would demand a bigger orchestra, with beefed-up trumpets, cymbals and bass drums. In World War II, he had snarled his way across Europe with Patton's Third Army in a tank called "Thunderbolt." He was Patton's star pupil, and he had been Westmoreland's understudy. Was this the man for a political war?

But things had changed, Abrams, who had seen fit to employ certain tactics in Germany, thought others were necessary in Vietnam. He had been through some instructive experiences, such as commanding Federal troops at the integration battles in Alabama and Mississippi in the early nineteen-sixties. "I cannot recall any situation when the opportunity was greater to slip off the gangplank into the quicksand," Abrams said recently. "There couldn't be too much force, or too little. It was a time when you didn't use a sledge hammer when a tack hammer would do better."

Abrams was different in another way. He was not part of the "Club" which had been running the war. The Club was a collection of officers of similar personal style and professional approach. Personally, they were gleaming and "squared away." Professionally, they favored quick strikes and stunning blows which inflicted huge damage on the enemy in set-piece battles. The password was "Airborne" and the badge the "jump wings" worn above the heart which attest that a man has endured arduous physical training and has jumped from an airplane at least five times. In the ranks, the wings amount to a virility symbol. In the higher echelons, they are the badge of an American military version of an "old boys" network. One of its graybeards is Maxwell Taylor, who was one of Westmoreland's strongest patrons in the military establishment. The Airborne Club was in its ascendancy in the early sixties—at the same time "counterinsurgency" was a phrase Army careerists repeated into their shaving mirrors in the morning. Around that time, the club and some members of Special Forces (the Green Berets) realized they spoke with the same accent. In its original conception, Special Forces was to be a very small, highly trained band of specialists who would work in great secrecy in true guerrilla style. Then the Airborne Club, intoning counterinsurgency, embraced Special Forces, which, with John F. Kennedy's blessings, mushroomed into anything but its original design. It became a sort of super Ranger group with bastardized counterinsurgency rhetoric. The "Airborne" part of Special Forces suddenly took on great importance, though in its original conception a parachute was just a way of getting somewhere to begin work.

When Col. Robert B. Rheault (Airborne) was relieved of command of Special Forces in Vietnam recently, and charged with murder along with seven other Green Berets, some observers noted that his successor was not Airborne. He tried to become Airborne, but broke his ankle badly on his fourth jump in one hour. He was subsequently sent home for medical reasons, and replaced by a long-time, Airborne, Special Forces officer. Some observers saw a pendulum swing, somewhat erratically, in those moves.

Abrams is known to have been insistent

in bringing about the prosecution of Rheault and the others. His reasons are not yet known—and may be asked of him in court. One certainty is that as a square-shooting, traditional soldier, he was shocked when some of the "dirty tricks" customary in Green Beret activity became known to him forcefully. He has his own club—"The Old Scruffies"—who believe battles should be fought with feet planted firmly on the ground and that making a fetish out of jumping out of airplanes is puerile. Rheault could never join The Old Scruffies. When the case broke in the newspapers, Westmoreland intervened from Washington to order that the men be allowed to telephone their families. There may be trouble in Clubland.

It may well be much more than that. Abrams is said to have threatened to resign if the charges were dropped. Army apologists say his purpose involved enhancing the sense of law in Vietnam. Others say the motive was less noble. Whatever his reasons, Abrams has committed his prestige to the prosecution of the case—which has already grown helter-skelter into the most embarrassing, at least, episode of the war. The Army seems to have proceeded with little sense of consequences. Each step in the case has blown the case even bigger. Now much more could be at stake than was originally necessary—while the alleged death of a man recedes into unimportance. The similarities in process between the Green Beret case and the blundering, Topsy-like growth of the war are easily apparent.

Quite apart from this episode, one effect of the changing of the clubs was an opening toward a new approach to the war by the less dashing, more fundamental Abrams. His original single assignment as deputy in Vietnam had been to study the Vietnamese fighting forces and say how they could be improved. That task continues with even more urgency now.

Abrams quickly realized that most Vietnamese military problems were really political problems. In many ways, the ARVN has always been more of a political party than a fighting force. Until very recently, a requirement of all ARVN officers was a baccalaureate, which restricted military careers to a tiny crust of the society. The only military career for peasants, or even lower-middle-class men, who were opposed to the VC and wanted to do something was in the Regional Forces or Popular Forces (R.F.-P.F.), essentially the militia or national guard. They should have been a major factor in the armed services, certainly in a civil war. But the ARVN considered them politically untrustworthy yokels, and U.S. advisers consistently took their ARVN counterparts' lead and ignored "those funny little Ruff-Puffs." Thus the country's militia never had any training worth the name, received decades-old weapons—if any at all—and was almost completely cut out of air support, artillery support and even ground reinforcements when attacked. It was no wonder that their military efforts were comic.

There was never any lack of dismay at this state of affairs among some Americans, but no one ever listened to them seriously until Abrams. His study convinced him something had to be done about the R.F.-P.F. They have been getting training, weapons and better logistics, and their improvement has been enormous. But past neglect is easily overcome, and the capabilities of the crucial Ruff-Puffs still leave much to be desired.

Their neglect was symptomatic of all the wrong approaches to the war which have resulted in the present unpredictable state of the ARVN and the continuing inability of the Government to cope with its political threat. Abrams has demanded so much that the ARVN has improved considerably, but no one, Abrams included, dares promise very much. The roots of trouble are too deep.

"I know all I can expect from that guy is good news," Abrams said recently about an American adviser to an ARVN division. "That guy has been lying to me for two years, but if the news is bad, I'll hear about it through some other channel." Another time, Abrams said: "Some of those guys just tune out on me," as he described the frustrations involved in conveying his urgency about the problems to U.S. officers.

There was a major tuning-out of the advisory effort in 1965 when the ARVN had lost the war and U.S. combat units began arriving. But even after the crisis passed, the ARVN was not tuned in again. The reason was U.S. over-confidence—in which the ARVN basked.

One high-ranking officer who was close to the problem said: "We thought, hell, we're here in strength, and we'll finish it. The idea of bolstering the ARVN was always there, but no one ever did much about it. There was a feeling that with all that American strength, we really didn't have to bother with building up the ARVN that urgently."

At a recent MACV meeting, Abrams and his staff discussed the increasing North Vietnamese infiltration into the Delta area of Vietnam, where they never before had gone and where there was only one remaining American brigade. A worried aide asked what could be done about this threat: Would American troops have to return? Abrams slammed his fist on a table and emphatically said the U.S. would not do anything about it, and that the ARVN could cope with the threat if they wanted to.

The Americans fighting the war now were small children when the old mistakes were made. Many of the troops were too young for the Army when negotiations to end the war began in Paris. More and more, the American troops in Vietnam share, in even stronger manner, the feelings of the U.S. about the war. Their bitterness is even more intense now when some units are being withdrawn—but not all. "I'm in favor of letting the Vietnamese fight the war," said one soldier recently, "But I'm still here."

Thus Abrams was deeply concerned when Alpha Company's temporary refusal to fight made headlines around the world. He visited the area the day after the story broke in the newspapers to see what had gone wrong firsthand.

There is probably nothing that can be done about G.I. attitudes toward the war. If anything, the cynicism will probably increase in the future, but chances are that the Alpha Company incident will not be repeated very often nor surpassed. There is little or no threat of mutiny in the U.S. Army because of several factors which control the unhappy feelings: firm leadership, loyalty to buddies and the recognition that one's chances of being a free and healthy man after Vietnam are best developed by doing things the Army way. "They can have my body for a year but they can't have my mind," said one soldier recently at a fire base near the Cambodian border. His attitude is typical.

Abrams has had two sons serve in Vietnam and he has a genuine interest in the welfare of his fighting men. Recently, he was reviewing action during a "high point" and mentioned that U.S. casualties had been modest. He interrupted his narrative to interject: "No casualty is modest, no casualty is modest."

Abrams can be ferocious at briefings, especially at the stagy, formalized variety, which are as staple a part of military life as prayer is in monastic communities. One MACV officer who has witnessed many scenes of outrage offered three rules for pleasing Abrams: "Be informal; be prepared; be to the point." The rules provide good insight into Abrams's style of operating.

"Just tell me something I can use," Abrams once thundered at two MACV briefers who had begun what promised to be a long contrapuntal dissertation, filled with what he con-

sidered extraneous information—bolstered by a slide show.

He is not the kind of man who believes everything he hears. "Whenever we get a report of some good news, we wait 24 hours and then, if we're really lucky, it turns out to be 25 per cent correct," he said recently.

"He is not at all reluctant to raise his voice at briefings," said an officer who has attended quite a few, "and he can needle people. He can be very sarcastic in a funny way, and sometimes he can appear to be funny when he is being very serious. You have to get tuned to his manner."

A case in point was a routine daily briefing some time ago in which the briefer, in running through a long list of the day's incidents, mentioned that a river patrol boat had strayed into Cambodia. This was the second time that a boat had strayed so far off course—and the case was found to have the same embarrassing political repercussions, if not worse.

"Now, wait a minute, wait a minute," Abrams interjected. "Now, isn't there something we can do about that?" he asked, his voice rising slightly. "Can't we put a sign up on the river, or maybe a big red light right at the border—to stop this?" A witness recalled that "there were titters at first, but then people caught on that he was quite angry and they stopped."

What Abrams does with the information is as important as the demands he makes on its quality. "He grapples with problems," said a former associate. "You can almost see him wrestling with questions. This is fairly uncommon. Most of the time if any of the generals have any uncertainty about something, they look at one shoulder, then the other, reassure themselves all the stars are there, and plunge ahead."

"Abrams has doubts. He knows he is fallible, and that the system is fallible. He takes his time. But then, *poiv*—when the decision is made there is no doubt about it."

Abrams maintains daily communication with the Pentagon by phone or cable and frequently talks to the White House—though Nixon does not share in the day-to-day quarterbacking of the war as Johnson did. His reports to the President are technically only reports—data on which policy decisions can be made. But the reports necessarily become advocacy as well. Abrams surely has strong feelings about what should happen. His job is to win a war—or, at least, euphemistically, to bring about a satisfactory military solution. He could not live with a policy decision that militated against these ends, or he would risk contradicting his whole career and conscience.

Abrams prefers to keep his feelings and opinions private. He has never sought to explain himself or the war to the American people. He considers himself a public servant, working within the system, who realizes that the Government's problems are bigger than his. A former colleague at MACV said: "Abrams could be the commander of the legions, but never the proconsul. It's not his style. He is the soldier doing a job, following orders." The details of his reporting—and the nature of his advocacy—remain secret. To what degree his advice has been overruled, if it was at all, cannot be known precisely now. He has surely advised caution in U.S. withdrawals, just as the Saigon Embassy consistently has. He participates in drafting the Embassy telegrams on topics which involve fighting. If he cannot sign the Embassy telegram on some point, he sends his own, and Henry Kissinger gets two from Saigon that day.

Not long ago, Abrams was guest of honor at a dinner party at the Caravelle Hotel in downtown Saigon. After dinner, he stood with one of his Vietnamese friends, another military man, on the terrace, 10 flights up, overlooking Saigon. Abrams gazed at the city and said that it was beautiful at night: "Much too beautiful to give to the Vietcong."

## THE RISKS OF TOO HASTY WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in the next day or two we will see here in Congress and around the country a massive demand for faster troop withdrawals from Vietnam, a public protest against the phased and deliberate withdrawal procedures, based on South Vietnam's ability to defend its own future, which are being followed by President Nixon.

Before we get too much colorful rhetoric on this floor and elsewhere in connection with this so-called Vietnam moratorium, it might be well for those who call for these hasty withdrawals to realize the risks and harm their course entails, how it could easily throw away all that 39,000 American men have given their lives to insure.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column by Mr. Joseph Alsop that appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

### VIETNAMIZATION WORKING WELL BUT LIMITS MUST BE UNDERSTOOD

(By Joseph Alsop)

At this strange juncture, President Nixon is actually being denounced for saying that he does not wish to be the first American President to lose a war. Maybe, therefore, truthfulness is tactless.

Yet the hard, on-the-spot facts in Vietnam make it a duty to tell the plain truth, which is that the President can perhaps lose the war if he handles his "Vietnamization" program in the wrong way. It is a fine program, and it is working very well indeed, so far. But it has its own clear limits, and these must be understood.

This reporter had better confess at the outset that he went to Vietnam unhappily convinced that the U.S. troop withdrawals already made, in the name of "Vietnamization", must certainly have caused heavy military setbacks. Happily, however, that pre-judgment turned out to be entirely erroneous.

No troop withdrawal, of course, can ever be a net plus until a war has been successfully ended. The now-withdrawn brigade of the 9th Infantry Division, for instance, that had been operating in Dinh Tuong province in the delta, had genuinely become superfluous in Dinh Tuong. But there were other provinces where this brigade of the 9th Infantry would surely have greatly accelerated the terrible erosion of the whole VC structure, which is now the key feature in Vietnam.

On the other hand, there is much more to be said for making the South Vietnamese feel they must carry the main burden on their own, without big brother to come to their aid at all times. And above all, the two troop withdrawals to date have not exceeded prudent limits.

If the President is not over-hasty, moreover, further very massive withdrawals of U.S. units in Vietnam will eventually become both safe and prudent. The test, in all cases, must be whether erosion of the local VC structure has finally reached the point of no return.

But there are also two big fakes in the announced theory of "Vietnamization", as distinguished from the practice to date. To begin with, it is faking to pretend that providing M-16 rifles has given the South Vietnamese army's divisions the same fighting power as American divisions.

Even with the aid of the U.S. helicopter companies left behind after Vietnamiza-

tion, the ARVN divisions have far less mobility than the better U.S. divisions. They also have only about one-quarter of the mobile artillery support; for the other three-quarters of every ARVN division's artillery is tied down in fixed positions. This tied-down artillery in fact supports the territorial forces, rather than the division's regiments and battalions. That is the first fake.

The second fake, which is much more dangerous, lies in the fact that the enemy now has 233 maneuver battalions in South Vietnam, against only 168 ARVN maneuver battalions. The numbers are about even in the delta. But in the other corps areas, accordingly, the disproportion ranges from about five-to-three all the way up to nearly two-to-one. The disproportion, therefore, means that some (though not many) U.S. units will have to stick around until Hanoi ceases its massacre of the south.

Where Hanoi has two maneuver battalions against one ARVN battalion, after all, nothing on earth will prevent an eventual breakthrough by Hanoi's battalions. And the worst of it is that the President is obviously strongly tempted to leave ARVN to fight on these terms, in precisely the provinces where the situation is now most favorable.

Some key people in the administration, reportedly including the State Department leaders, are apparently arguing, in effect, that you cannot vietnamize without accepting some setbacks. But these people plainly are unable to envision the kind of setback they are talking about.

In the provinces in question, the VC structure has been almost wholly uprooted from the populated areas. The people are living in peace for the first time in many years, with their own elected hamlet and local governments, under the sole protection of the little RF companies and PF platoons of the territorial forces. But let big enemy units once break through into these new areas of peace; and everything that has been built up will be smashed down for good.

It will be smashed down for good because the people have put their confidence in their government and the U.S. government; if they see the territorial forces and the elected hamlet and village governments massacred before their eyes, that confidence will never be restored again. So the other test of prudent American troop withdrawals until Hanoi ceases to invade the south is whether the people who have given us their trust will still be adequately protected.

#### IF WE ARE GOING TO PROTEST, WHY DON'T WE PROTEST TO HANOI?

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, with all the busy little preparations now afoot for our day of national protest on October 15, I wonder why it is that nobody in charge has ever thought about protesting to Hanoi instead of to President Nixon.

Why is it that with these professional protesters, our country is always wrong, and the other side always right? If these protesters seek a more rapid end to the tragic fighting why do they not ever address the other side, why do they not ever find something amiss in the other side to find fault with? Why is it always us?

Roscoe Drummond raises that point very succinctly in his column in the October 11 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, and I believe Members may find it interesting reading:

#### WHY NOT PROTEST TO HANOI?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—All the protests don't have to be made by those who blame the President for not withdrawing faster from Vietnam.

Most Americans know that it takes two to make peace, and that thus far the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong have shown no interest in it. This is why Mr. Nixon suggests that the Oct. 15 student protesters ought to aim at Hanoi which is the real barrier to peace, not at Washington.

Is this suggestion a tactical retort or is it serious?

Obviously the peace-at-any-price student and senatorial protesters are not going to make an equal protest to Hanoi because they want instant, unilateral United States withdrawal regardless of the consequences. That's their right, good judgment or not.

But is there a valid, meaningful, significant protest which other Americans could make to Hanoi?

There is.

Why shouldn't the Congress of the United States lead a massive protest against North Vietnam's illegal and inhuman mistreatment of American prisoners of war?

#### PRISONER MISTREATMENT

The first step would be for the Senate and the House to pass—and, one would hope, unanimously—a joint resolution demanding that Hanoi cease its cruelties and crimes against enemy prisoners in proven violation of the Geneva convention by which it is bound through its signature in 1957.

Could it be passed unanimously—or nearly unanimously—so that it would be impressively expressive of the unity of the nation? Why not? Such a resolution has been introduced in the House by Rep. William L. Dickinson (R) of Alabama, and already has more than 200 cosponsors.

Are those senators like Fulbright, McGovern, McCarthy, Cooper, Muskie and others, who applaud the peace-at-any-price Oct. 15 protest, going to refuse to join in supporting a congressional resolution bringing home to Hanoi that the American people are acutely revolted at its inhumane and continuing maltreatment of captured United States servicemen?

#### NEEDLESS IGNORANCE

Surely those who want the President to get out of Vietnam faster than he deems prudent are not indifferent to the cruel, unneeded suffering of American servicemen in North Vietnamese hands and to the painful anguish of American wives, parents, and children who are kept in needless ignorance of the fate of their husbands, sons and fathers.

Here are the precise commitments of the Geneva convention and how North Vietnam is violating them:

1. It is required to identify the prisoners it holds. Hanoi refuses.

2. The treaty requires that sick and injured prisoners be returned. Hanoi has returned nine in five years.

3. The convention provides that impartial inspections of prisoner-of-war facilities by such a body as the International Red Cross be permitted. Hanoi refuses. Washington and Saigon welcome such inspections.

4. There is supposed to be a free exchange of mail. Hanoi refuses.

The records show 1,350 United States servicemen listed as prisoners or missing in action, and many missing in action may be in North Vietnamese prison camps. Some 200 of them have been unaccounted for longer than three and a half years without their families even being allowed to know whether they are alive or dead.

#### IMPATIENT

Many Americans are divided and impatient, about getting out of the war, but most Americans are united and increasingly

impatient with this cruel and callous maltreatment of American prisoners.

Congress should speak out. The voice of the American people ought to be heard through the voice of Congress, and it wouldn't hurt if we let every senator and congressman know that this is what most Americans would like.

Would this be a meaningless gesture?

Not necessarily.

It is evident that Hanoi is sensitive about American public opinion, especially when it thinks it can manipulate it to its own needs. Therefore, it might consider doing something about prisoners rather than to keep building a resentful and revolted opinion in the United States.

It was the prisoner-of-war issue which long prevented serious negotiations on the Korean peace, and it was a breakthrough on the prisoner issue which made ultimate agreement possible.

#### COLUMBUS—THE SUPREME PATH-FINDER COMMEMORATED

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the very recent triumph in the form of Apollo 11, it is altogether fitting to place special emphasis on Columbus Day this year, for all great ventures since his epochal discovery have been compared to what he accomplished. Time has only added luster to his deeds, enriching our own modern ventures accordingly.

Just as the astronauts set forth on a supremely dangerous venture into the unknown, so did he. Just as they braved uncounted perils and prevailed, so did he, laying the foundation for the world and society we enjoy today. By his actions, he set an example of courage, adventure, and pioneering which have always been emulated and never surpassed.

We have been able to follow on almost a minute-by-minute basis the course of the flight to the moon. Can we begin to imagine what it was then, as this irrepressible explorer put his faith, reputation, and life on the line in the interests of pushing back man's frontiers ever further? Mocked, abused, and vilified, he persevered, without a national effort behind him. There was no mission control, thousands of technicians, and the wealth of an entire society backing him. There were those who had a vested interest in the failure of his attempt. Among those closest to him there was vile treachery. And even then, after his success was attained, he reaped a harvest of imprisonment, poverty, and disappointment. Not for him a future of triumph and acclaim.

So it is that any society or group of explorers must take a cue from and defer to this incomparable man from Genoa. It is directly due to him that the Western World took its earliest shape and form. Every great leap into the unknown springs from his pathfinding and quests. If ever the spirit of one man rode along with the astronauts, it was that of Christopher Columbus.

If ever we are to continue such successful treks into the unknown, it will be with the full knowledge of the debt we owe him. It is well to recall that he was motivated by faith in what too many ignore today. We could do much worse

than recall his example and do more than pay lipservice to it.

#### IT IS TIME FOR ACTION

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I find no grounds to quarrel with President Nixon for his message urging greater activity from Congress. It was moderate in tone rather than critical, and offered cooperation rather than censure. Let us not cloud the issue by attempting to read something which does not exist into the record of this year's session of Congress. Hopefully by the end of the session we will have a much more imposing record to point to but at the moment, the session is a disappointing one. The House has passed a number of important measures, but legislative action has not been completed on most of them.

It is an inexcusable fact that passage of appropriations bills is delayed more than ever before in history and that practically every agency of Government is operating under serious handicap because of budget uncertainties. There is no way to dress this up and make it appear other than it is—a very disappointing situation.

The Congress still has an opportunity to develop an acceptable year's record but time is very short. I think it important to look at the facts and realize the President is right in asking for action. He has correctly accepted a part of the responsibility because his programs were late in reaching Congress. Cooperation now is important for everyone.

#### NEW FARM AND FOOD-AID PROGRAMS

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in major respects our Federal food programs, those relating to both production and distribution, fall short of their potential in terms of both public service and the more narrow interests of agriculture.

Food production programs are currently oriented almost exclusively to individual commodities. They are very high cost for the results achieved, and at the same time have caused farmers to rely upon Government for a major part of crop income. This trend, in my view, impairs the long term health of American agriculture. It is high time to embark on a definite planned phaseout of these individual commodity programs.

In their place I recommend two separate but complementary approaches: First, a general cropland adjustment program not tied to individual commodities; second, a program of personal assistance available only to farmers of low income.

Food distribution programs for low-income families have now emerged from a trial period nationally and are ready for expansion and reform. The need is self-evident. Although food is so abun-

dant in this country that the Federal Government spends many millions of dollars a year to curb production, Federal food-aid programs for poor families succeed in serving only a small percentage of those eligible.

This situation in our bounteous land is a national disgrace. We have spent billions of dollars to feed the hungry of the world with food from U.S. larders, while at the same time not even recognizing the hunger of our own people. It is a sad commentary on the governing institutions which permit such a situation to develop.

What is needed now is a firm commitment, as President Nixon stated, "to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time." Such a commitment can succeed only if we in Congress are willing to recognize the existence of hunger and malnutrition—both nationally and in our own districts—and act in an adequate manner.

In this respect, Illinois, my home State, is hardly a paragon of virtue. I do not speak representing a State which has solved its own hunger problems and is ready to offer advice to those who have been derelict.

I am sorry to report to you that Illinois has a lower average percentage of participation by the poor than all other States. Meanwhile, last year 4,248 Illinois farmers received over \$34.8 million for participating in Federal programs to restrict the production of food. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, 1969, page 13287, and June 26, 1969, pages 17462-17471, for data on each county in the United States.

Nationally, where the food stamp program operates, only 16 percent of those eligible on an average are served. Where the surplus distribution program operates, only 22 percent of those eligible are served. These figures show that we have hardly begun; they also show the magnitude of the job yet to be done.

It is a strange paradox that many people are in want nutritionally in our land of abundance. Perhaps its most shocking aspect came to light last spring. At that time, 424 counties, some with very high concentrations of poverty, were discovered not to be participating in either the food stamp or surplus distribution programs. Among them were counties in which payments to farmers not to grow food were extremely high. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1969, pages 11977-11983, for list of counties. This, despite the fact that free food under the surplus food program is immediately available from the Department of Agriculture to any county willing to distribute it.

The low percentage of poor families served is especially shocking in some of the leading food-producing States in our country, such as Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

In these very States where the poor simply are not reached, both the number of farmers receiving Federal checks in excess of \$5,000 and the total amounts received last year skyrocketed—in one case by as much as five times the previous year.

In many counties where participation

in Federal food-aid programs was abysmally low, payments to farmers for non-production was unconscionably high. Thirty-one counties which purport to have food-aid programs actually feed less than 1 percent of those who are poor; yet at the same time, wealthy farmers in these counties receive millions of dollars in farm payments.

The low percentage of participation in counties where Federal food-aid programs do exist results from several factors.

The surplus distribution program provides for the distribution of surplus foods to accredited recipients. The Federal Government pays for the food for delivering it to county warehouses. The county or other unit of local government needs only pay for warehousing the food and distributing it to those who are hungry. Yet as Secretary Hardin has pointed out in his testimony before this committee, problems abound with the program and it can by no means be adjudged a success.

Usually there is only one warehouse in each county. Access to a family may be granted only once a month during limited, specified hours. It is difficult for the poor to get there on time at the right time. A strong man might be able to load into his car the bulky 34 pounds of food which make up the average monthly supply distributed. But most of the poor in this country are not strong men, nor do they have cars. The sick, the aged, the infirm, women and children find it difficult to find transportation to the warehouses, and next to impossible to get back with their burdens. Often they must pay others to drive them to the distribution points and pick up the heavy commodities, thus even further depleting what little money they have.

A poor person who gets the surplus food packages home must deal with still other problems. A family depending upon this food for its total monthly supply will find that it generally runs out on the 22d day of the month.

Furthermore, the food is presented in unappetizing, Government-issue packages. Some powdered milk items are widely disliked because they taste bad and are lumpy. Some of the contents of the food package are difficult to prepare and instructions are often difficult to understand.

Finally, the contents of the food packages vary greatly from season to season, among the States, and even among counties. Poor families often do not know what will be in the package until they pick it up. State and county officials may refuse certain items included by the Department of Agriculture, even though the poor recipient might desire the food. Few counties give out all 22 items of food.

Food stamps represent a big improvement over surplus distribution because they utilize the merchandising convenience of private food stores, but here, too, participation by those in need is extremely low.

The food stamp program is designed for those with a small, but steady income. A family must participate in the program on a regular monthly basis in order to continue to receive benefits. Thus, those whose incomes fluctuate from

week to week are prohibited from participating.

The poor who can afford to participate generally must spend between 37 and 50 percent of their monthly income for the food stamps. This compares with 17 percent spent by the average American for food. Such an expenditure for the entire month's allocation of stamps must be made all at one time, rather than every 4 or 5 days as most housewives do. Since many must spend as much as 50 percent of their income for food, saving this much money for a monthly expenditure constitutes an extreme additional financial burden upon the poor, a burden which most Americans do not have to face.

Although a poor family must often spend a large proportion of its income for food stamps, it will receive sufficient stamps to provide it with only two-thirds of the food supply needed for the month. This incredible situation can only be described as Government-mandated hunger.

Finally, since the accreditation process for those eligible to receive food stamps is closely linked to welfare eligibility requirements, the food stamp program suffers from many of the same deficiencies and variations which plague State and local welfare systems.

Even in homes served by stamps or surplus distribution, the nutrition level still may be unsatisfactory. Education on how to purchase and prepare nutritious meals may be lacking and the source of many problems.

To help meet these immediate major problems in our food distribution programs to poor people, I have six specific suggestions. Except for the first one, which I feel should be acted upon immediately, I suggest that pilot studies of the others be authorized as a means of measuring their practicality for national applications.

My suggestions are:

First. Require that benefits be made available uniformly throughout each participating State. This would effectively bring all counties of the United States under Federal food-aid programs.

Second. Discontinue Government warehousing of surplus food items and Government-issue packaging and utilize private food stores as points for the distribution of items on a surplus list. Under my proposal, vouchers would entitle those eligible to select approved items from regular merchandise stocks. Stores would be reimbursed by the Government.

Third. Utilize private food stores for the sale of food stamps and delivery of surplus food vouchers. Private food stores are readily accessible to every area, urban and rural, and by their very nature constitute a highly efficient distribution and service system. All are open at least 8 hours a day, 6 days a week and are well situated for customer convenience. Furthermore, they have demonstrated their ability efficiently and conveniently to handle all types of coupons redeemable for merchandise.

Supplementing the distribution of stamps and vouchers at food stores, we should provide those who are in poverty

and regularly receiving monthly Government or retirement checks—thus having a set income—with food stamps through the mail. This part of the system could thus be automated, reducing costs and allowing the concentration of our limited manpower on those whose incomes fluctuate monthly.

Elimination of special Government-issue packaging and warehousing would serve two important purposes. It would partially reduce costs, and it would remove a stigma experienced by child and adult alike, the stigma associated with the presence of "poor people" food packages in the home and standing in "poor people" lines at Government warehouses.

Fourth. Require that the local unit of government certify those eligible for food stamps and/or surplus distribution quarterly and in some cases at greater intervals, with vouchers or stamps issued more frequently to the poor than at present. Under this system, weekly purchase of food stamps could readily be accomplished.

Fifth. Permit concurrent operation of both the food stamp and surplus distribution programs in counties. All poor people would be eligible to purchase food stamps, but those of extremely low income would also be made eligible for surplus food vouchers.

This would serve two important purposes; It would give extra free food to those who have the greatest need for it; it would create a highly flexible means of stimulating consumption of selected items that may from time to time become in heavy surplus. To illustrate, a price-depressing glut of potatoes, apples, rice, wheat, or butter could readily be put to good use by this means. This would also, I feel, make it unnecessary to provide some food stamps without charge, as many have called for, while at the same time assuring the poor an adequate diet.

Sixth. Require that each eligible family must include at least one person with competence in food purchasing and preparation. Those already competent could meet this requirement by passing a written test. Others could establish eligibility by attending special courses offered through local schools or classes similar to those now being sponsored on a pilot basis by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

These suggestions, hopefully, would help to assure that benefited families get maximum nutrition from these programs.

When Secretary Hardin testified before this committee earlier this year, he stated his own awareness and that of the Department of Agriculture of many of these problems which I have discussed today, and he presented many suggestions for coping with them, several of which are similar to those I have listed and in a few cases are already underway on a pilot basis.

In one instance, a group of Illinois State and local officials and representatives of the private retail foodstores in the Chicago area sought my help in setting up an appointment for them to meet with Secretary Hardin and Assistant Secretary Lyng so that they could present a plan for a program which will

utilize vouchers permitting those qualified to shop at regular retail food stores. Subsequently, other meetings were held in Chicago between these officials and USDA specialists, and I am glad to report that a forward-looking pilot program is now being developed for testing in the Chicago area. This pilot voucher system would permit expectant mothers, or mothers with infants, who were qualified to participate in the supplemental food program, to shop for selected nutritious foods at their neighborhood food stores and "pay" for their purchases with vouchers. Thus, the program would use the considerable experience, know-how and efficiency of retail foodstores to distribute nutritious foods to needy mothers.

H.R. 9009

My second set of recommendations deals with long-term farm legislation. Even with expanded food-aid programs for needy families, general adjustment legislation assisting agriculture generally and marginal farmers particularly will be needed for the next few years at least.

Present programs are not satisfactory in terms of cost-effectiveness, impact on the agricultural economy, and assistance to marginal farmers. Despite very high cost, they do not effectively control production. At the same time, they have caused direct Government payments to represent an inordinately high portion of crop income.

Cotton farmers now get about half their crop income from the U.S. Treasury, wheat farmers one-third, and feed grains farmers one-fourth.

I believe there is a better way. A suggestion I have made is embodied in H.R. 9009, and I hope this committee will be able to give it serious consideration. Identical legislation has been introduced by 24 other House Members and 20 Senators.

It has three primary objectives:

First, to provide special assistance to the farmer whose income is low because his farm operation is very small. There are over half a million farmers whose individual gross annual sale of farm products is no more than \$5,000 and whose off-farm income is no more than \$2,000 according to the latest census statistics. From this gross income must come all the expenses of running a farm. These people need help, and present programs do not adequately provide it.

H.R. 9009 provides for retraining grants of up to \$1,000 for these farmers, and also adjustment assistance of up to \$2,500 a year for not more than 2 years; loans under existing credit programs to ease the transition to off-farm employment; and compensation for acreage allotments surrendered to the Secretary of Agriculture for permanent cancellation. These aids would help submarginal and marginal farmers gain skills to secure off-farm income and thus to better themselves whether they continue to farm part time or not.

Second, to phase out acreage controls, base acreages marketing quotas processing taxes, and direct payments for wheat, feed grains, and cotton over a 5-year period. Total payments under these programs would be limited in 1971 to 80

percent of the amount spent in 1969, and each succeeding year thereafter would be reduced by 20 percent of the present level of spending so that by 1975 no payments would be made.

During this period, and in the future, marketing loans for wheat, feed grains, cotton, and soybeans would be available at 85 percent of each commodity's average market price over the 3 previous years. Thus, the Commodity Credit Corporation would once again function as was originally intended, as a convenience to orderly marketing. At present, CCC acts more as a permanent storage center for surplus crops which have piled up year upon year, causing immense storage problems and costs, much waste, and adverse influence on market prices.

Third, to phase-in an extensive program of land retirement emphasizing the retirement of entire production units. This program would be operated by the Secretary of Agriculture on a competitive bid basis in order to obtain the maximum benefit for the taxpayer's dollar. As annual limitations gradually eliminate present commodity programs, all of which involve annual retirement of only a percentage of the land on each farm, cropland will be pulled out of production under competitive long-term contracts.

The cost of implementing H.R. 9009 would obviously depend upon the scale of land retirement undertaken by the Secretary of Agriculture. By the end of the 5-year phaseout, I would estimate that the new farm program would cost less than half of the present level of spending.

If, as I recommend, extensive reforms and expansion of the food stamp and surplus distribution programs are undertaken, utilization of food would increase. This in turn would reduce the need for cropland adjustment.

H.R. 9009 is people-oriented. Present programs are crop-oriented. My proposal provides effective adjustment aid to farmers who have the most pressing personal financial need. Present programs give income support to commodities and yield many payments of astronomical size to individual farmers, which in turn, give the big operator resources with which to get still bigger, often at the expense of the small farmer.

In my opinion, H.R. 9009 makes sense both political and economically, and is in tune with the times. It affords a sensible way for the Congress to resolve a serious dilemma.

An extension of the Agricultural Act of 1965 without substantial change is most unlikely. At the same time a radical change of existing law would be very difficult for many members of the Committee on Agriculture to support, in light of the individual constituencies served. My proposal provides a way out.

Because it is long term, my proposal gives individual farmers and the agricultural economy abundant time to make adjustments. At the same time it provides assurance of substantial reform within the 5-year term.

All of us, I am sure, want to see the day when farmers get all their crop income from the private market, instead of getting a major part from the U.S.

Treasury. All of us want farmers to be free to plant whatever crops they wish, without the influence of Government inducements.

All of us want the abundance of our farmland made available to low-income people. We cannot countenance hunger in a land of plenty.

The proposals I have made here today would, over a 5-year period, restore American agriculture to a sound private-market base and crop-selection freedom to the farmer.

My proposals on food-aid to poor families would cost money, perhaps a great deal of money. But they would end the unconscionable paradox which finds our Government spending millions to curb food production while many of its citizens go hungry.

#### TO REDESIGNATE THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AS THE DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENT, AND POPULATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I requested a special order today so that members of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population could discuss the merits of H.R. 12000 to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population. This bill was cosponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman DARDARIO, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman MOSHER, a member of our task force. These gentlemen are to be commended for recognizing the significance of the interrelationship of our environment, natural resources, and the population growth rate.

Members of our task force have submitted an identical bill, H.R. 12000 has been referred to the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the full Committee on Government Operations.

The chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), is well known for his leadership and concern in correcting the abuses of our environment and we are hopeful that his subcommittee will give this bill a high priority.

I would like to enter into the RECORD at this point, Mr. Speaker, a section of the report of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, entitled "Managing the Environment." This section is entitled "Human Ecology," and the most significant part states:

It is apparent to the subcommittee that the population explosion is fundamental to the requirement for environmental management.

The article on "Human Ecology" follows:

#### HUMAN ECOLOGY

Environmental quality management is a political issue today in the Western World because of our affluence. The standard of living is high and the plethora of things

which money can buy serves to accentuate the values in the landscape which cannot be purchased but must be planned for.

In the world as a whole, including the emerging nations with their great expectations and populations, environmental management is essential to food supply and rapid economic development. A tailoring of management practice to each situation will be required. In fact, control of environmental quality which is too rigid or too elaborate may set back the emerging countries.

It is apparent to the subcommittee that the population explosion is fundamental to the requirement for environmental management. Population must come under control and be stabilized at some number which civilization can agree upon. Otherwise, the best use of natural resources will be inadequate and the apocalyptic forces of disease and famine will dominate the earth. In an epilog to his recent book "Ecology and Resource Management" (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968) Kenneth E. F. Watt states:

"It would be tragic if readers of this book conclude that the problem of expanding human populations versus finite resources can be solved merely by increasing the efficiency of utilization of the resources. Ultimately, such a one-sided approach would reduce men everywhere to the role of pitiful scavengers, constantly combing the litter of a ravaged biosphere in search of scraps overlooked in prior searches by vast hordes of fellow scavengers. Increase efficiency of resource management, unaccompanied by internationally practiced birth control, can only lead our species rapidly down a one-way street to oblivion. Unless a massive worldwide program of birth control is begun now, no amount of efficiency in resource management will suffice for the needs of humanity."

Finally, environmental quality is an issue because of our richness in technology. Despair might be warranted in facing these complex problems, if this were not an age of greatly increased scientific knowledge to understand, management skills to organize and operate, and technology to accomplish virtually any task, once it is identified. The fortuitous situation of having the power to cope with the problem should stimulate the courage and willpower to get on with the job.

Our task force, Mr. Speaker, has conducted informal hearings since early June. We have made available to our colleagues the highlights of these hearings. Twenty-two hearings were held. These hearings have been very meaningful and educational. The first action the task force took was to cosponsor the bill to establish a Commission on Population and the American Future requested by President Nixon. The support of H.R. 12000 is the second action of the task force.

The task force is not wedded to the specific reorganization recommendations of this bill, but recognizes the bill as an excellent vehicle with which to conduct hearings for the record.

The young people of this country are mad and militant over our priorities. They realize that we are chewing up our environment at such a pace that they may not have the joys of nature to share with their children that we all enjoyed.

We need to focus more attention on the environmental consequences of all our activities inside and outside of government. We need public awareness and we need congressional awareness. It must be recognized that our inability to manage our environment is due largely to our lack of understanding the signifi-

cance of our rapid population growth rate.

No one can honestly say how many people the earth can accommodate but we certainly can say that we have proven incapable of managing our environment and our society at the rate at which the population is presently increasing.

Obviously we cannot change direction overnight. Solving this problem is going to take significant planning. It will take new attitudes. It will mean, for many of us, biting the bullet.

The inquiries and responses of subcommittee hearings on this legislation could be the most salient thrust this Congress and the public receive in learning what should and can be done to correct the imbalance of our ecological system.

I encourage Mr. BLATNIK's subcommittee to conduct hearings as soon as possible and offer the research work of our task force to his subcommittee.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself today with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) and the other Members of his Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am a member.

As one of the original sponsors of this legislative initiative, it is especially gratifying to me that the Task Force has chosen as one of its first policy recommendations to support the concept and rationale as outlined in H.R. 12000.

Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, it is proper that we should recognize and acknowledge the fact that the first impetus for this legislative proposal came several months ago from my good friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO), with the able staff assistance of Mr. Phil Yeager, counsel to the Science and Astronautics Committee. It was Congressman DADDARIO, whose judgment I greatly respect, who originally put this legislation together to dramatize the need for viewing the problems of environment, resources, and population together as a whole, and to reorganize our Federal Government structure to that end.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that environmental, natural resource and population problems are intimately interrelated, so that policymaking and management, including support of research and technological development should be coordinated for all three of those areas.

So crucial have become these problems, genuine coordination is now imperative. The need is immediate.

And that need obviously implies some very significant restructuring and reassignment of missions in our Federal agencies.

Therefore, our task force is introducing a bill which would concentrate responsibility for environmental, natural resource and population problems in a renamed and reorganized Department of the Interior.

We propose the transfer of several existing functional units to the new, enlarged Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, in addition

to those functions already being performed by the Interior Department.

Those which our bill would transfer to the new Department are the Bureau of Census, the Environmental Sciences Services Administration, the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Oceanic Canal Study Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Environmental Control Administration, and the National Air Pollution Control Administration.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that adequate hearings and discussion may indicate why there should be other transfers, or that some of these changes we are proposing may not be necessary, to achieve the ultimate purpose of the bill we are introducing today.

Thus, we do not pretend that this legislation is perfectly conceived in its introductory form.

Moreover, we fully recognize the many, many difficulties always faced in any such major reorganization proposal. We obviously may be stirring up a bureaucratic hornets nest, and we are raising very difficult questions as to consolidation of congressional committee jurisdictions.

So be it. I repeat that the need for some such coordination is imperative in the Nation's interest. It is already past due.

Our bill may not be the precise or final answer to this crucial need, but we submit it is an important, necessary first step.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the President sent a message to the Congress today asking us to roll up our sleeves and to get to work. One of the new initiatives of this administration has been the visible attention given to population matters. The President said:

There is a widely-recognized correlation between population growth and poverty in the under-developed nations of the world. I have asked Congress to support our endorsement of those individuals and organizations seeking voluntary answers to this global question in other lands.

To approach this question as it applies at home, I have called on Congress to create a national commission to undertake now a study of how the nation is to provide for the 100 million new Americans expected before the turn of the century.

Beyond this, I have asked that a new philosophy become American government policy. We will interfere with no American's freedom of choice; we will infringe upon no one's religious convictions; but we shall not deny to any American woman the family planning assistance she may desire but cannot afford. That is the goal I ask Congress to support.

I believe that hearings on H.R. 12000 would add significant substance to this goal.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in this Chamber over the last 9 months about the quality of our environment. Many of us have felt rather frustrated in developing meaningful legislation that would effectively correct our misuse of our environment.

The task of improving the quality of our environment is infinitely complex and that is due to the fact that our environment is a complex system made up of highly interrelated parts. There is no

single solution but the bill, H.R. 12000 that we are discussing today does make visible a very important fact. The fact that our environment, our natural resources, and our population growth are interrelated; that our inability to manage our environment is a result of our misuse of natural resources in satisfying the increased demands of our rapid population growth.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER), the original sponsors of this legislation, are to be congratulated on their awareness of this interrelationship. The increase and urbanization of our population has created new and larger demands for goods and services. These demands have stimulated greater industrialization and new technology, further whetting the individual appetite for a higher standard of living.

It is difficult to believe that individual demands for more and better goods and services will diminish. Nor can we expect that individual demands for freedom of movement, fresh air, clean water, and a chance to be with nature will diminish. Fulfillment of these human desires is dependent upon our ability to live within nature's ecological boundaries and a recognition of the fact that the earth's resources are limited. The world cannot go on indefinitely expanding both its demands upon the earth's resources and its total population. Since individual demands cannot be expected to diminish, then the number of individuals must be limited.

The President has a Cabinet-level Council on Environmental Quality and this Congress has passed legislation to form an independent Council on Environmental Quality. We will also be considering a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, requested by the President in his population message. All these are good and necessary but we as a Congress cannot afford to sit back and wait for council reports and Commission reports. We owe our constituents a continuing pursuit for solutions to these problems that create the deterioration of our environment.

I wish to encourage the Government Operations Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization to conduct hearings on H.R. 12000 just as soon as possible. We need to get moving fast and this would be an excellent beginning.

For the benefit of my colleagues I offer the following article for the RECORD:

[From the Science Teacher, January 1969]

#### THE FUTURE OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT<sup>1</sup>

(By Robert W. Lamson)

In thinking about and acting to influence man's future environment, we must consider many factors—the physical, biological, and social; the "man-made" as well as the "natural." Man's future environment will include the human populations, the cities and institutions which man has created, as well as the physical, chemical, and non-human biological systems—the oceans, continents,

<sup>1</sup> This article represents only the views of the author and not those of the Department of the Interior.

river basins, and the populations of various species of plants, fish, insects, birds, and animals upon which man depends for his survival and well-being.

If we wish to protect and improve the social, physical, and biological aspects of our environment, we must attempt to answer and act upon the answers to the following three critical questions:

What are the trends which are helping to modify or create the natural and man-made environments which man will inhabit during the next half century?

What is the possible range of these alternative future environments?

What might be done to influence these trends so as to shape the future in desired directions?

This article discusses these questions, specifically as they concern the United States.

#### TRENDS AND CONDITIONS CONFRONTING THE UNITED STATES

Important trends which will affect man's future environment include population growth and distribution, resource supply and use, output of wastes, and growth and use of technological and organizational power.

**Population growth and distribution.** The current world population of about 3.5 billion could double and reach 7 billion or more by the year 2000 if current trends continue. Projected United States population for the year 2015 ranges between 325 and 483 million. In just 50 years, the nation's population could grow by 125 to 280 million over today's population of about 200 million.

Throughout the world, people have been moving from rural areas to more densely populated urban areas, and in the United States, a very large percentage of the growing population lives and is projected to live on a very small percentage of the land.

**Supply and use of resources.** The United States contains a supply of renewable and non-renewable natural resources which is not unlimited, which can be depleted, but which can also be expanded and upgraded through application of scientific research, and used more efficiently through better management.

Use of many resources in the United States is projected to increase even more rapidly than population, due to increased per capita demand for resources caused by increased industrialization and use of technology, urbanization, rising levels of income and individual expectations, increased leisure, and outdoor recreation. Increasing demand for resources sometimes involves a requirement for higher quality resources, for instance, water.

**Output of wastes.** Output of wastes—solid, liquid, and gaseous—is increasing for the nation and per capita, thereby intensifying the threat of pollution to our air, land, and water. Sources of pollution include cities, industries, farms, heat from power generation, automobiles, recreation, mining, boating, and commercial shipping. The types, sources, and amounts of wastes will tend to increase with the growth of population, industry, and use of technology and resources. Many types of wastes are also projected to increase more rapidly than will population.

The factors which help to increase demands for resources, for clean water, pure air, and uncluttered land, also help to increase the output of wastes, thereby making demands more difficult to satisfy. While we have placed increasing demands upon the environment, we have also increased our dumping of wastes into it.

Although we may not be in immediate danger of exhausting our supply of many types of resources, we are in danger, because of declining quality, of jeopardizing our usable supply.

#### Growth of technological organizational

power. By applying our knowledge and experience to solve practical problems, we are increasing our technological and organizational ability to:

1. Push back many of the constraints of nature, of distance, time, and disease, and of our formerly low capacity to manipulate the environment;

2. Shape and create widespread, intense, and long-lasting changes in the natural environment; some of these changes could be irreversible and adverse to man's long-term survival, health, and well-being;

3. Create "artificial" or man-made environments (for instance, cities and manned satellites), and to live in new environments (under the ocean and on the moon);

4. Perceive, predict, and monitor as well as to control, influence, or manage environmental changes, for example, via new techniques (systems analysis), tools (microscopes, telescopes, satellites, and computers), laws (domestic rules as well as international agreements concerning conservation, use of resources, and technology), and institutions (river basin commissions);

5. Increase rapidly the production of food and energy, transform raw materials into finished products through industrial processes, and transport people, goods, energy, and information.

**Changing proportion of "natural" and "man-made" aspects of the environment.** As a result of population growth and of using our increased technological and organizational power, more and more of man's environment is becoming man-affected or man-made, except where special provision has been made to keep the influence of man and his machines at a minimum (for example, in wilderness areas and natural areas created to provide a base line for ecological studies).

The primary threats to man's physical and psychic survival, to his health and well-being, now increasingly stem from his own creations, from the environments which he has created or altered, from the natural forces which he has harnessed, and from the institutions, techniques, and tools which he has invented in order to remove the constraints of space, time, and low capacity to manipulate the environment.

Man no longer has the margin for error which space, time, and his relative lack of power once provided for his ecological mistakes.

He must, therefore, take care, in his relation to the environment and in his actions to shape it, that he does not make himself and his society more vulnerable to sabotage, disruption, and disaster—for example, if a small element of the system which he designs does not perform perfectly, if his shaping of the environment should have adverse effects, or if disturbances in the environment, such as floods, earthquakes, and hurricanes, should affect the areas in which he has settled.

We have had some sharp, recent experience with systems which created potentially disastrous effects when a small part of the system failed—for instance, the Northeast power failure and the Torrey Canyon tanker disaster.

In attempting to use our power to influence the environment, we should design for a range of contingencies—for the optimist when all works well and for the pessimist when must goes wrong. The test of our technical creations is not how well they perform when all parts work as designed, but how well the system runs and how widespread the damage is when a part of the system fails.

Since the environment influences man himself, and since man has increased power to influence his environment, man is, in many ways, through intent as well as inadvertence, and perhaps in ways he does not understand, increasingly influencing his own genetic, physical, and psychological nature—

and that of his children—through the environments which he creates.

Because man's increased power to manipulate the environment has created a total environment which is increasingly man-made and in which man's margin for error is reduced, his only protection now is knowledge and wisdom in using his technological and organizational power. Man's ability to create adverse effects may be greater than his ability to perceive, judge, prevent, and control them. As a result of his inability to control wisely the purposes to which he puts his power, man may find that he is creating effects in his "natural" and "man-made" environments, as well as in himself, which he cannot control and which are adverse and irreversible.

#### RANGE OF ALTERNATIVE FUTURE ENVIRONMENTS

In attempting to look at the "natural" as well as the "man-made" aspects of man's future environment, one can project a number of possible alternatives, ranging from optimistic to pessimistic.

The many elements which will make up man's future environment vary with respect to: (1) probability of occurrence; from impossible to inevitable or zero to 100 percent; (2) popularity, or the extent to which the event is desired by the public or by specific groups, today or in the future; and (3) desirability.

The actual future environment which man will inhabit depends upon the nature and unfolding of the various trends which are helping to shape the environment and upon man's actions to influence these trends.

The crucial problem in looking at the future is to decide what is desirable among the range of possible future events and then to work for it, taking into consideration the probability that the future event will occur, the difficulty and costs of bringing it about, and the consequences of not doing so.

Within the range of possible future social and ecological environments, many pessimistic possibilities could be realized in the absence of adequate policies to prevent their occurrence.

For example, problems of external defense, international order, and war could become worse, with general nuclear war one pessimistic possibility for rapidly decimating our population, and, at the same time severely damaging our natural environment and our cities.

Large-scale loss of life due to ecological and technological disasters is not impossible, particularly if large and densely concentrated populations depend upon an ecology and large-scale systems of technology and organization which are highly vulnerable to disruption, breakdown, and misuse.

In the absence of adequate policies to protect against such natural hazards as storms, earthquakes, and floods, larger numbers of people could become vulnerable to disaster.

Other possible adverse effects of misusing our technological power have been mentioned, for example, global ecological imbalances and more intense and widespread disasters caused by:

1. Environmental pollution which upsets the chemical-thermal balance of the earth's atmosphere because of increased burning of fossil fuels, pollution of the upper atmosphere, and impairment of the cycle by which the carbon-oxygen balance in the atmosphere is maintained, through photosynthesis, by plants on land and in the ocean;

2. Soil depletion and increased salinity of the soil;

3. Poorly planned, large-scale, environmental engineering projects which trigger world-wide ecological effects—rapid or slow—which are adverse to man and irreversible.

Increasing pressures to mass produce and construct, in a short time, large numbers

of new buildings and housing units could cause a decline in diversity, quality, and choice in our cities. Without proper protection, the quality of the countryside, also, could continue to deteriorate because of junkyards, billboards, power lines, overenriched lakes ruined by algae growth fed by wastes from cities and farms, polluted streams, and erosion of hillsides and of the many new inadequately protected construction sites.

The cumulative and mutually reinforcing effects of many environmental changes on the ecology and on man's physical and psychic health are potentially dangerous but not well known.

For example, we do not know enough about the long-term ecological, somatic, and genetic effects of various chemicals used in fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides; of such environmental contaminants as radioactive wastes and lead; of the concentration of various poisons through the food chain, or of their cumulative and interactive effects. Nevertheless, the outpouring of toxic materials into the environment is already great and increasing.

Even though the nation's economy, our gross national product, and our per capita income will continue to grow, individual standards of living could decline because of inadequate policies and programs to protect the environment. Since the social, physical, and biological aspects of man's environment interact, deterioration of the non-human environment could help to create economic and social decline.

Moreover, failure on the social and political level could, in turn, contribute to deterioration of our physical and biological surroundings. For example, the educational system could fail to transmit to succeeding generations the cultural values which underlie the nation's political system as well as the attitudes and skills essential to maintaining environmental quality.

Internal order as well as ecological balance and environmental quality could break down or become more difficult to maintain. Or, their maintenance could be based more and more on "external controls" and repressive measures, on the threat of punishment and constriction of freedom.

Man's actions to avert the various environmental threats which now confront him will help to determine whether or not his future environment will be one in which he can thrive as well as exist.

Depending on his actions to prevent the occurrence of future pessimistic possibilities, and to realize optimistic ones, man could enjoy more widespread and heightened values of, for example: natural beauty, clean air, water, and uncluttered land; cities which are beautiful, exciting, and a joy to live in; rising levels of living; tranquility and silence; privacy as well as sociability; diversity, individuality, and choice; justice and security; political freedom, the opportunity to influence and participate in the decisions which affect his welfare and that of his children; democratic, representative government; and the opportunity to develop his personality to the maximum extent.

We must remember that the optimistic projections will not automatically come about without human effort. Nor will we prevent the pessimistic projections from coming true if we do not work at it. In fact, projections can become self-denying or self-fulfilling prophecies, depending upon their effect on human attitudes, effort, and will.

When people view any particular future alternative as necessarily inevitable, such an attitude tends to generate self-fulfilling or self-denying prophecies, depending on whether we see the inevitable as optimistic or pessimistic. For example, a pessimistic projection which is viewed as inevitable can become a self-confirming prophecy through reducing any effort to prevent its occurrence, thereby increasing the probability that it

will come true. An optimistic projection which is viewed as inevitable can become a self-denying prophecy through reducing the effort devoted to bringing it about, thereby reducing the probability of its coming true.

On the other hand, if the future is regarded as open and subject, to some extent, to human manipulation, then this will tend to leave room for the creative exercise of human wisdom, will, and effort.

#### CONTROL OR INFLUENCE OF TRENDS

Having outlined some of the important trends confronting the United States, and a range of alternative environmental outcomes associated with these trends, the question arises: Should we attempt to "adjust" to the trends, or to "influence" and "control" them, or both?

Assuming that "adjustment," by itself, is not an adequate guide if we wish to promote economic growth, individual well-being, and environmental quality, we then need to consider what can be done to "control"—or at least to "influence" the various trends which will affect man's future environment. What can be done to make more probable the optimistic rather than the pessimistic projections?

Technological and organizational power. It is crucial that we control the uses of our increasing technological and organizational power to affect our environment since to date, we have used this growing power in an unbalanced way:

To limit deaths, but not, at the same time and in the same degree, to limit births. As a result, no matter how efficient the technology, skill, and organization devoted to producing, expanding, and making more efficient use of resources, population now outpaces production in many parts of the world, with tragic results.

To use, destroy, and deplete resources for immediate benefit, without sufficient regard for the resource needs of future generations and without providing adequate knowledge and skills to compensate for the depletion.

To pollute our land, air, and water, but not to prevent pollution, clean it up where it occurs, and restore the damaged environment.

To promote economic and population growth, but not to protect and promote environmental quality.

To create and apply new knowledge and powerful technologies without, at the same time, acting to prevent and limit the damaging side effects of using this knowledge and technology.

There is a need now to restore the balance in our use of science and technology—in our attitudes, laws, and institutions. For science and engineering, by themselves, cannot save us from our lack of wisdom and vision in using science and in managing our technological power.

Additional technological power and efficiency, applied in the same manner that we have applied them in the past to our environment and to the forces of nature, will not necessarily save us from our lack of balance and wisdom in using that power.

We need, therefore, to perceive, predict, evaluate, influence, and control the effects of using our technological and organizational power so that the optimistic rather than the pessimistic possibilities will come to pass.

To carry out the research, planning, and operational programs to perform those activities, we need to create the necessary laws and institutions, in government, at the federal, state, and local levels, as well as in the private sector, in universities and industry.

We need to use our technological power in such a way as to affect the trends which, if unchecked, would realize the pessimistic possibilities. In other words, we need to influence population growth and distribution, the supply of and demand for resources and services, and the output of wastes.

*Population growth and distribution.* Prob-

lems of population increase as well as density could seriously jeopardize the ability of this and other nations to meet, concomitantly, their national goals for security, economic growth, welfare and well-being, resources, conservation, and environmental quality.

There is, therefore, a need to develop a population policy based on analysis to determine:

1. What, if various alternative projections for future population growth and distribution were to come true, the effects would be on the success and costs of our policies:

A. To supply and conserve resources (land, water, air, food, minerals, energy, timber, wildlife, wilderness, outdoor recreation and park areas, open spaces, natural beauty, silence, etc.)

B. To provide services (transportation, health, welfare, housing, sanitation, education, etc.); and

C. At the same time, to protect and promote environmental quality; that is, to prevent further pollution of our land, air, and water, to clean up what pollution remains, to restore the damaged environment, to rebuild our deteriorated cities and to create new ones;

D. To solve these problems within the existing framework of government and political and personal values (to protect and strengthen freedom of choice and representative, popular government and to limit the extent of intrusion of government into the personal lives of citizens).

2. Which, if any, of the various alternative projections for future population growth and distribution we should regard as goals for population policy, and the costs and benefits of achieving each; and

3. How, by what methods, we could achieve each goal. Programs for action to influence population growth rates and distribution could be based on such analyses.

Alternative goals for population growth might include, for example: (1) to insure that all American families will have access to information and services that will enable them to plan the number and spacing of their children, and thereby, to insure that any future American child will be a "wanted child"; (2) to achieve population growth in the United States which would increase more rapidly or more slowly than is projected; and (3) to stabilize United States (and world) population at less than its present size, or double its present size, or greater by a factor of 2.5, 3, or 4. Here, the question arises: At what level and when should this stabilization occur—in 40, 60, 75, 100, or 200 years?

*Supply and use of resources and services.* To help satisfy the increasing demands for resources, there is a need to increase the available supply, through research and exploration programs, and to make more efficient use of the existing supply through improved conservation, management, and pricing.

Moreover, if our aim is to increase individual well-being and standards of living, access to resources and services, as well as to promote overall economic growth, then the question arises whether we should attempt to limit the rate at which demand grows as well as to "satisfy" increasing demands for resources and services. This would require us to limit the rate at which population grows and puts pressure on our not unlimited ability to provide resources and services.

*Control of waste output.* If we are to protect the environment adequately, we must bring under control and manage the wastes of our society which threaten to poison and bury us and to destroy the ecological systems upon which we depend. We must, therefore, prevent, limit, manage, and control waste and pollution at each step in the process by which our economy and industry transform energy and materials, from raw materials through to finished products, to ultimate use and disposal.

This requires us to create more efficient and less wasteful industrial and economic processes, and to provide for use, reuse, recovery, and recycling of the waste products—solid, liquid, and gaseous—which are generated at each stage in our economic system.

PERSONAL AND POLITICAL VALUES AND CONTROL OF TRENDS

To control and influence the trends outlined above requires "management" and control of people and institutions as well as of the environment. What is the relation between: (1) "management" of the environment and of the "trends" which will affect the environment, and (2) personal and political values?

"Environmental management" involves the monitoring and manipulation of physical, chemical, and non-human biological systems—the oceans, river basins, watersheds, airsheds, industrial, agricultural, and municipal wastes, and populations of various species of fish, birds, animals, insects, and plants.

But such objects are only part of the environmental quality problem. Human persons, their attitudes, ideologies, practices, social systems, and institutions are also part of the problem of maintaining environmental quality. They must also be part of the cure.

If more "efficient environmental management" involves human persons, attitudes, and institutions, then what are the implications of "efficient environmental management" for such values as freedom, privacy, autonomy of personality, dispersal of power and pluralism (particularly under conditions of rapidly increasing population), industrialization, urbanization, and use of technological power to manipulate the environment?

How can the United States promote environmental quality, and, at the same time, protect and promote various important personal and political values under conditions in which an additional 100 million people are projected to be added to the United States population in a short 30 years?

If the United States is to control the effects of its citizens' actions on the environment, and at the same time, to protect their personal and political values, there will be a need to rely, to a large extent, on internal psychological controls—rather than on the external threat of law or punishment. And, if such internal controls are to be used with a rapidly expanding population, then great reliance must be placed on education for conservation and environmental quality—at each stage of a person's life—in the home, through school, and in other areas of activity.

The need to promote and to reconcile "environmental quality" and "environmental management" with such values as freedom, privacy, and autonomy of personality, dispersal of power, and pluralism is one which places a critical responsibility on the educational system in general, and on the teachers of science in particular.

CONCLUSION

Our current environmental crisis is due to man's misuse of power—to one-sided use of his capacity to control the forces of nature and to his lack of understanding of himself and his lack of wisdom in using his power.

Much remains to be done for environmental quality—in many areas—in terms of attitudes and education, laws and institutions, research, planning, and operational programs.

Science teachers who convey the attitudes and skills needed to protect and promote environmental quality are on the forefront of man's effort to restore balance and harmony—within himself, within nature, and between himself and nature.

We must restore wisdom and balance in our actions, in the use of our power, and in nature. Time is short. Much of our damage

to the environment is irreversible what we destroy cannot be restored and is lost forever.

The accelerating damage which we do to nature and to ourselves will not wait for us to catch up, nor will it wait while we refine our understanding of this damage.

We must learn, and science teachers must help future generations to learn, to restore the balance:

Between our power and our wisdom in using that power

Between our power to create and our power to destroy and disrupt

Between our efforts to prevent injury and our efforts to heal the damaged environment

Between our efforts to understand environmental problems and our actions to prevent and correct these problems

Our power has exceeded our wisdom.

Our power to destroy the environment has surpassed our power to correct the damage, to conserve and create.

Our efforts to prevent have lagged behind our efforts to cure.

Our cures have been too little and too late.

And, we have often allowed the quest for more perfect knowledge to deflect us from acting now with what knowledge we have.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reemphasize the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) regarding the attitudes of young Americans. We were part of the Republican campus study tour group last spring and we know just how upset our young people are about our deteriorating environment. It is encouraging that so many young people seem to understand the complexities of our environment.

However, we need more than just understanding. We need more young people involved in the science of ecology. Dr. William McElroy, Director of the National Science Foundation, testified at one of our Earth Resources and Population Task Force hearings. Dr. McElroy expressed hope that the Foundation would be able to play a more aggressive role in creating more interest among young people to pursue the science of ecology.

Education is a marvelous cure for many ills. It seems to me that we could make some significant strides in overcoming our environmental quality problems by increasing the educational input on the subject to our young people. Our secondary schools should consider adding curriculum on the problems of our environment and the relationships of population growth and resource depletion. Our colleges and universities should consider adding environmental studies to their basic college requirements. Personally I would like to see more scholarships offered in this field of study.

I do not believe that there is much dispute over the fact that environmental degradation, depletion of natural resources, and rapid population growth are all interrelated. This whole conglomerate of problems offers an ecological epitaph of the world that needs to be avoided. We can solve these problems with more education and participation of our young Americans. Let us stimulate this education and participation.

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a point in regard to the significance of the interrelationship between mineral resources and population growth.

There is a direct relationship between

the depletion of mineral supplies on the one hand and the increased rate of population growth and the demands for a higher standard of living and improved quality of life on the other. Presently the United States contains 6 percent of the world population, but uses about 30 percent of the world's mined minerals. With the world population expected to double in the next 30 years and the intensified effort of the developing countries to improve their living standards, there will be increased demands for minerals during the remainder of this century. As this demand for minerals increases, the quality of ores can be expected to decrease. This will create the necessity for more energy output to extract needed minerals from their ores, further depleting available energy fuels. Increased population and technology will create more demands for power.

I believe it is important that we become very aggressive in our search for solutions to living within this entire phenomena of ecology. Immediate hearings on this legislation would definitely be a step in the right direction.

I offer for the RECORD at this time an article entitled "The World Is Running Out of Raw Materials" from the New York Times of June 22, 1969:

THE WORLD IS RUNNING OUT OF RAW MATERIALS

(By Water Sullivan)

Those who wish to dramatize the population explosion point out that, if present growth rates continue, the mass of humanity in a few centuries will exceed the entire mass of the earth. What that shows, of course, is that there is a limit to the population that this planet can support. But what is that limit?

At a recent committee meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science a leading government scientist pointed out that there has never been a broad scientific study of this essential problem in all of its ramifications.

The psychic effects of crowding are often mentioned. It is known that some mammals under crowded conditions undergo hormonal changes that cut their birth rate. But if we can make the deserts bloom and thin out our more congested cities, we can greatly increase world population without this becoming a limiting factor.

Perhaps our political institutions are incapable of bringing about such a revolutionary redistribution of the population. This is uncertain, but what is definitely known is that the raw materials needed to support modern civilization are limited.

If we are to rebuild our economy, irrigate the deserts, industrialize the underdeveloped nations, vast amounts of energy will be required and, unless we can harness the power of the hydrogen atom, that energy depends on limited supplies of fuel.

To what extent, then, is world population limited by our finite reserves of fuel, metallic ore and other raw materials? A book recently published by Dr. Charles F. Park Jr., professor of geology and of mineral engineering at Stanford University, indicates that the world population may already be far beyond the level that, in the future, could be supported by this planet's resources.

Dr. Park's analysis is featured in the current issue of "Focus," a publication of the American Geographical Society. It is entitled: "Affluence in Jeopardy."

He says that we have taken false comfort in the argument that ample mineral resources lie under the sea or deeper in the ground. The world is already beginning to

run short of some materials of great importance to a technological society, such as mercury, tin, silver and cobalt. The big drain, however, will come if and when the world population reaches its projected level for the year 2000 (roughly double that of today) and the nations of Asia, Africa and South America become fully industrialized.

In 1967 the United States had a per capita consumption of about one ton of iron. If global consumption reaches that level by the year 2000 and the population has doubled, the world's annual demand for iron will be 12 times what it is today.

In 1967 the American per capita use of copper was 18 pounds. If, by the year 2000, world requirements reach this level, the global demand will be 11 times what it is today, which Dr. Park, as an ore specialist, calls "staggering."

If the same formula is applied to lead, the needs will rise 16-fold. As it is, readily accessible lead ore in this country has fallen to such a level that most lead for American industry has to be imported. By the year 2000, according to Dr. Park, it "would be a difficult and probably an impossible task to obtain the indicated amounts of copper and lead."

Furthermore, he points out, these projections do not allow for any increase in per capita consumption by highly technological societies, such as that in the United States. Such stagnation is highly unlikely.

Those who believe atomic energy will prevent disastrous poverty, starvation and civil unrest during the coming century note that cheap electric power could be used to desalt seawater, irrigate the deserts and extract minerals from our waste materials. Our daily refuse would be sent to special plants for sorting by electric and other means, instead of being buried, burned or dumped at sea.

Dr. Park concedes that iron could be salvaged in this way, but he despairs of recovering such critical substances as silver and mercury. Some 31 per cent of American silver consumption (46.5 million ounces) goes into photographic film. The second most important industrial use is in electrical and electronic equipment (24 per cent). Other uses include silverware and jewelry (17 per cent), brazing alloys and solder (12 per cent) and batteries (7 per cent).

Mercury is used in temperature and pressure recording devices. Such substances, Dr. Park argues, are irretrievably lost in the vast amounts of daily refuse. "One cannot conceive of the reclamation of mercury from broken thermometers."

He also is pessimistic about substances. Mercury is unique in being the only metal that is liquid at room temperature. It is possible, however, that photosensitive plastics may some day replace the silver nitrate used on film. Aluminum, which is comparatively plentiful, can replace many uses of copper. There are substitutes for some uses of cobalt, but only cobalt is suited to the making of permanent magnets.

Thus Dr. Park argues that the popular concept of a constantly expanding economy and an upgrading of other nations to our living standards is a sure path to disaster, unless radical checks in population can be achieved. Ocean resources and deep-lying deposits can be exploited but only at high cost, not only in dollars, but in energy, and our fuels are limited.

He scoffs at the export of people to other planets as impractical. Some believe mineral resources on the moon can be brought to earth, but this will depend on whether the moon has undergone the internal heating and differentiation that, on earth, has extracted from the primordial mixture of materials the veins of pure ore found on earth.

His argument also leads one to conclude that the long-term destiny of mankind depends, not only on halting the growth of population, but learning how to extract

energy from the fusion of hydrogen isotopes. This fusion releases the unruly power of the hydrogen bomb.

Those in this country and abroad seeking to harness the fusion reaction are optimistic, but the solution to this problem is not in sight. Success would provide ample energy for the remaining lifetime of the earth and should enable man, under wise leadership and assuming some method of population control, to work out ways to live in equilibrium with his environment and its resources.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) and nine other members of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, a bill which would require the Federal Government to apply space age systems techniques to solve the national problems of environmental pollution, national resource development, and population. The legislation was originally introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Under our legislation, the Department of Interior would be radically restructured and expanded, renamed the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, and given principal Federal responsibility in all three areas. Although it has been apparent for several years that population and environmental quality are inextricably related, this bill is the first major congressional initiative for considering the population problem as part of the overall environment-resource crisis facing America today.

At the present time, responsibility for population planning, environment quality, and pollution control is distributed among several agencies of the Federal Government, including the Bureau of the Census, the Environmental Science Services Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Environmental Control Administration, the National Air Pollution Control Administration, and a variety of independent agencies. Our bill would centralize responsibility in these areas within the new Department of Resources, Environment, and Population. I would hope that the reorganized Department could work closely with the President's Environmental Quality Council and that the Council and the Department could together launch a coordinated attack on environmental problems.

Too often, we assume that the problem of feeding an additional 70 million persons per year is the only problem we face as the world's population increases. In fact, it has been predicted that the shortage of mineral resources will become serious sooner than the food shortage.

As the population of the United States increases and the standard of living in this country rises, the demand on our natural resources—coal, mineral ores, even water—may outgrow our supply. It is possible, through modern agricultural techniques, to increase the productivity of our farmlands; but not even modern science can make it possible to dig coal or mine iron ore where the supply has been exhausted. Before the supply of certain metals is actually exhausted, we will

be forced to use lower and lower quality ores; as the refining process becomes more complicated, we will undoubtedly place increasing demands on our supply of water and energy fuels in our effort to extract the metals we need and then dispose of the resulting pollutants.

Clearly, we must begin planning, and acting, now if we are to prevent the creation of a vast garbage dump in America and restore the environment of this nation to the high quality we once enjoyed. If we are to accomplish our goals, consideration of all the problems involved—population, natural resources, control of pollution—must be the responsibility of one agency. I support this legislation enthusiastically, and I would hope that the Committee on Government Operations and the Congress will give it early consideration.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have some additional articles here that I feel will be of real interest to my fellow colleagues. These articles offer some of the best commentary on this entire subject and I recommend that they be read. I offer the articles for the RECORD at this time:

#### PEOPLE, POLLUTION, AND RESOURCES

(By Dr. John C. Calhoun, Jr., vice president for programs, Texas A. & M. University)

It doesn't make much difference whose predictions you take about population growth. All of them indicate a rather dramatic increase in numbers of people. The more conservative estimates put the U.S. figure in the year 2000 at something like 340,000,000. It was only a few years ago that our population was just one half that amount and one way to look at the problem in a relative sense is to visualize that every city in our country as of about 1965 will have to be duplicated by about the year 2000.

One of the major concerns before our planners and thinkers is the magnitude of this growth. Where will these people live? Where will we obtain the raw material to sustain them? How many people can we effectively handle on our globe? After all, we live on a finite planet having fixed resources, a limited atmosphere and other finite dimensions. Although most of the predictions seem to be optimistic about our ability to cope with this situation, it may mean some changes in our entire social system, not only with respect to population itself, but with respect to the use and management of resources.

Numbers of people, of course, are the key to our transition. When we had fewer people it was much easier to make allocations of land for parks or homes, for dams or mines, for recreation or highways. So long as populations were scattered, the various uses did not interfere with one another. Now they do. Interactions become important only when the different demands upon resources come into conflict and this is first of all a function of the numbers of people. The numbers of people and their increasing needs raises the question of allocating resources to a new level.

The effect of this growth is felt by all parts of our economy, not just by those who are in favor of park lands or wilderness areas. In a speech two years ago, Mr. James Boyd, President of the Copper Range Company, noted that the mineral people also were having problems in this area. I quote him, "... The rapidly increasing population is steadily encroaching on the mining domain. In the past, the availability of land in the more highly mineralized parts of the world was not a particular problem. Today, competing uses for land are becoming more and more urgent ... Populations are taking up

more and more of the land surface, thus limiting the areas in which prospectors can operate . . ."

But, the numbers of people is only part of the question. People are motivated in one way or another by two basic forces which must be noted. One of these is the urge to a higher standard of living and the second is an urge to a higher quality of living. To a degree, these two goals are interlocked and there was a time when most of us may have equated a higher standard of living with a higher quality of life. Today, however, these two issues definitely are separated in our thinking, and there are those who argue that our higher standard of living has produced a lesser quality of life.

What these two issues recognize are two different kinds of uses for our resources. The use of a resource for energy production, for construction material, or for industrial sites may produce the most effective means of advancing our gross national product. Using the same resource for a recreational area or for aesthetic enjoyment may most effectively enhance our living. In some cases, we might be able to do both with the same resource, but many times these uses represent a conflict.

Throughout man's long history he has expressed a continuing desire to know and possess nature. This force had its origin in our dimmest beginnings and has grown to the point where it now absorbs a considerable portion of our energies. In fact, we now have this usage organized. It is a goal of our research. We travel even though the wind doesn't blow and the soil produces not just by the chance of nature but by the organized use of genetics, fertilizers, and irrigation. Man cannot yet command a sunny day but he stands on the threshold of modifying the weather in a very real way. Even the ordinary appearing rocks of the earth have succumbed to man's manipulation and we make use of the nuclear forces than bind them together.

This kind of progress is imperative and essential. All nations on the earth wish to emulate our nation in the development of their technology and industrial economy. They, and us too, desire also to achieve the more mundane aspects of this development—the city blocks of concrete and the hard-surfaced roads between them, and air filled with radio waves and television signals, labor saving devices in our homes and offices, and refrigerators filled with packages of frozen foods.

Essentially all of this is a part of our production economy. The system which we have established is one which gathers resources from many places, changes them into machines, usable materials and goods, and passes them on to the consumer. Society is, in effect, an enormous organism with a prodigious consuming ability which our industrial capacity serves.

The production of these needed goods is highly organized and economically motivated. Our production and manufacturing system has evolved to its present efficiency and sophistication because of years of research, development and operational improvements. Industrial and economic complexes exist for providing this consumption input. In magnitude and interaction these systems are very important to our culture. We have an instrumentation complex, a chemical manufacturing complex, a food processing complex and a defense industry complex to name a few. They are institutionalized to a high degree and together they make up our stable economy.

This is one side of the picture and we cannot continue to have a growing standard of living without continuing to feed resources into this technological organism. The United States has, in fact, a resource accumulation effort which not only encompasses the nation, but straddles the earth. With six percent of the world's land area and

six percent of the world's population, for example, we use on the average about twenty percent of the world's total mineral production and twenty-five percent of the world's consumption of energy. I am sure similar statistics could be quoted in other resource areas.

This marvelous system for producing consumer goods and using technological advances has brought about our focus upon the second issue, a concern for the quality of life. Although this issue has been pinpointed in terms of pollution, what we ordinarily think of as pollution is only part of the problem. Our concern for this question includes not only water pollution and air pollution, but such things as sonic boom noise and other noises, automobile safety, excessive use of drugs, the loss of individual privacy, the loss of natural wildlife areas and similar subjects. As was said earlier, the increasing numbers of people brings the problem up because these people have to have some place to live and work. If we build highways for them to communicate we must tear down trees and go through park areas. If we build up cities for them to live along the shore, we may perhaps destroy bays or marine breeding areas. One part of the quality of living issue, therefore, derives from the mere pressures of numbers of people.

Secondly, however, there are a large number of by-products, wastes, and negative impacts which accompany the resource production and manufacturing process which I described. The smelting of ore produces large clouds of particulates; the generation of power creates a thermal by-product. Fuel combustion and power generation yield sulphur dioxide as part of the combustion process. Sulfide wastes are a by-product of paper production and a gaseous residue of many refinery operations. One of the most alarming side effects is the DDT dissemination which has accompanied agricultural production. In general, industries have done much to reduce undesirable by-products and waste effluents. Their actions are limited, however, by the economics of production and manufacturing. A single company cannot afford to adopt waste control measures if its competitor does not do likewise. An action to control an undesirable effluent may be acceptable to one industry but may be a disadvantage to another. For example, a decision to limit the burning of fuels to those having low sulfur content could have an adverse effect upon whole segments of the economy not engaged in burning fuel. Our industrial complex interlocks so well that waste control decisions in one part may have a leverage action to affect many other parts.

In any event, the adoption of operations to control industrial waste or eliminate by-products will add to the cost of production. Sometimes the technology for waste control doesn't exist or needs to be improved. Who is to pay for the research? Is the total cost of control to be passed on to the consumer? Perhaps the question should be, "Is the consumer ready to accept this added cost?"

My basic point is that there are waste effluents or undesirable by-product activities associated with almost all parts of our resource production and manufacturing system. In some places the elimination of these wastes and by-products have been woven into the economic structure and into industrial competitive positions, but we have not done this on an across-the-board basis.

A third aspect of this issue is that our consuming society doesn't consume completely. Society doesn't quite use any of the inputs that come to it from our producing and manufacturing system. Part of the effluent is in the form of human waste, part of it is in the form of material waste and cast-offs from consumptive goods and services. As standard of living and per capita consumption goes up, per capita waste product will go up also and this has been well documented.

The exhaust from the automobile or the

worn out automobile itself, the cellulose material from our vast packaging economy, the large volume of food and animal waste accompanying industrialized food production and processing—all contribute to the five pounds of solid waste per day per person that go out to our disposal systems.

Now, in contrast to the highly organized industrial and economic complex for providing the input of goods to society, the handling of the waste is largely a service operation. We have not developed a system for gathering waste, treating it, and placing it back in the environment which matches the complex distribution and marketing system that exists for producing consumer goods. We need "supermarket" waste disposal just as we need supermarket retail outlets and department stores.

And because waste handling is primarily service oriented while the production of goods is profit oriented, there is a dichotomy between these two activities. In only a minor way does recovery from waste go back into our production system. We need to consider better ways to tie the handling of waste into our economic system. Perhaps we ought to contract waste services to profit-making concerns, subject to publically determined specifications and thereby place waste handling on a competitive basis. Maybe we ought to handle waste disposal systems the same way we handle public communication and transportation services.

Overriding the whole problem of waste handling, of course, is the matter of how we fit this into our political system. Several years ago Arthur S. Miller had a comment which is germane to this. He said, "What technology has done is to create a true national economy through the development of rapid communication systems and even more importantly through the growth of huge industrial combines which straddle the continent and which are the main units of functional federalism. But that national economy is superimposed upon a decentralized political system—the fifty allegedly 'sovereign' states." The situation with respect to handling of wastes is even worse because not only do we have a waste disposal system that is disjointed with respect to our political system, it is also separated from the economies of production.

There is a fourth aspect to the quality of life problem which arises from the uses we make of our technological capabilities. We drive our automobiles for pleasure as well as for profit. We are not charged individually for the carbon dioxide or other effluents we put into the atmosphere. The television set is there and even though we do not like to have our entertainment interrupted with large numbers of advertisements, it is served to us that way so that's the way we take it. Machines are noisy and because the machines exist we accept the noise along with the machine. In short, as we move ahead in our technological age, even the individual makes a contribution to the negative aspects of the quality of life by some of the things he does. They may not be negative so far as he himself is concerned but they can be negative to society as a whole. Those of us who are non-smokers know the meaning of this problem when we sit in a smoke-filled room in which we give those who smoke the privilege of enjoying themselves.

These then, it seems to me, are the three fundamental forces at work with which we must deal and for which we must find satisfactory rationalizations. First, the pressures of the numbers of people, second the continuing urge to advance our standard of living and, third, the urge to increase and enhance the quality of our living, which carries with it a commitment to an improved quality of our environment.

The rationalization of these forces lies in the question of managing natural resources. In the final analysis, the only thing we have to work with are the resources that were provided on the earth, although we may rear-

range them into new forms. We may take the resources from the rocks and forests and translate them into the resources of the city, but all we have done is to move resources from one place to another, perhaps upgrading them in the process. Somehow, we must manage our limited resources to satisfy the space demands of people, the standard of living demands, and the environmental quality demands. Although I do not have answers for rationalizing the forces at work, I can suggest a few steps that need to be taken.

The first thing we must do is to clarify all of the many uses that we may need for our resources and attempt to place these uses in perspective with respect to overall national and social goals. We are just now recognizing all of the uses that ought to be considered. We have tended to limit our concern to providing living space, to resources for producing the essentials of life, and to maintaining our technological economy. We are now willing to admit that parts of our environment must be reserved for life forms other than man, for recreation and aesthetics and even for scientific experimentation. At least one of the things we have accomplished in the last few years is to bring these many uses into open discussion and recognize their value.

A second step we need to take is to examine our overall resources situation and assess what we have. We know too little about our total resource system and its ecological relationships. Because we do not know the current state of many environmental situations, we have no way of evaluating what has happened after we undertake alterations. It is past time to establish base line measurements for our natural environment so we will know where we have been and what we have done. Because we do not have sufficient understanding of ecological relationships, it is almost impossible to analyze a projected course of events and predict what might occur. It is as though we were trying to embark upon a cross country trip without a road map, compass or road signs or without knowing where we started from. Although in recent years we have started a few overall inventories, such as the public land law review commission and the evaluation of public lands for wilderness areas, we have not undertaken a total assessment of what is available for satisfying the total uses we recognize.

As a third step we need to examine our system for making decisions with respect to resource allocations. At the present time, our decision making structure is highly decentralized. Individual decisions with respect to pieces of large resource systems are placed in the hands of different mission agencies or political entities. When the people in the San Francisco Bay area a few years ago approached the problem of waste effluent into the Bay they found a very large number of individual political and other units having some decision making capacity. In some places, we have organized regional groups such as the river basin planning groups, port authorities, and other action agencies. We are also beginning to construct some checks and balances such as those between the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers relative to estuarine problems. We have not yet arrived, however, at a general working procedure that will consider all potential uses, all kinds of alternative resource management routes backed up by a generally accepted moral position that we will use each and every part of our environment and its resources for the highest possible good.

We do not have a history of considering many alternative developments to a given resource situation. We do not have a history of spending the energy and funds needed to evaluate alternatives. Generally speaking, we place decisions in the hands of mission oriented action groups who rightly consider

each resource with respect to their own mission. But most of the missions are relatively narrow. This generally puts us in the situation of arguing the pros and cons of a single resource management program rather than the merits of several alternative programs. The decision maker usually makes a commitment based only on a single proposed course of action. Although I do not have specific organizational recommendations to make in this area, I think the problem needs attention both at the federal and local levels.

One of the things that would help is the proposed Office of Ecology at the federal level. This unit could carry forth the necessary investigative and inventory work with respect to our environment and resources so that we would have some yardsticks against which to measure our actions. Another possible favorable action would be the creation of an overview federal group to consider all the plans and proposals that are advanced for the use of our resources with approval authority for the more general recommendations of all mission agencies related to resources management.

As a third step, we must move in the direction of making the side effects of resource production processes and the adverse by-products a part of the cost of production. Whether we do this by a taxing system, use charge or some other device is a matter to be decided by analysis and perhaps by trial and error. We must make these desirable actions a part of our system of economics. Coupled with this, we need to take steps to devise technological systems and managerial systems for developing a sophisticated waste disposal complex that will match the resource production and utilization system.

These kinds of steps will not, of course, provide us with the answers to each and every detailed question in every individual local situation of resource management. Whether we use a particular valley as a wild river or as a waste disposal stream can be decided only in the context of the individual situation and its particular characteristics. Likewise, there will be no general panacea for determining whether a particular tract of land should be maintained as a recreational forest or be open to commercial forest development. No formula will give us a means of computing whether a particular aquatic habitat should be devoted to recreation or to fish breeding. These determinations can be made only after all parameters have been considered and all possible uses have been examined. The important thing, it seems to me is that we recognize the need to consider all possible uses, all possible values, all possible alternatives, and to hear all voices, both majority and minority, as to what can be done for any particular situation.

In summary, I see our present situation as bringing to the surface three basic parallel issues which combine to make our resource management decisions much more complex and much more important. These issues are: first, the increasing numbers of people and their need for space and a proportionate share of the earth's environment; second, a continuing urge to improve our standard of living; and third, a growing awareness that we must maintain and enhance our quality of life. All of these pressures bear upon the resource itself and upon the job of the resource manager. This management has been done historically from mission bases which consider generally only a relatively narrow spectrum and uses and priority within the boundary conditions of a highly sophisticated economic and industrial complex. The future must consider all kinds of uses, all kinds of values, and all kinds of alternatives. Somehow, we must develop a system of decisions which will allow us to handle each individual problem within the context of total environmental goals and a review system that provides the maximum end use.

[From the New York State Conservationist, December 1967]

#### NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE CULT OF EXPANSION

(By Durward L. Allen, professor of Wildlife Ecology, Department of Forestry and Conservation, Purdue University)

As proprietors of North America, we have custody of a great freehold. How we handle it will identify us in times ahead. Probably the most exacting demands on our skill and conscience are in dealing with replaceable natural assets, those that can be improved in use through biological processes—soils, waters, forests, ranges, wildlife, and scenic beauties.

Historically, the management of renewable resources has been a threshold of frustration and delay. Accomplishments, often good in themselves, fitted only by chance into any reliable outlook for tomorrow. There has seemed to be no plan at work, nor even a comforting philosophy.

Despite the difficulties, we must invoke what foresight we can in resource use, and in terms of major issues I think we have much to work with. Our context is the field of human, or resource, ecology. This is a developing scientific discipline concerned with relationships of humanity to the total environment. Characteristically, it involves synthesis and generalization. Inevitably it includes conceptual trial and error.

The ecologist is aware of his limitations, but he is learning to distinguish rights from wrongs. I suspect he knows considerably more now than anyone can apply. If this is true, then a weak link in our resource management effort is the information function that should be telling the customers what they need to know. Information people strive with great diligence to sell the conservation idea. But it probably is good for anyone to have an occasional review of premises and a more critical focus on the issues.

#### WHAT IS THE OBJECTIVE?

To put first things first, what is the objective of our concern with the resource environment? What do we want for mankind now and in the future?

I suppose the only reasonable answer is this: *We are after the best possible living standard for every individual.* Such a statement identifies a worthy goal but does not define it. How could anyone describe an idealized life pattern for the future? This involves personal attitudes, and for each of us standards are likely to change with time. For my part, I cannot accept a common viewpoint: I doubt that the output and consumption of material goods is a satisfactory measure of living standard. It is part of our well-being, but there probably are more fundamental things. Surely, good health is the greatest beneficence that modern science has to offer. No doubt a quality existence includes being well fed, well clothed, and well housed; but space and pleasant surroundings must also be high on the list. In social terms, we take for granted all the freedoms that are a part of human dignity. Freedom from work is not one of these.

#### SOLVING RESOURCE PROBLEMS

Resource problems are characteristically a national concern. At local level they frequently are obscured and fragmented by provincial attitudes and politics. It seems right to expect of any government that it consider responsibly the needs of the whole public and use our unmatched technology to plan ahead for human welfare. Surely a century hence is not beyond our limits of responsibility.

Assuming that there is a science of environmental relationships, how does it go about its problem solving? Probably you could not get the same answer from any two people. However, I think there are basic aspects of the population-resources equation

on which many thoughtful persons could agree:

First, we are dealing with a strictly limited quantity, the finite earth, its space and raw materials.

To this we apply our atom-age culture, a variable of bewildering complexity that includes our industry, science, and all we do to make resources useful.

Another variable is the number of people who divide the benefits, today's steeply ascending curve of population.

Finally, a living standard is resolved from relationships of the other three. The concept can be represented this way:

$$\frac{\text{Resources} \times \text{Culture}}{\text{Population}} = \text{Living Standard}$$

It is common knowledge that over half the earth's inhabitants are perpetually hungry, and that on this continent we have the highest living standard of any major area. The relationships I have cited are inherent in some calculations by sociologist Philip M. Hauser, of the University of Chicago. Hauser states that all the goods and services now available in the world would support about half a billion people at our level of living. Yet the total population of this planet now numbers 3.4 billions!

Since the resource professional is trying to raise living standards, and since he is working with an earth whose space and raw materials are fixed, it behooves him to consider how many people he is trying to serve. He must be concerned with what is happening to human numbers.

#### WHERE TO PUT POPULATION

Global trends of this kind are illustrated by some figures the United Nations published several years ago: In 1700, the earth's population was growing at such a rate that it would double in 178 years. By 1800, the gain had stepped up a bit; numbers were doubling in 154 years. By 1875 the rate was 98 years and in 1960 it had declined to 41 years. If the trend continues, by the year 2000, the people of the earth will be doubling their number in 23 years.

Obviously this is geometric expansion, an exponential curve, numbers building at compound interest. The biologist recognizes it as the kind of increase expected in any animal population that invades an unoccupied area or finds access to a new resource base. In North America we have done both. The continuing availability of usable resources is primarily a result of today's burgeoning technology. In addition, we are hard at it, draining, irrigating, filling, cutting, bulldozing—making huge investments to "develop" and populate the blank spaces on our map.

That the demographic results of this process are not fully appreciated was impressed on me vividly several years ago. A group of resource specialists were standing on Hoover Dam, looking down into the partially filled reservoir that is Lake Meade. In response to a philosophical question, a civil engineer who was our guide said this:

"With the population of this country doubling in 35 years, don't we have to keep ahead of the game and see that what those people will need is ready for them? Here in the Southwest that means making available every acre-foot of water that can be stored for use. I think we can't fall down on this one almost regardless of what it costs."

A voice in the rear took issue with him. "You're leaving out something important. Because every time you carry out one of these big developments, with each new acre you irrigate and make habitable, you're adding to the total population and to the demand it will make on all resources. You are developing a bigger problem that will take more billions in public money on the next go-around!"

Strangely enough, this relationship of the population to the resource base is sometimes denied—which seems something like a claim

that two human beings can occupy the same space at the same time.

Our great cultural advances have been influential around the world. Most significant are those in medical science. We know that birth rates may vary regionally and periodically, but the overshadowing cause of population increase has been the decline in death rates. A single discovery—the use of DDT to control the insect vectors of typhus and malaria—brought about a spectacular population build-up in the tropics after 1945. Nearly all our help to "have-not" nations has contributed to their population problems.

We are keeping people alive, even if we cannot feed them or make them comfortable. Last year there were about 125 million births, and roughly 60 million deaths. This is a worldwide gain of 65 million people—or is it a gain?

#### THE NATURAL MAN

In natural communities of living things, there are automatic checks on the numbers of any species. These controls may operate with some lag, but they are effective. It is said of most mortality factors that they are "density dependent," a characteristic that is evident as we watch the ills develop in high populations of animals—food depletion, the spread of disease, fighting and social breakdown, pollution of the habitat. Various causes of mortality interact and may be mutually reinforced. The most basic and predisposing factor is social stress itself, which tends to increase as the square of the population.

One of the rapidly growing fields of biological endeavor is that of animal behavior. Such studies are richly rewarding in revealing the key to many ecological adjustments. Individuals in a population are organized and socialized according to patterns fixed in the germ plasm quite as realistically as are structural features. Orderly social relationships are a means of spacing individuals and dividing up the habitat for efficient use. They are a mechanism for mitigating strife within a species and holding competition to useful levels. They have a highly critical survival value.

#### THE POLICY OF EXPANSION

Possibly some will claim that man is an entirely different kind of being, largely immune to biological controls. This is implicit in our common attitude toward population and the economic system. Particularly here in North America, we appear to be embarked on a policy of more and more of everything from now on. Every small town wants to be a big city, and every chamber of commerce is dedicated to bringing in more customers, attracting more industry, getting more land taxed for more dollars, and developing every natural asset for more business.

This outlook, of course, originated from the unquestioned fact that these activities built the strength of our nations. Part and parcel of the expanding economy has been the expanding population, acted upon by an elaborating technology. Economists commonly take a short-term view in their recommendations to promote growth in business activity and an annual increase in Gross National Product. This, of course, is what every office holder requires during his own tour of duty.

The result is a general assumption that expansion is forever, and that science will provide the material means of outrunning the increase of human numbers. In 1965 a survey for the Population Council of New York showed that barely more than half of U.S. citizens feel any real concern about the nation's population growth. Their complacency feeds, no doubt, on daily exposure to the outlook for "progress"—food from the oceans, which could nourish billions of hot-house humans; the desalination of sea water to turn every desert into croplands; the industrialization of all "backward" areas via unlimited nuclear energy. Orthodox specialists and purblind writers commonly issue their stirring forecasts in terms of the vast

numbers of people that can be served. *This thinking could lead to the epic folly of our time.*

#### NOTHING EXPANDS FOREVER

The truth is that nothing expands forever, and that continuing strength in our industrialized society will depend on a new outlook. Attitudes that seemed to work in our earlier history no longer apply in a well-populated continent.

Ahead, we may confide, is a time when social and political progress will catch up with and direct our applications of biological and physical science. By intelligent choice we will have an optimum world population living on a pay-as-you-go regime of resource use. This somewhat visionary prospect has, in reality, no respectable alternative. Professional endeavors in every applicable discipline need to get oriented toward such a goal. The time is now because exponential curves wait for no man, and degradation of habitat is in many cases irreversible.

In the seethe of overgrown cities we see abundant evidence of biological disruption. The signs are social, psychological, physiological, pathological. Increasing crime rates, the befuddlement of youth, soaring costs of government, the growth of every kind of insurance and welfare plan—a basic ecological response is suggested in all these trends. They bespeak a social adaptation syndrome quickened by population stress.

Overcrowded man must be specialized, organized, controlled, and protected from his fellow men. He gets little gentling in a worn and soiled environment. He seems more content and thrifty when having access to variety and distance, even silence and solitude. The mass production of anything—even human beings—means standardization. There was respect for his own kind of Robert Frost's statement, "I'm against a homogenized society because I want the cream to rise."

#### CURBING POPULATION

It is unthinkable that we should fail to cope with the population problem in decades ahead. Our only approach is through the birth rate—it must be effectively reduced over most of the world, as we continue to promote good health and prolong life among all peoples. There is reassuring evidence that once a high level of education and material prosperity is attained, a lowering of the birth rate will be automatic. Hence, such accomplishments will be, in a measure, self-perpetuating.

Today's challenge is to make known at home and abroad the overriding urgency of what must be done. A few far-sighted people have fought on this front for several decades. They deserve an uprising of support that can originate only in North America.

If a downward trend in population could be achieved, the imperative demands of our proliferating economy should ease. This need not be a disaster in any sense. Economists are becoming increasingly interested in the mechanisms that such a situation would involve. Economist-demographer Joseph J. Spengler of Duke University points out that favorable economic trends are not dependent on steadily increasing numbers of people. In effect, a limited population could stimulate demands for goods and services almost indefinitely through better living. Spengler ended an address to the Industrial Conference Board in New York this way:

"In the future, economic growth will depend mainly upon invention, innovation, technical progress . . . Population growth will probably play an even smaller role than I have assigned it in earlier discussion. It is high time, therefore, that businessmen cease looking upon the stork as a bird of good omen."

#### QUALITY CONTROL OF ENVIRONMENT

It goes almost without saying that the best anyone can possibly do in damping the population boom will not be soon enough. Mean-time a line is to be held; there is a program

of quality control to be applied with judgment and courage to the human environment. In North America we have great possessions that will cost us little to keep but much to lose.

The most perishable amenities of this world are its open spaces and quietudes, its greenery, pure waters, natural rivers, wetlands, wildlife, and choice scenery, its dwindling modicum of true wilderness. Substantially, these are what President Johnson has characterized as "natural beauty." Nationally they are the out-of-doors we use for recreation. Locally they may be the charm of a pleasant countryside or well-groomed city.

Since pioneer times this landscaping has graced our inherited estate as a luxury we could afford. Its dollar value is difficult to pin down. It is vulnerable to attrition by piecemeal decisions, which assume that a little more of one thing or a little less of another won't really matter.

#### NEEDED: CITIZENS CONSERVATIONISTS

This public attitude is an honest one. Our leadership in resource affairs is largely a thin line of mercenaries, where there should be backing in depth by citizen volunteers. Most of today's universities are centers of technology, rather than philosophical thought. The vast majority of young people go through school with no exposure to the biological realities of human existence or the natural world. They assume the duties of citizenship with little understanding or feel for the order among living things—a necessary basis for workable attitudes toward human and resource husbandry.

Holding or salvaging the most fragile values in our environment has become an emergency issue—first in time because the headlong impetus of our makework enterprise has no built-in controls. Our history and success has fostered a certain arrogance toward the native wildness of our homeland. North Americans are commonly so bemused with the charm of bringing straight lines and square corners to the chaos of nature—our bulldozerkampf—that they have no idea where it should stop. Among choices to be made, it seems essential to dissipate our wasteful momentum in doing more of everything we know how to do, useful or not. In the resolution of values, man's mastery of the earth will pay him greatest tribute when he achieves the forbearance to leave some of it alone.

#### LOOK SKEPTICALLY AT GREAT PROJECTS

The essence of resource planning is to identify investments of lasting worth. Important strategy probably is to look skeptically at great public projects calculated to change the face of the land, replumb river systems, and make new areas "productive." Water projects are notoriously destructive of flora and fauna and the natural scene. They require our grandest gorges and pristine rivers, the winter range of big game, the drowning of geological and archaeological treasures, the loss of recreational open space. People in our great Northwest may well ask themselves a particular question:

"What is a salmon run worth for all time to come?"

A common motive in impounding waters is flood control. Yet the temporary nature of such benefits on silt-laden streams is seldom recognized. As reservoirs fill with sediment, their storage capacity is lost. In the floodplain below a dam, temporary protection from overflow encourages a build-up of structures and settlement. What problems are being created for solution at public expense when spring runoff can no longer be contained in the silted-up reservoir? Hopefully, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 can bring a more long-range appraisal to bear on projects of this kind.

One may say realistically that the essence of good research management is not so much in costly works as in avoiding mistakes. Much

of today's necessary investment is for overdue clean-up of pollution and repair of damage—a situation that should change as our estate becomes more orderly.

#### POLICY OF PINCHOT AND ROOSEVELT

It might logically be assumed that the doctrine of conservation would be sufficient guide in the management of our natural wealth, and perhaps it should be. More than sixty years have gone by since Chief Forester Gifford Pinchot and his colleagues developed this idea with the encouragement of President Theodore Roosevelt. They said it was to be a new government policy providing for "... use of the natural resources for the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time."

The good of the majority and the longest time—this viewpoint assigns our generation a limited equity in resource property. It says that people of the future have a right to use what we leave, and thereby our children many times removed should have a share in critical decisions. They will be at least as well qualified as we are to dam the Grand Canyon, cut old-growth redwoods, and subdivide the last seashore.

It was the short-range view that stirred Pinchot and Roosevelt. They saw the sackage of a continent taking place under an assumption that everything belongs to the first-comer. The pelf of the land was being burgled off, with profits-in-our-time the only criterion of success. We know now that some of those early gains were borrowed from capital, with the debt left to a later generation. We ourselves have made payments on this account in reclaiming damaged lands and sickened waters.

The first decade of this century is recognizable as the period of changeover to a new outlook and a new morality in the management of national assets. It was also a notable action period. In the face of bitter opposition, Roosevelt set aside many areas from the public domain for use as forests, parks, and wildlife refuges.

The conservation idea caught on as a principle and slogan. Semantics became much involved in its ideology. For half a century we have argued about the difference between exploitation and development. One is bad and the other good, by someone's definition. In our latter-day sophistication, almost any operation may be labeled righteously as conservation. The farther we get from the Pinchot-Roosevelt era, the easier it is to say that, after all, conservation means different things to different people.

History is witness that major accomplishments in the natural resources field have depended in gross disproportion on the inspiration of a few. Great works have not been the option of political parties, but of men whose common ground was a feeling for their own kinship to the earth. Through the years, there have been such people in government and in citizen organizations. We have made fitful progress toward national controls—even international efforts, as in our migratory bird regulations.

#### THE ACTION OF F. D. R.

The presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt was our second period of great concern and action on behalf of responsible resource use. During the thirties, Roosevelt brought men like Ding Darling and Hugh Bennett to Washington and gave them encouragement to do their jobs. An economic crisis demanded new adventures in public works. A devastating drought brought home to all the plight of ailing soils and watersheds, impoverished wildlife, mistreated grasslands and forests.

Congress and the president acted, and the public approved. But the technology of the day was found wanting. The ecology of living resources was little understood; needed facts and techniques were not to be had.

Largely on a trial and error basis, management projects muddled ahead.

What Pinchot had perceived thirty years before was now evident to many—that we have continuing incentive to study and improve the soils, forests, grasslands, waters, commercial fish, and other sources of supply for our industrial brawn. Of course, something similar can be said for making best use of nonreplaceable wealth.

The great awakening of the thirties was lost in a world of conflict, and thereafter it recovered only briefly before the budgetary competition of the cold war caught up. During the forties and fifties, despite inadequate support, resource management technology made progress in our governments, in states and provinces, and in educational institutions. Local and national conservation organizations continued to build their memberships, and public awareness of important problems showed steady gain.

In the United States, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was created in 1958. It submitted its special report to the President and Congress in 1962. In its philosophical tenets the report suggested that:

"Leisure is the blessing and could be the curse of a progressive, successful civilization." And again that, "The fact that we live in a world that moves crisis by crisis does not make a growing interest in outdoor activities frivolous, or ample provision for them unworthy of the Nation's concern."

#### NEW LIGHT ON POPULATION

The most significant happening of the past twenty years has been the emergence of the population issue into full high-level acknowledgment. For long the going was hard; but able technical leadership, crusading citizens, and growing editorial confidence brought it off.

The portent of a changing attitude in government came in 1961. In March, following his inauguration, President Kennedy made it clear that he understood the problem and favored its open discussion.

On January 4, 1965, in his State of the Union Message, President Johnson declared a policy of far-reaching significance: "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion of world population and the growing scarcity of world resources." This statement was the basis of administrative communications to embassies and all missions of the Agency for International Development.

In his speech commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations, the President made a forceful appeal to the world:

"Let us in all our lands, including this land, face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of the world. Let us act on the fact that less than five dollars invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth."

This statement defined the issue clearly. It committed the United States to domestic action and world co-operation. As a new departure in the quest of mankind for peace, decency, and the abundant life, there is little question that it ranks with the founding of the conservation concept itself in 1907.

#### THRESHOLD OF THE FUTURE

The way is opening ahead, but the vast bulk of humanity is not informed. In fact, on this continent the best educated people in the world are bumbling ahead under an expanding economy slogan that still largely ignores space values, fails to distinguish between quantity and quality, and regards overflowing masses of human beings as a consumer base essential to "prosperity." We still have the hang-on attitude toward land that the "highest use" for any acre is to

make it yield dollar tribute in the form of something that can be used up and replaced.

This is our wastrel era, which people of the future are unlikely to admire. On a different plane, and under a different rationale, it is as much a me-first, dollars-for-today program as was that of the exploiters in the late 19th century.

We have conned ourselves into a state of mind whereby it is popular to dignify the "user" and deride the "preservationist." It seems a doubtful hazard that too much of anything is going to be preserved; many things could be over-used.

Economic projections by Joseph L. Fisher and Neal Potter of Resources for the Future are commonly accepted as essentially favorable. These indicate that the predicted doubling of population by the year 2000 will not be accompanied by major shortages of material goods in North America. As for the world, these authors "... venture the view that living levels in most countries can increase over the coming years, with diets improving slowly and energy and mineral use more rapidly. The process depends heavily on education, motivation, favorable government policies, and social adaptations."

The importance of the latter qualifications is evident when we consider a statement by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in the Third World Food Survey of 1963. "By 1975 world food supplies would need to be increased by over 35% merely to sustain the world's population at its present unsatisfactory level of diet."

Raymond Ewell, Vice-President for Research at the State University of New York, says that if present trends continue, mass starvation can be expected in several far-eastern countries by the early 1970's and that it will be widespread over Asia, Africa, and Latin America by 1980.

It is evident that there are grave hazards on the one hand and possibilities for great technological progress on the other. It should be remembered that the projections previously referred to are for "resources and raw materials," and that supplying the world as they suggest would require what amounts to an international pooling of capital and natural assets. It would entail the total mobilization of science and the intensive development of all lands and waters for maximum yield of subsistence products. . . .

What such a program would do to this earth as a quality habitat can only be left to the imagination. And if we actually could work our way through to the year 2000 by such heroic measures, what then? Does anyone think the process might be repeated from the new population level?

In our forecasting and analyses we give great emphasis to material goods and dollar values—things we know how to measure. One wonders if it really is asking too much for us of the present generation to share the enlightenment of John Stuart Mill in 1848:

"A population may be too crowded, though all be amply supplied with food and raiment. It is not good for man to be kept perforce at all times in the presence of his species."

#### MAN MUST COPY NATURAL WORLD RELATIONSHIPS

Inevitably we come back to the proposition that in man's future there is to be an ecosystem whose basic relationships will resemble those in the natural world. In our world too, the healthy developments will be toward stability—a state in which input equals output. It is evident that we are going to have population control. The question is how soon, and how much we will have left to work with when it becomes effective. Our science can rise to its potential as the boon and salvation of mankind only when the frantic demands of the population emergency are abated.

As a general guideline, if we are able to muster the control to preserve and improve in reasonable degree the esthetic features and recreational open space of this conti-

nent, it is likely that many other aspects of the resource management program will fall into place. As a critical reality, any major accomplishment of this kind will require support by millions of informed citizens; and on that score, the difficulties are increasing.

In reflecting on his mission, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall expressed the qualms of an outdoorsman:

"We have developed a whole new generation of sedentary city-bound citizens, wheedled by spectatorship and the air-conditioned advantages of glassed-in living into acquiescing to the diminution of the spaciousness, the freshness, the green splendor of the American earth."

This is indeed a basic jeopardy in efforts to preserve and restore the quality and variety in our habitat. The prime obstacle of decades past, a stone wall of disregard, could easily become the roadblock of complete unfamiliarity.

We have a vital problem of communication. People must be kept in touch with the out-of-doors and conscious of their privileges as owners of it. Our up-to-date conservation story tells of human numbers, quality living, quantities of resources. It describes how we monitor our status and progress by careful inspection of our range. The story will have to be told by spokesmen who know whereof they speak. I have no doubt that all of us who take on this critical information job can be most effective if we hold ourselves keenly aware of a fateful mission—that the message concerns the greatest challenge with which mankind has yet had to deal.

[From the New York Times Magazine, Jan. 9, 1966]

#### THREE HUNDRED MILLION AMERICANS WOULD BE WRONG

(By David E. Lilienthal)

By the year 2000, just one generation away, the population of the United States will probably be about 300 million—100 million higher than it is now and 200 million higher than it was in 1920. Yet, in comparison with many undeveloped nations, population growth would not seem to be a serious problem in America.

Certainly this vastly increased population will not lack for food. While population growth in Latin America, for example, has brought per capita food production below pre-World War II levels, we in the U.S. worry about overweight, spend huge sums to restrict farm production and give away enough food to prevent famine in poor nations throughout the world. In contrast to less developed nations, we have enough space, too. Just fly over this country and see the huge, sparsely populated areas that could easily accommodate additional tens of millions.

Great differences in resources, technology and education help explain why Americans regard overpopulation as a menace only to other peoples. It can't happen here, they think. I used to think so, too; I don't any more.

During the past 10 years, much of it spent overseas, I came to the easy conclusion that if we succeeded in tripling or quadrupling food production in hungry nations—and in some areas in which I worked we did just that—the problem of overpopulation could be solved. But gradually I learned I was mistaken to believe that increased food production was the complete answer to the crisis of population abroad. Gradually, I also learned that America's overflowing cornucopia has obscured a deeper crisis developing here: a population of at least 300 million by 2000 will, I now believe, threaten the very quality of life of individual Americans.

An additional 100 million people will undermine our most cherished traditions, erode our public services and impose a rate of taxation that will make current taxes seem tame. The new masses, concentrated (as they will be) in the already strangling urban

centers, cannot avoid creating conditions that will make city life almost unbearable. San Francisco, to take a still tolerable example, once was one of my favorite cities—cosmopolitan, comfortable, lovely. Now the high-rise buildings have sprouted like weeds and suburban blight is advancing on the Golden Gate. The value of real estate has increased while people's enjoyment of life declines.

Historically the United States owes much of its vigor and power to population growth. (Only 50 million people rattled around in America in 1880.) Large markets, skilled manpower, huge factories, a country able to spend billions on war, space and social welfare—all this, plus 75 million passenger cars—is surely a consequence of rising population. But no economy and no physical environment can sustain infinite population growth. There comes a point at which a change in quantity becomes a change in quality—when we can no longer speak of "more of the same." And another 100 million people will, I fear, make just that change in the joy of life in America.

It is probably true as the population will grow, so will the dollar value of our output. U.S. wealth, measured by Gross National Product, is now \$670 billion; barring a major economic setback, total output will be doubled in about two decades. With G.N.P. climbing at the rate of \$40 billion a year, the U.S. probably can afford to build the schools, housing projects, roads and other necessities of life for 300 million Americans.

But if our resources are mainly spent merely to survive, to cope with life in a congested America, then where is the enjoyment of living?

Our teeming cities are not pleasant places today; imagine them by the middle of the next century when the areas of some might be 100 times larger than they are now. This is the real possibility envisioned by Roger Revelle, director of the newly established Center for Population Studies at the Harvard School of Public Health. And it will be to the cities that tomorrow's millions will flock. Or consider the picture, drawn with characteristic wit, by economist John Kenneth Galbraith: "It is hard to suppose that penitente Western man, stalled in the ultimate traffic jam and slowly succumbing to carbon monoxide will be especially enchanted to hear from the last survivor that in the preceding year Gross National Product went up by a record amount."

Nor does the nightmare consist only of traffic jams and a bumper-to-bumper way of life. As we have seen in the history of the last 25 years, public services only the Federal Government can provide will continue to expand. Moreover, state governments, until now unable (or unwilling) to pay their share of the bills, show signs of awakening to their responsibilities. But bigger government efforts do not produce better results for human beings: they are simply a way of getting a job done where no more feasible methods exist.

Even today, most of the nation's most serious problems are caused largely by the pressures of a too rapidly rising population. In the next generation, the problems may become unmanageable. Take four basic needs: education, water, air and power.

The quality of education is closely related to the problem of numbers. Within the next five years, we are told, the number of high school students will rise to 15 million (a 50 per cent increase over 1960), forcing hundreds of communities to consider imposing stiff new taxes. Many taxpayers will refuse to accept the added burden and their children will attend even more crowded classes. Far-sighted citizens will approve new school bond issues, but the increased financial drain probably will not result in an improved education.

Our standard of democracy entitles everyone to free schooling through high school. But our educational standards are rising.

Two-year junior colleges, many of them supported by cities and states, loom as the next step in our system of free, universal education. Along with the surge in enrollment at traditional four-year colleges and universities, higher education is expected to attract about 12 million students in 1980 (triple the 1960 figure).

Merely building the physical facilities for such huge increases is a formidable prospect. Creating a sympathetic atmosphere for education, and filling the need for qualified teachers is a much more staggering problem. Of course, we may argue for the radical reform of U.S. education. We may plead for overhauling the existing system of teacher training, as James B. Conant has eloquently done. But I see few signs we are about to undertake such vast changes in the machinery of U.S. education; nor does it seem possible, even if the mood for drastic reform was overwhelming, simply to order new procedures, new goals and new solutions and then put them into practice. Good teachers cannot be turned out by fiat. We do not live in a planner's paradise. Ask Robert Moses.

With increased urbanization and industrialization, demands on the water supply will be much greater than most Americans have remotely imagined. The drought in the northeast United States last summer was an indication of shortages even greater to come. And though engineers and scientists can, and will, tap new sources of water and devise ways to purify polluted rivers like the Hudson, the cost will be fantastic—hundreds of billions of dollars. Add to the current strain the pressure of a 50 per cent increase in population and the result may well be a chronic water shortage that can hardly be solved at any tolerable price.

Imaginative but impractical water schemes have been proposed, such as one to bring to the United States the almost limitless supply of far northern water, carrying it a thousand miles and more to our own boundaries. Assuming that Canada would agree to the politically prickly diversion of her waters, the cost is estimated in the neighborhood of \$100-billion. But it has taken more than a generation of hot dispute and interminable litigation to decide priorities of water among our own sister states of the West. How much greater the difficulties of diverting Canada's water to care for U.S. needs?

As for nuclear-powered desalination plants, quite apart from the cost of constructing the huge installations we would need and the pipelines to carry the water inland, there is the additional problem of safety in disposing of radioactive waste. Technicians may solve the problem, but at what social cost? The conversion of precious open spaces into atomic garbage dumps?

Just as easily accessible water supplies dwindle, air pollution will increase. Air pollution is the result of congestion, industrialization and the multiplication of automobiles—factors in direct relation to population density in urban areas. Los Angeles is not an industrial city, yet at times its air is hardly fit to breathe. And with the spread of industry in the sprawling cities of the nation, more and more places will be Los Angelized.

We have long assumed that at least the air we breathe is free. It won't be for much longer as we expand our efforts to purify the atmosphere. In California, for example, an aroused public finally insisted that automobile manufacturers install exhaust filters to trap toxic chemicals. Keeping automobile fumes and industrial poisons out of the air we breathe is going to be an increasingly costly business. By the year 2000 the high cost of breathing will be a real issue, not just a phrase.

Packing too many people into an urban area increases the cost of providing still another essential of everyday living; electric power. Even more serious, such concentrations of people may make absolutely reliable electric service more and more difficult to

maintain. I doubt if it was a mere coincidence, for example, that New York City needed 10 hours to restore electricity after the recent Northeast power failure while smaller communities were able to turn on their lights in a much shorter time. Growth is desirable up to a point; then the advantage of size diminishes and the multiplication of complexity multiplies the headaches. And by 1980 we can expect at least a 300 per cent increase in the nation's electrical energy needs. Most of this will flow into urban areas. The present difficulties of maintaining absolutely reliable service to such concentrations of people and industry, and holding down costs, will thus be magnified.

As chairman of T.V.A. and the Atomic Energy Commission, and in my present work in Asia and Latin America, I have become familiar with the problems of producing and distributing electricity on a large scale. Indeed, it was T.V.A. a generation ago that pioneered the concept that the greater the use of electricity the lower the cost per kilowatt hour. This is still generally true. But for great cities the exact contrary is coming to pass. To distribute electricity in a large densely populated area such as New York is more costly than in smaller urban markets. Huge generating power plants produce ever lower generating costs; but to bring this power to the consumer in massive concentrations of population grows more and more expensive. Consequently, the price of this essential of modern life probably will go up in the great cities as population growth continues.

Without realizing it, we are fast approaching what may be called the population barrier beyond which lie unpredictability and, I fear, problems of unmanageable size. Consider, for example, the relationship between population growth and the poor.

The Federal Aid to Dependent Children program has doubled to more than four million cases during the last decade, while the costs have soared from about \$600 million to more than \$1.8 billion. Even more depressing than the numbers of families who cannot survive without welfare assistance is the phenomenon known as the "cycle of dependency."

More than 40 per cent of parents whose children receive A.D.C. funds themselves had parents who received relief checks. This cycle is sad but not surprising. Poor people tend to have more children than they want or can afford, and the children have less chance to receive the education and training they need to break the pattern. Thus, even the third generation appears on relief rolls in the U.S., the most socially mobile nation in the world. In America, reports the National Academy of Sciences in a recent study, "The Growth of U.S. Population," "the burden of unwanted children among impoverished and uneducated mothers . . . is much like that experienced by mothers in underdeveloped countries."

Since the poor cannot contribute their share of the mounting costs of education, medical care, public housing and similar necessary government enterprises, the money must be supplied by the rest of the population through taxation. But the most painful loss is not measured in dollars but in human resources. And one measure of the potential loss is the fact that one-fourth of America's children are the offspring of poor parents.

Belatedly, we are helping poor couples who need and want financial and medical help in family planning. The White House Conference on Health in November gave high priority to birth control as part of Federal efforts to halt the cycle of dependency and poverty. Tax-supported activities in 40 states, combined with such large-scale private efforts as Harvard's Center for Population Studies and the \$14.5 million grant by the Ford Foundation for basic research by the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center and the Population Council, herald new progress in a long-neglected field.

We tend to patronize the poor by preaching to them about birth control; though poverty-stricken parents with four, five or six children are the most publicized aspect of population growth, they are by no means the most important numerical aspect of the problem. As a matter of simple arithmetic, the four-fifths of the nation's families who earn more than the poverty-line income of \$3,000 a year—who can afford two, three or four children—produce a greater total of children than the one poor couple out of five which may have six youngsters.

In fact, the latest census information reveals that though poor families may have more children than do better-off families, the difference is much smaller than many people believe. According to the National Academy of Sciences analysis, in 1960 married women 40 to 44 years old in families with incomes below \$4,000 and above \$4,000 differed in the average number of children by less than one. The postwar baby boom, for example, was more pronounced among middle- and upper-income families than among the poor.

Thus, these relatively well-off families are the ones mainly responsible for our rapidly rising population curve. They and their children are the ones who will account for most of the 100 million additional Americans by the end of the century.

How many children a couple should have is a decision only they should make; a government inducement or deterrent—a tax, for example—is morally repugnant and politically impossible. We cannot penalize the poor in order to limit the size of their families while we allow more prosperous parents to have as many children as they want. The large majority of middle- and upper-class parents need no birth control help from government, nor will they welcome outside advice on so personal a matter. Yet it is this group of families who will want to have three, four or more children for the very natural reason that they like children and can afford to support them. The question is, can the country support them?

Any notion that The Pill or some other scientific device is the sole and complete answer is very dubious. At a symposium on birth control not long ago, Dr. Stephen J. Plank, a professor in the Harvard School of Public Health, cautioned against "the facile assumption . . . that we may be able to contracept our way to the Great Society." Birth control, he said, is a question of motivation rather than technology alone.

The neglected arithmetic of the population problem facing us is depressing. Look at this table showing the birth and death rates over the past quarter-century in the United States:

Year	Births	Rate (per 1,000 pop.)	Deaths	Rate (per 1,000 pop.)
1940	2,360,399	17.9	1,417,269	10.8
1945	2,735,456	19.5	1,401,719	10.6
1950	3,554,149	23.6	1,452,454	9.6
1955	4,047,295	24.6	1,528,717	9.3
1960	4,257,850	23.7	1,711,982	9.5
1964	4,027,490	21.0	1,798,051	9.4

Although the birth rate has been declining since the mid-50's, while the death rate has remained relatively stable, the drop in the birth rate is too little and too late to prevent an oversized population. The surge in the number of births over deaths continues (2.3 million were added to the population in 1964).

Or examine these low and high population projections prepared by the Census Bureau:

Year	Low	High
1970	206,000,000	211,000,000
1985	248,000,000	276,000,000
2010	322,000,000	438,000,000

The high figure would be reached if birth rates returned to the levels of the early 1950's. The low estimate—enormous as it is—is based on the possibility that the rates may decline by 1985 to the comparatively low levels of the early World War II years.

One theoretical way out of the dilemma would be to say that since America can no longer sustain complete "family freedom," some form of compulsory birth control is, regrettably, necessary. It would not be the first time in our history that government intervened to restrain individual impulse in the name of collective welfare. Yet, where children and parents are concerned, I do not believe we can yet advocate the sacrifice of one freedom for the sake of preserving another. Such a "solution" would make no sense at all, theoretically, practically or ethically.

Government policies and private programs must make plain the kind of life we all face if economically comfortable families reproduce at rates they personally can afford. With equal urgency we must make plain the dangers if poor families have children in numbers they cannot afford.

Obviously, a stationary population—one in which the birth rate matches the death rate—is out of the question for many years to come. It is probably not feasible, nor even desirable. All we can hope to achieve is a slower rise in the size of our population rather than the present steep increase. What is needed is a far more drastic cut in the birth rate—a voluntary curtailment of the right to breed. It is needed, but I have no great conviction that it will happen.

For though scientific ingenuity may be able to solve many of the technological problems we are only beginning to understand people always change more slowly than technology. It is easier, after all, to design a new industrial process than redesign a cultural tradition. Yet that is the order of change we face if we are to preserve life's dignity and quality. Confronted by the crisis of population growth, we must, at present, appeal to private conscience for the sake of the general good.

#### FECUND FUTURE

At the estimated 1965 U.S. birth rate of 19.5 per 1,000 of population, a woman who reaches the age of 45 will have an average of three children. To achieve a stationary population, in which parents only replace themselves, the average number of children would have to drop to about 2.1. If childbearing gradually declined to this level by 1980—a highly unlikely possibility—the U.S. population would then be about 250,000,000, and by 2020 the population would hit 300,000,000 and remain unchanged thereafter. At that point the birth rate would have declined to 14 per 1,000 and the death rate would have climbed to 14 per 1,000 (because a nongrowing population includes a much higher percentage of the aged).

On the other hand, if present fertility and mortality trends continue, a long-range projection by the National Academy of Sciences foresees that in about 650 years there will be one person per square foot throughout the United States, and in less than 1,500 years the weight of the U.S. population will exceed the mass of the earth—that is, 6,588,000,000,000,000,000,000 tons!

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 20, 1969]

#### IT'S THE RICH DOING CROWDING (By Jean Mayer)

(NOTE.—Professor of nutrition, lecturer on the history of public health and member of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard, Dr. Mayer has been chosen by President Nixon to organize the October White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health. His article is excerpted from the Columbia University Forum.)

One theme of this essay is that food is

only one of the elements in the population problem. Admittedly, at present, it is a major factor in some parts of the world, but there are large areas where the national food supply is a minor factor and others where it is not a factor at all. Furthermore, considering the world as a whole, there is no evidence that the food situation is worsening and there is at least a likelihood that food may at some time (20 or 30 years from now) be removed altogether as a limiting factor to population.

Yet to deny that the population problem is basically one of food for survival is not to deny that there is a population problem; it is in fact to remove the appearance of a safety valve and also to reveal the problem in its generality. For were we really to starve when the population reaches a certain magic number, this in turn would cause a drastic increase in child and infant mortality, decreased fertility and a shortening of the average life span.

In other words, it would cause the increase in population to be self-limiting. If the world can continue to feed—however badly—an ever-increasing number of people, this safety valve (however unpalatable, it would be a safety valve) is missing. And if lack of food is not a component of the definition of overpopulation, rich countries become candidates for overpopulation.

Another theme is that there is a strong case to be made for a stringent population policy on exactly the reverse of the basis Malthus expounded. Malthus was concerned with the steadily more widespread poverty that indefinite population growth would inevitably create. I am concerned about the areas of the globe where people are rapidly becoming richer.

For rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb the ecology more and create more land, air, water, chemical, thermal and radioactive pollution than poor people. So it can be argued that from many viewpoints, it is even more urgent to control the numbers of the rich than it is to control the numbers of the poor.

That the magnitude of the population problem has increased dramatically in recent years is well publicized. Scholars have estimated that after hundreds of thousands of years of slow growth, the population of the world reached the quarter billion mark some time around the beginning of this era. It doubled to 500 million by 1650. Two centuries later, it reached the billion mark.

The next doubling took 80 years, with a population of two billion in 1930. It would appear that the world is on its way to the next doubling, to four billion in 45 years, by 1975; and a population of eight billion may well be reached within the following 30 or 35 years unless rates of growth are drastically decreased. The present growth rate would lead to a population of 500 billion by the year 2200 and give the surface of all continents a population density equal to that of Washington, D.C. at present.

This increase has been due not to an increase in birth rates but to a decrease in death rates. Around 1700, life expectancy at birth of European populations was about 33 years, and had increased little in the previous 300 to 400 years. By 1950, life expectancy in Western and Central Europe and in the United States had increased to 66-69 years, an increase of over 100 percent.

This decrease in mortality rates is no longer confined to populations of European stocks. In 1946, the death rate of the Moslem population of Algeria was higher than that of Sweden in 1775. In 1954, in spite of generalized guerrilla war on its territory, the death rate of this population was lower than that of Sweden in 1875. A similar telescoping of the drop in death rates is going on all over the world.

From a demographic point of view, it must be noted that a drop in the death rate, with

birth rate unchanged, not only results in an increase in the rate of population growth but also produces an acceleration in the rate of growth itself: a decline in age specific mortality rates in ages prior to the end of the childbearing age has the same demographic effect as an increase in the birth rate. In the United States, 97 out of every 100 newborn white females reach the age of 20; 91 reach the age of 50. In Guatemala, only 70 reach the age of 20; 49 that of 50. If the death rate in Guatemala fell within the next decade to somewhere near the 1950 United States level, a not unlikely development, this alone would increase the number of women reaching the beginning of the childbearing period by 85 per cent.

Because of the high proportion of young people in underdeveloped countries generally—a country like Costa Rica has twice the proportion of people under 15 that Sweden has—this drop in the death rate in the pre-childbearing period has now and will have in the next few years a gigantic effect on the birth rate. Brazil had 52 million people in 1950, 71 million in 1960 and 83 million in 1966. If present rates prevail, it should have 240 million by the year 2000, or 14 times the 1900 population. With a drop in mortality in the young age groups, the increase could be even more spectacular.

#### DEPRESSION A FACTOR

The significance of the demographic trends within this country is not generally appreciated. The United States, with a population of 200 million, has at present 1/16th of the earth's population on 1/16th of the land area. Though a number of underdeveloped areas are piling up population faster, we are accumulating about 2.2 million people per year, more than any increase before 1946. The rate of growth seems unimpressive, 1.1 for the year 1967 (the highest rate reached was 1.8 in 1946 to 1957). If the rate prevailing over the past five years persists, the population of the United States will reach 300 million by the year 1990.

What most of us have tended to ignore is that the so-called baby boom of the postwar era followed a period of depression and very low birth rates: from 1920 to 1933, the birth rate had fallen steadily from 27.7 per 1000 in 1920 to 18.4 in 1933. The absolute decline in births was less steep, because the numerical base of women of childbearing age was still growing. When the birth rate started rising in the early '40s, the increase was applied to the still large number of women born between 1916 and 1924. Since 1945, the baby boom that has been so well publicized had actually been taking place on the basis of the shrinking group of women of childbearing age born since 1924.

As of 1963, the last of the undersize groups had entered the reproducing age. From 1964 (when the first girls born in the big postwar years reached the age of 18), the number of women in the childbearing age has started increasing rapidly. While in 1940 there were 32 million women 15 to 44 years of age, in 1950, 34 million, and in 1960, 36 million (a very slow increase), there will be 43 million in 1970 and 54 million in 1980.

While the birth rate is declining (and while a better index, the age-standardized general fertility rate based upon women of childbearing age only, is also declining), the sheer existence of the number of women and girls alive now means that even in the unlikely event that the fertility rate fell to the historical lows of the depression years and never departed from it, the population of the United States would still more than double in the next century. The reader will, I trust, give me credit for not minimizing the problem of total population either at home or for the world at large.

#### DENSITY MEANS LITTLE

With this picture of ever-increasing numbers of people, the first reaction among a portion of the public is that we are running

out of space, that the "population density" is becoming dangerously high.

This concept of "population density"—number of people per unit surface—has underlain the concept of "overpopulation" in the past. It is not very useful except where the primary resources are extractive (mining) and where the most primitive types of agriculture (independent of industry for fertilizers, machines, etc., and hence essentially dependent on area) and forestry prevail. It also presupposes that there is no industry to absorb surplus manpower.

It is a concept of dubious value where nonextractive industries are dominant and where trade is possible. The high density band from Boston to Washington has an area of 14,000 square miles, an aggregate population of over 30 million (or over 2000 persons per square mile) and very limited natural resources. The median family income is \$1000 more than for the United States as a whole. Can this area be said to be overpopulated from a material standpoint?

To those who object that this area is part of a larger and less densely populated whole, one might point to prosperous Holland, or Belgium, or even Hong Kong, which, although trade with its hinterland is very meager (imports from mainland China represent only 17 percent of total imports), not only houses 3.1 million people on 398 square miles (12,700 per square mile) but has shown an unexcelled increase in national product of 7 to 10 per cent per year—a doubling of real output within ten years.

Once one argues that a certain population density should be preserved, such as density with respect to capital, for example, one is dealing with a much more complex concept. From it follows the idea that some sparsely settled countries need rapid increases in population, preferably through immigration, for optimal use of resources. The mental image of population density entertained by most people is, in any case, complicated by esthetic and social considerations, and "high density" is more likely to be ascribed to Calcutta than to Paris, to Costa Rica than to Denmark.

This leads us to the second and more popular concept, that overpopulation can best be appraised with respect to food resources and that the present rate of increase in the world's population is rapidly carrying us to the brink of or to actual starvation. It is my contention that this is not happening.

Furthermore, I do not consider that my belief, which I shall now endeavor to justify, makes me an "optimist" as compared to the legions of conservationists, social scientists, etc., who have embraced a Malthusian "pessimism." If anything, this view makes me even more pessimistic about our chances of limiting the world's population at an early date: famine or the threat of famine is perhaps the worst method of limitation, but it would work.

#### A SHORT-LIVED THREAT

World War II was not a Malthusian check. In spite of the horrendous numbers of soldiers and civilians killed, in spite of the massive genocide perpetrated by the Nazis, food production decreased much more than population. By 1945, intake per capita was 16 per cent lower than the 1934-38 average. The creation of the Food and Agriculture Organization, a specialized United Nations agency that was endowed during its first years with particularly articulate spokesmen, dramatized the worldwide concern over the food situation.

The difficulties inherent in getting agriculture going while industry and the means of communication were not yet rebuilt led to a generalized feeling of pessimism. Cereals, oils, meat, dairy herds were, in succession, the objects of great attention, the conclusion being in each case that prewar levels of production and consumption were not going to be reached for years. The chaotic

state of international trade accentuated shortages, which UNRRA and various emergency agreements attempted to cope with on an ad hoc basis.

And yet very quickly the situation improved. The oil shortage vanished first; while the gigantic ground nut scheme of the British government, which was supposed to mitigate it, was taking off to a very slow start, the reappearance in the channels of trade of adequate amounts of fats and oils eliminated the motivation for the scheme itself.

U.S. production of cereals and animal products, which had grown during the war in spite of the lack of abundant manpower and the diversion of the chemical industry to military purposes, had to be slowed down as surpluses started accumulating and, with their appearance, the threat of a collapse of agricultural prices loomed. By 1952-3, the worldwide rate of per capita production of food had overtaken prewar rates.

Since then, the average rate of increase in the production of food for the world at large has been 3 per cent per year while the population has increased on the average 1.7 per cent. In document No. 8148, the State Department estimates that if individual consumption levels remained at the 1955-7 level, the world at large would show by 1975 an annual surplus of 40 million tons of wheat and 70 million tons of rice. (This estimate is based on the postulate that there will be no increase in rice production in Europe and North America and no increase in wheat production in North America.)

Actually, this slight but steady gain of food production over population is part of a secular trend. E. S. and W. S. Woytinski, in their monumental "World Population and Production," estimate that since 1850 the increase in output has been more rapid than the increase in population.

#### MALNUTRITION WIDESPREAD

As chairman of the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, I have been talking of these evils at home for years. I have done extensive work in malnutrition in Asia and Africa and have just returned from a trip to Nigeria and Biafra, where I went to study the famine and the means to alleviate it. I am, therefore, as well aware of the widespread character of malnutrition as anyone in the world.

Caloric undernutrition is still found in many parts of the world, and not always as a result of war or civil disorder, earthquakes or floods, invasions of insects and other parasites or abnormally prolonged droughts. Protein deficiency—kwashiorkor where it occurs without accompanying caloric deprivation; marasmus when both caloric and protein intakes are inadequate—is encountered in varying degrees of prevalence among the young children of most countries of Asia and Africa and in many of Central and South America.

Vitamin A deficiency is perhaps underestimated as a threat to the life, and the sight, of children of most of the same areas where protein deficiency is also seen. Riboflavin deficiency, thiamine deficiency (beriberi in its various forms) and a number of other deficiencies are still very much with us. Still, there is no evidence that the situation is getting worse.

The food balance sheets on which post-war pessimism was based are imperfect instruments. As an officer of FAO, I spent considerable time attempting to gauge such unknowns as figures for waste at the retail level and within families, and that portion of the food supply that does not move within the channels of trade (food grown by the farmer for his family is very inaccurately known, particularly as regards fruits and vegetables, which tend to be underestimated). The nutritional standards against which available supplies are gauged are themselves being refined.

As the results of additional experimental

and clinical work become available, it is realized that a number of such standards—those for protein and calcium among others—were probably unnecessarily high. Even without such re-evaluation, the evolution of food balance sheets, the only instruments we have to judge the race between food and population, make it apparent that most regions do show the same slow increase of per capita supplies exhibited by the world at large.

It must be recognized, of course, that many of the worst nutritional scourges of mankind have been historically due as much to ignorance and to callousness as to lack of nutrients as such. Thousands of children die of protein deficiency in areas where the proteins which would save them do in fact exist and are often consumed in sufficient amounts in the very households where infants and toddlers die for lack of them. A faulty understanding of a child's needs may be the main reason he is denied some of the food consumed by his father and older siblings.

As for man's inhumanity to man and its contribution to starvation, it could be illustrated by thousands of examples: cereals being shipped from Ireland under the protection of naval guns during the famine; stocks being withheld during the Congo famine to keep prices up; crop destruction policies in South Vietnam; the food blockade of Biafra.

#### LAND KEPT IDLE

Certainly, as far as food is concerned, ours is not one world. The U.S. Government rents 20 million acres from our farmers so that they will not grow food on them. A study made at Iowa State University a few years ago suggests that 62½ million acres ought to be similarly retired so that surpluses will not continue to be created in relation to the present market, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Argentina and France have been, or are at present, involved in similar efforts to restrict production.

Nor is this idling of food production restricted to highly developed countries. A recent study estimates that Ghanaian farmers work only an average of two hours a day in the cocoa area, the wealthiest agricultural area of the country.

It is fair to say that in most areas of the world, the race between food and population would be more favorable to the development of adequate nutrition if the rate of population growth was decreased. But I believe that there are no grounds for saying in 1969 that the nutritional state of the world is getting worse. It is not.

And I believe that improvement in communication, availability of surpluses in certain countries, the existence of solid international organizations and the gradual improvement in international morality make large-scale famines, such as the Irish or the Bengal famines, less likely to occur in this era—except perhaps in Red China, because of its alienation from the two richest blocs of countries. (It appears, moreover, that the food situation in China has improved considerably in the past two years, making the recurrence of famine there, as in India, more remote.)

Bad as it is, the present is no worse than the past and probably somewhat better. But what of the future? In absolute numbers, the increase in population is likely to accelerate for some time. Can the food supply be kept up? My contention is that, for better or for worse, it can and will.

First, let us consider conventional agriculture. FAO's figures indicate that 3.4 billion acres are at present under cultivation. This represents less than 11 per cent of the total land area of the world. Some experts—Prasolov, Shantz, Zimmermann—estimate the area that can eventually be made arable at from 13 billion to 17 billion acres. Colin Clark, director of the Agricultura. Economics Research Institute of Oxford, uses the figure of 19 billion acres, but counts double-cropped

tropical lands twice. (He considers, incidentally, that if the lands were farmed as well as the Dutch farmers work their acres today, it would support 28 billion people on a Dutch diet; if Japanese standards of farming and nutrition were used, this area would support 95 billion people.)

#### THE FERTILIZER PHENOMENON

The biggest potential increase of food production does not, however, come from extension of the area under cultivation, but from the increase in the use of fertilizers. The phenomenal increase in food production in this country has actually been performed with a reduction in acreage farmed.

By pre-World War I standards of cultivation, it took 1½ acres to support an American. If such standards prevailed today, we would need to add at least 40 million acres to our farm area every ten years, or the equivalent of an additional Iowa every decade.

In fact, we use fertilizers instead. One ton of nitrogen is the equivalent of 14 acres of good farmland. The use of between 200,000 and 300,000 tons of nitrogen (and corresponding amounts of other necessary elements) per decade has obviated the need to discover another Iowa.

And our use of fertilizer is less intensive than it is in Japan, where it is well over twice ours, or in Western Europe. (Incidentally, in spite of its already high standards of cultivation, Japan is still increasing its agricultural production at a rate of 3 per cent per year.)

India, Africa and most of Latin America use only an infinitesimal fraction of Japanese or Western amounts of fertilizer, or none at all. Garst has estimated that an expenditure of \$10 an acre per year for fertilizers would alone add 50 to 100 per cent to the low yields in underdeveloped countries. Applying this investment to an area of 1.5 billion acres would be equivalent to adding at least 750 million acres to the crop areas of these countries, the equivalent of a continent bigger than North America.

It is interesting to note that this primacy of fertilizers was recognized relatively late. In this country, the recognition dates back only to World War II, and has accelerated since the Korean conflict. In Japan, it dates back to 1950 or thereabout. And the leaders of the U.S.S.R. only recently realized that a large-scale increase in fertilizer output would be easier and more rewarding than the extension of cultivation to the "virgin lands."

There are many other advances in agriculture that have yet to be applied on a large scale. The identification of necessary trace elements and their incorporation into fertilizers and feeds have opened vast areas to cultivation and husbandry in Australia and elsewhere. Selective breeding of plants and animals has permitted the development of species with superior hardiness and increased yields. In the greater part of the world such work has hardly begun.

Advances in animal health and nutrition have permitted the mass production of milk and eggs in indoor conditioners on a scale that was unimaginable a few years ago. The City of Los Angeles, for instance, is now an important and efficient dairy area. In some large installations, computers programed to calculate the cheapest method of providing a diet of known energy and known content in ten essential amino acids, total protein and other nutrients automatically set the controls that will mix basic staples providing the cheapest adequate poultry diet as they are informed of the latest commodity prices.

Herbicides increase yields; pesticides prevent losses from rodents, insects and fungi. In many underdeveloped countries, one-quarter of the crop is lost before it reaches the consumer. Certain methods of preservation of foods by radiation have just been approved by the Food and Drug Administration. The control of weather by seeding clouds for

rain, speeding cloud formation by heating lakes by atomic energy, the desalination of brackish water by various methods are entering the realm of practical feasibility.

#### FOOD FROM PETROLEUM

Powerful though these methods of "classical" agriculture are, I believe that they will, within the lifetime of most present inhabitants of this planet, be left far behind as methods of food production. The general public is still unaware of some new developments, their promise and the extent of the means likely to be expended in the next decade in bringing the results of research to practical application.

Large-scale manufacture of food from petrochemicals started during World War II, when the Germans manufactured synthetic fats to feed forced labor groups. These fats did not conform to desirable standards of taste or safety (they contained a high proportion of branched-chain fatty acids not normally found in nature and probably not fully metabolized, and retained a petroleum-like odor). After the war, interest in "synthetic" fats persisted for a while during the years when it appeared that a shortage of natural fats was likely to be protracted.

During the '50s, little or no work was done in this field, but recently some of the larger international oil companies have again become actively interested, and pilot plants are now in operation. Fatty acids, triglycerides (the constituents of our common oils and fats) and fully metabolizable simpler compounds, such as 1,3-butanediol, may soon be manufactured at very low cost for human food and animal feeds. While the promise of abundant and cheap atomic power, widely heralded for the morrow in the more immediate postwar period, has shown itself slow to be realized, it is coming, and it may well be that oil will be increasingly a raw material for food and plastics rather than a fuel.

As a potential source of food production, photosynthesis can be used much more efficiently in algae than in higher plants. With proper mineral fertilization and with the proper rate of removal of the finished products, one square meter may serve to support algae production sufficient to feed one man. And a large proportion of the calories produced—as much as one-half—are derived from protein; vitamins are also produced into the bargain. Several universities are working with a number of species, *Chlorella* in particular, and large industrial firms are yearly becoming more interested.

The problems entailed in passing from the theoretically feasible to the economically feasible are formidable, but their solution is likely to be hastened for an unexpected reason. Interplanetary travel of long duration and the organization of distant stations require not only recycling of oxygen and waste water; they necessitate the fabrication of food and its integration into the recycling of oxygen, water and excreta.

Over the next two decades, an increasing fraction of the several billion dollars that the United States and the Soviet Union will spend every year for space travel is going to be channeled into life support systems. The money spent in the aggregate on new methods of food production will probably, during that period, dwarf the cost of the Manhattan Project.

In many ways, we may have in space exploration what William James called "the moral equivalent of war." We will probably also have in it the technological equivalent of war without the corresponding losses in men and resources. The usable "fallout" of such research is likely to be enormous. Certainly, if economically harnessing of photosynthesis, through biological units or directly, can be realized under the hostile interplanetary, lunar or martian conditions, it should become relatively easy to put it into effect on earth.

All this is no longer science fiction. It is

as much of a reality as the Federal income tax. Obviously, a breakthrough in this field could for centuries altogether remove food as a limiting factor to population growth.

#### A POOR BATTLEGROUND

I hope I have said enough to show how dangerous it may turn out to link the population problem so closely to food, as so many writers have done. These have generally been conservationists and social scientists rather than agricultural or nutritional scientists, concerned—rightly—with the effects of crowding which they had observed. At the same time, not sure that the public and governments would agree with them that there was cause for concern and action based on these grounds, they have turned to the threat of a worldwide shortage of food as an easily understood, imperative reason for a large-scale limitation of births.

Had they consulted nutritionists, agriculturists and chemists, they might have chosen a more appropriate battleground. For if we can feed an ever-increasing number of people—even if we feed them as badly as many of our contemporaries are fed—their argument fails. And yet there is a need for the establishment as soon as possible of a sound population policy for the world at large.

There is, of course, another good reason for not tying population control to food. This tie eliminates from contention rich countries, and in particular surplus countries such as ours. Our population is increasing faster than it ever has; our major nutrition problem is overweight, our major agricultural problem is our ever-mounting excess production.

Does anyone seriously believe this means that we have no population problem? Our housing problems; our traffic problem; the insufficiency of the number of our hospitals, of community recreation facilities; our pollution problems, are all facets of our population problem.

I may add that in this country we compound the population problem by the migratory habits of our people: from rural farm areas to urban areas and especially to "metropolitan" areas (212 such areas now have 84 per cent of our population); from low-income areas to high-income areas; from the East and Midwest to the South and Southwest; from all areas to the Pacific Coast; from the centers of cities to suburbs, which soon form gigantic conurbations, with circumstances everywhere pushing our Negroes into the deteriorating centers of large cities. All this has occurred without any master plan, and with public services continually lagging behind both growth and migrations.

Let us conclude with one specific example: Four million students were enrolled in U.S. colleges and graduate schools in 1960; six million in 1965. The Census Bureau estimates that eight million will seek admission or continued enrollment in 1970; six million in 1975; 12 million in 1980. No one questions our ability to feed these youngsters. But are we as a Nation at all prepared for a near doubling of the size of our colleges and universities in 11 years?

#### PARKS REFLECT TRENDS

Let us now examine the other argument, that in certain ways the rich countries are more immediately threatened by overpopulation. A corollary of this is that the earth as an economic system has more to fear from the rich than from the poor, even if one forgets for a moment the threat of atomic or chemical warfare.

Consider some data from our own country. We have already said that "crowding" is certainly one of the pictures we have in mind when we think of overpopulation. The increased crowding of our cities and our conurbations has been referred to, but what of the great outdoors?

In 1930, the number of visitor-days at our national parks was of the order of three million (for a population of 122 million);

by 1950, it was 33 million (for a population of 151 million); by 1960, it was 79 million (for a population of 179 million); by 1967, 140 million (for a population of 200 million). State parks tell the same story: a rise in visitor-days from 114 million in 1960 to 179 million in 1960, an increase in attendance of over 125 per cent for a rise in population of less than 20 per cent.

Clearly, the increase in disposable income (and hence in means of transportation and in leisure) becomes a much more important factor in crowding and lack of privacy than the rise in population.

Not only does the countryside become more rapidly crowded when its inhabitants are rich; it also becomes rapidly uglier. With increasing income, people stop drinking water as much. As a result, we spread 48 billion (rustproof) cans and 26 billion (nondegradable) bottles over our landscape every year. We produce 800 million pounds of trash a day, a great deal of which ends up in our fields, our parks and our forests. Only one-third of the billion pounds of paper we use every year is reclaimed.

Nine million cars, trucks and buses are abandoned every year, and while many of them are used as scrap, a large though undetermined number are left to disintegrate slowly in backyards, in fields and woods and on the sides of highways. The eight billion pounds of plastics we use every year are nondegradable materials. And many of our states are threatened with an even more pressing shortage of water, not because of an increased consumption of drinking fluid by the increasing population but because people are getting richer and using more water for air-conditioning, swimming pools and vastly expanded metal and chemical industries.

That the air is getting crowded much more rapidly than the population is increasing is again an illustration that increase in the disposable income is perhaps more closely related to our own view of "overpopulation" than is the population itself. From 1940 to 1967, the number of miles flown has gone from 264 million to 3334 billion (and the fuel consumed from 22 million to 512 million gallons).

The very air waves are crowded. The increase in citizen-licenses from 126,000 to 848,000 in the brief 1960-7 interval is again an excellent demonstration of the very secondary role of the population increase in the new overpopulation. I believe that as the disposable income rises throughout the world in general, the population pressure due to riches will become as apparent as that due to poverty.

I trust that I have demonstrated how dangerous it is to link constantly in the mind of the public the concept of overpopulation with that of undernutrition. I believe that it is dangerous to link it necessarily with poverty. It is absurd on the basis of any criterion of history, economics or esthetics.

Some countries are poor and densely populated. A few countries are poor and so sparsely populated that economic development (e.g. road building, creation of markets) becomes very difficult. It is easy to demonstrate that a couple with many children will be unable to save and invest.

It is perhaps also true that, as the comparison to 19th century France, England and Germany suggests, at a certain stage of development, too low a birth rate (as in France then) decreases the ambition and labor of part of the population so that the savings expected from the decreased birth rate never materialize. (Losing wars because of a smaller population and having to pay a heavy tribute, as happened to the French at the conclusion of the 1870-71 war, also nullified this advantage.)

#### TAXING THE ECOLOGY

The fact is that we are not yet in one world and that while in general it is true that population increases make improvement in

nutrition and in delivery of social services more difficult, the relation of changes in wealth to changes in population has to be examined in each area on its own merits.

We have seen, furthermore, that there is more to the problem of population than the decrease in income consequent to overpopulation. We have seen that the increase in disposable income creates a population problem that is becoming every day more acute. The ecology of the earth—its streams, woods, animals—can accommodate itself better to a rising poor population than to a rising rich population. Indeed, to save the ecology, the population will have to decrease as the disposable income increases.

If we believe, like Plato and Aristotle, in trying for excellence rather than in rejoicing in numbers, we need a population policy now for the rich as well as the poor. Excellent human beings will not be produced without abundance of cultural as well as material resources and, I believe, without sufficient space. We are likely to run out of certain metals before we run out of food; of paper before we run out of metals. And we are running out of clear streams, pure air and the familiar sights of Nature while we still have the so-called "essentials" of life.

Shall we continue to base the need for a population policy on a nutritional disaster to occur at some hypothetical date when it is clear that the problem is here, now, for us as well as for others? Shall we continue to hide the fact that a rational policy may entail in many countries not only a plateauing of the population to permit an increase in disposable income, but a decrease of the population as the disposable income rises?

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 17, 1969]

#### WORLD'S No. 1 WORRY—TOO MANY PEOPLE

In a world full of dangers, one danger is coming to be feared more than any other. The danger is overpopulation.

The chart on these pages shows why alarm is rising.

The world today contains about 3.5 billion people. That is double the population of 50 years ago and three times that of a century ago.

By the year 2000, according to projections made by the United Nations, the world's population will be about 6 billion.

That means that in the next 31 years the world will acquire 2.5 billion additional people—an increase of more people than existed on this earth only 20 years ago.

How to feed these added billions of people is only part of the problem that such a startling population explosion presents.

*Increasing upheaval:* What officials and experts are beginning to realize is this: The more people there are and the more crowded their living conditions become, the greater grows the likelihood of violence and upheaval.

Riots, revolutions and wars are foreseen as almost inevitable products of the overpopulation that lies ahead.

This is noted: Most of the huge population growth will occur in those parts of the world that already are overcrowded, that are poorest and least able to feed and support more people.

These also are the areas where unrest is greatest today, and where pressures of expanding population already are contributing to revolution or aggression.

At present, 2.5 billion people—or 70 per cent of the world's population—live in underdeveloped regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

By the year 2000, there will be about 4.7 billion people—or 77 per cent of the world's population—in such regions. China, which is already bursting at the seams with nearly 740 million people, will have more than 1 billion. India, hungry and riotous with 540 million today, will have a billion people by the turn of the century.

Asia will contain, all told, 3.46 billion inhabitants, which is almost as many as the world contains today.

Africa, even less developed than Asia, will have a total population of 768 million by 2000—more than double its present population.

Latin America, struggling now to support 280 million, will have about 638 million.

Developed areas: By contrast, the more developed areas of the world—Europe and North America—will grow much more slowly in population than the already crowded and underdeveloped areas.

Europe, now supporting some 450 million people fairly comfortably, will have about 527 million by the year 2000. The United States, where some 200 million people live in relative affluence today, will have about 318 million by that time. Soviet Russia, growing at about the same percentage rate, will see its population increase from about 240 million now to 353 million.

The noncontributors: Along with rapid population growth in underdeveloped countries will come another significant change: a growing proportion of young people. Thus a larger share of the population will be dependent and nonproductive—demanding food and other necessities of life but contributing little to producing those necessities. The result will be to limit the ability of backward economies to meet the needs of their expanding populations.

Lauchlin Currie, once an official of the U.S. Government and now an adviser to the Government of Colombia, recently said this:

"I regard the rate of growth in the population of the underdeveloped countries as the single most important obstacle to development and, hence, the single most important problem of the world, even outranking the threat of nuclear warfare in terms of ultimate dread possibilities."

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 17, 1969]

#### BIRTH CONTROL NOW, COUNTRY BY COUNTRY

Concern over an ever-expanding population is turning worldwide attention to diverse aspects of a growing debate—the argument over "artificial" birth control and family planning.

For example: Just how widespread is the practice of limiting births, whether legal or illegal? Do laws for or against contraception mean much, actually? What is the attitude of people in other countries toward self-regulated family planning, regardless of religious or governmental directives?

For answers, members of the staff of "U.S. News & World Report" in world capitals checked into the situation. Their findings:

#### LONDON

Big social changes—including the legalization of abortion—recently have been introduced in Britain.

The Abortion Act, which went into effect in 1968, makes it possible for a woman to have a free abortion in a National Health Service hospital. The only requirement is that two physicians must first agree that such treatment is necessary to the woman's physical or mental well-being.

In essence, medical circles agree, this makes it possible for almost any woman to have an abortion, since it is nearly always possible to find two doctors who would agree on such a course.

In the past, abortions were theoretically illegal, but were permitted in many cases. Latest estimates are that from 15,000 to 50,000 abortions a year are being performed in Britain.

Another big change is the increasing presence of Family Planning Association centers. These give free advice—and free supplies such as the birth-control pill—to applicants. Today there are 780 such clinics throughout the country, paid for by volun-

tary subscriptions but often supplied with free offices by local governments.

About 500,000 women and men received advice from these centers last year. Tens of thousands of others sought advice from doctors.

It is estimated that more than three fourths of British married couples practice some form of birth control. Reliance on the pill, now used by about 1 million British women, is increasing rapidly. Only half of that number had used the pill in 1966.

Interest also has been expressed in Britain about an "abortion pill," which is under development. Medical circles say such a pill is expected to be ready for distribution in a few years.

#### PARIS

Since 1920, France has had a law making it a criminal offense to give out birth-control information, and putting contraception and abortion on the same criminal footing. This law was revised last year to permit the sale of contraceptives.

The French Movement for Family Planning, founded in 1956, is credited with the recent growth of popularity of the birth-control pill. It is estimated that 500,000 women in France now use this form of contraception and that 1 million will be using it by 1970.

A recent book by a group of young doctors says that the most important step toward birth control is education. They say: "Everyone has heard of the pill, but only one woman in 1,000 knows exactly what contraception is about."

There is no real sex education in French schools, and contraception remains largely a taboo subject.

After the pill, the next most favored method of contraception in France is the intrauterine loop. Women who prefer the loop do so because it can become a permanent method once it has been inserted by a doctor. However, the loop has to be checked every six months, and cannot be used by all women.

A recent test of loop insertions revealed 8.4 per cent expulsions, 0.2 per cent infections, 4.1 percent heavy bleeding, and 2.22 per cent pregnancies. Other tests indicated that pregnancies during use of the pill were only 0.15 per cent.

Abortion is forbidden in France. However, official figures show that there are about 250,000 induced abortions annually. Unofficial sources put this figure at a total of 1 million.

The Conseil National de l'ordre des Medecins, France's highest medical authority, last year rejected proposals from a commission on population problems to liberalize the law against abortions. The law is even less likely to be changed since the latest Papal Encyclical on birth control.

#### BONN

Contraceptives of all kinds are easily available in West Germany. The pill has been in use since 1962 and is gaining in popularity. About 1.4 million women—13 per cent—in the age group from 16 to 45 take the pill.

Abortions are illegal, except when decreed by doctors to save the life of a mother or for other ethical reasons. Nevertheless, the abortion rate in West Germany is described as alarmingly high. For every 1 million live births, unofficial estimates indicate that there are 200,000 to 1.5 million abortions annually.

Sprays, the loop and other devices are no longer in favor, since they are considered too bothersome and not 100 per cent effective.

Recent polls show that the majority of all young West German couples desire at least two children, but prefer to space them according to their professional and family plans. Even young Catholic couples say: "We prefer to have the pill and not play Roman roulette."

#### ROME

In Italy—right on the Vatican's doorstep—any kind of "artificial" birth control is illegal, but the practice flourishes just the same.

In a nation where nearly 100 per cent of the people are at least nominal Roman Catholics, abortion is widespread and use of the pill is becoming more and more popular. There is no evidence to show that the papal encyclical on birth control has caused any diminution of these practices.

In fact, it is noted by an official of the Italian equivalent of the Family Planning Association that the encyclical produced such a flood of publicity in the Italian press—where the actual advertising of contraceptive devices is also illegal—that it might have even acted as a spur to their use.

Despite the ban on contraceptive devices, the pill is easy to get in Italy. This is because it can legally be prescribed as a remedy for any woman suffering from any gynecological disorder. There are at least eight different brands of the pill on sale in Italian drugstores.

Doctors appear in general to have no compunction about prescribing the pill, even when they know it will be put to contraceptive use. Drugstores are similarly permissive. It is not uncommon for pharmacists to sell the pill across the counter without a prescription.

Use of the birth-control pill still tends to be confined mainly to the more educated, middle-class Italians. The loop is relatively unknown here.

Abortion, though outlawed, has been practiced for centuries among rich and poor alike. One source estimates that at least 1 million abortions are carried out in Italy each year. An illegal abortion is said to cost about \$128 at current rates, and clinics where such operations are performed are easy to find.

Thus, despite the church ban on birth-control devices—and the ostensible illegality of them—Catholic Italy has a birth rate not much higher than Britain's.

#### STOCKHOLM

Birth-control methods, including legal abortion and sterilization, have long been used in Sweden and elsewhere in Scandinavia.

Experience in Sweden shows clearly that sex education in schools and easy access to contraceptives at low cost do not guarantee effective birth control. Social misfits, mentally retarded people and many youngsters fall to use contraceptives—often under the influence of liquor.

Widespread use of the pill in recent years has been charged with an alarming increase in venereal diseases. Reported cases of gonorrhea after the vacation period in 1968 were running up to 50 per cent higher than a year ago. Syphilis, too, is spreading again.

At the same time, the pill has failed to reduce the number of illegitimate births and abortions. In Sweden, the total of illegitimate births rose from 11,500 in 1960 to 18,000 in 1966.

Under a liberal abortion law, applications for legal abortions climbed from a temporary low of 4,085 in 1960 to 7,380 in 1967. As many as 95 per cent of all applications were granted last year, as against 62 per cent in 1960. Legal abortions are free under Government welfare programs.

Contrary to popular belief, Sweden does not permit abortions for foreigners except in emergency cases. Many American women who have tried to get legal abortions here have been rejected.

Despite the liberal attitude prevailing in Scandinavia, the number of illegal abortions is surprisingly high—up to 20,000 a year in Sweden.

A Swedish law of 1941 also permits sterilization for eugenic, social or moral reasons. Over the past 15 years, about 25,000 persons

have been sterilized—90 per cent on medical grounds.

#### BUCHAREST

Communist governments in Eastern Europe encourage people to have more children by paying subsidies to mothers of big families, and by providing nurseries and kindergartens where working mothers may leave their children. In Russia, for example, more than 3.5 million mothers of four or more children are drawing monthly state subsidies.

Many different kinds of contraceptives are available. So is instruction in their use by gynecologists and midwives. However, contraceptives often are of poor quality and are not produced in sufficient quantity.

Accordingly, there is widespread incentive to resort to abortion. Recognizing this, and hoping to keep down the number of abortions performed on the sly under dangerous medical conditions, most Communist governments have adopted easy abortion policies. The one exception is Rumania, where—in 1966—abortions were outlawed except for rare cases.

Except in Poland and East Germany, a fee is charged for voluntary abortions, while abortion on medical grounds is free in all countries.

The Soviet Union recently decided to begin mass manufacture of intrauterine devices, after its Health Ministry ruled against the pill as a contraceptive for health reasons.

#### CAIRO

Despite having one of the world's most serious population problems, Egypt's Government has not given birth control high priority.

And, without Government action, little can be done in this field, since the masses of people with the largest families—the peasants—do not have the knowledge or means to act on their own.

At present, both the pill and intrauterine devices are slowly being introduced. About 300,000 women are taking the pill, but this is still less than 4 per cent of the "target group"—fertile women with at least two children—that the program is trying to reach. Experts say it is unlikely that this number will ever increase very much, because of shortages in the supply of pill ingredients, and because so little is being done to promote the desirability of birth control. Use of the loop also is on a very modest scale.

Unlike the situation in Catholic countries, there is no major religious obstacle to overcome in mainly Moslem Egypt. But there are superstition and suspicion to cope with. Many Egyptians—including "intellectuals"—believe that Western emphasis on the desirability of birth control is just a plot to keep underdeveloped countries such as Egypt from becoming big countries.

#### OTTAWA

Growing use of the pill and other birth-control measures, in spite of strong laws against the sale of contraceptives and against the dissemination of birth-control information, is believed to be a major cause of Canada's declining birth rate in recent years.

The laws are generally disregarded, except in areas where the Catholic Church is strong, such as in rural parts of Quebec Province. No one has been prosecuted in Canada for the illegal sale of contraceptives since 1961.

The birth-control laws, as well as Canada's law prohibiting abortion, are being changed. New provisions of the Food and Drugs Act will permit sale and dissemination of birth-control medicines, instruments and information.

A new law on abortion will permit establishment of a "therapeutic-abortion committee" in each hospital. The committee would be empowered to approve abortions in any case where continued pregnancy "would or would be likely to endanger life or health."

## MEXICO CITY

Birth-control work in Mexico consists of training and research programs and clinics throughout a country where the population is growing at a rate of 3.5 per cent a year. Control methods are the pill, intrauterine devices, injections and the rhythm method—for those who prefer it, and their number is small.

It is estimated that 1 million women are using the pill. Results are described as highly satisfactory, with only minor side effects which decrease with use.

The programs are sponsored by private organizations. The Mexican Government, anxious to avoid conflicts with the Roman Catholic Church, is not involved.

Use of the intrauterine loop is growing, although one doctor describes it as "good for some women and not for others."

Clinics in Mexico now are working with three types of contraceptive injections—effective for one month, two months or three months. The results are reported good, especially with women who are incapable of remembering to take pills regularly.

The rate of abortion in Mexico is estimated at one for each live birth.

## RIO DE JANEIRO

Latin-American women are showing increasing determination to limit the size of their families by whatever means are available.

Abortion is the most common form of birth control, especially in the big cities, but the pill is catching up, particularly in the middle and upper income groups. Intrauterine loops are the most controversial, and the rhythm system is the most discredited.

The Brazilian Family Welfare Society estimates that 4,000 abortions a day—about 1.5 million annually—are performed in Brazil. This works out to be one abortion for three live births.

The ratio is reversed in neighboring Uruguay, where there are three abortions for each live birth. Other South American countries fall in between.

Brazil has a constitutional ban on the distribution of contraceptives or birth-control information through the mails or in public. But doctors say that family-planning clinics are allowed to operate without interference, in the hope that they will reduce the abortion rate.

The loop is widely used in Chile, where one doctor devised a low-cost loop made of nylon fishing line. The pill is described as the overwhelming favorite among Argentine women, most of whom use some form of birth control.

The Family Welfare Society in Rio de Janeiro estimates that 1.5 million Brazilian women—almost 10 per cent of the 18 million women of childbearing age—use the pill and many other contraceptives.

## TOKYO

In Asia, most countries are trying to contain populations which are increasing 3 per cent or more a year. But finding effective ways is proving difficult.

Two or three years ago, the intrauterine device was hailed as revolutionary—the cheapest, easiest way to cut the number of births to reasonable levels. Asia, with at least 2 million insertions, has become the largest market in the world for the loops.

Today, enthusiasm for the loops has waned. Results have been less than satisfactory. Some programs have been supplemented with the more expensive, more controversial pill.

Experts ask, what are the alternatives? Older contraceptive methods are unreliable. Injections and experiments with "immunization" are inadequately tested. The conclusion now being reached by leaders in family planning:

Induced abortion may be the only effective means of reducing population, particularly

in areas of the world where education standards are low and poverty is widespread.

In three Asian countries, abortion is already considered the most dependable check on spiraling populations.

Japan pioneered, legalizing the operation in 1948. Abortion by qualified doctors gets major credit for reducing the birth rate to a modest 1 per cent gain per year—one of the lowest in the world.

In two neighboring countries, abortion is illegal but widely practiced. An estimated one out of every three pregnancies in South Korea is now terminated by abortion. The cost is \$3 to \$8. In Taiwan, abortion—costing about \$6—is at least as important as the loop in curbing population growth.

Family-planning programs have been under way in Taiwan since 1964, with the aim of reducing the population growth rate from 3 to 2 per cent a year. Results of a program to insert 600,000 loops by 1970 have been mixed. Many women complain about them for one reason or another, and the retention rate is only 60 per cent after 18 months.

The Republic of Korea has had comparable experience with a program begun in 1962. Over 1 million loops have been inserted, but at least 2 out of every 10 are removed for various reasons.

Both countries are supplementing their IUD programs with pills, a more complicated and costly procedure.

## BANGKOK

In South Asia, the world's most critical area of population growth, only three countries—India, Pakistan and Singapore—have national programs aimed at controlling births. Malaysia is beginning one.

The Philippine Republic has no program, and is further inhibited because about 85 per cent of its population is Catholic and leans toward the "conservative" wing of the Church.

Thailand, a relatively underpopulated country by Asian standards, but one which is beginning to feel the pinch of population versus agricultural productivity, has no program yet. Indonesia, a nation of more than 110 million people and a high-density population in some areas, has no program worth mentioning.

Pakistan and India—both growing rapidly—have had major birth-control programs for years. But neither has made much of a dent in its birth rate.

Pakistan aims to have 5 million couples of childbearing age practicing birth control regularly by 1970. Right now, it looks as if the goal will be met. Some 2.4 million couples have begun some form of birth control: the loop, the pill or conventional contraceptives. In addition, 180,000 men and women have been sterilized.

India's program is 15 years old, but the population is nevertheless growing at a rate of about 2.5 per cent a year—and threatens to climb to 3 per cent, which could mean disaster.

At first, the loop was seen as the answer to India's control needs, but results have been disappointing. Now, sterilization is being stressed, and a "finder's fee" of \$1.33 is being offered to anyone who brings a person to a clinic for the simple operation.

## CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFENSE AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this morning at a news conference our colleague, GEORGE BROWN, spoke for myself as well as for Congressmen PHILIP BURTON, BOB ECKHARDT, DON EDWARDS, DON

FRASER, BOB KASTENMEIER, ABNER J. MIKVA, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, and WILLIAM F. RYAN in announcing the forthcoming introduction of legislation to create an Office of Defense Review, a Joint Committee on National Priorities, and a Temporary Commission on National Security.

As one of the first Members of this House to vote against military appropriation increases, GEORGE BROWN conveyed eloquently the urgency we all feel in making the Congress more responsive to the needs of his Nation and capable of reasserting a leadership role. Since his statement articulately describes the immediate events surrounding the need for structural change in Congress, I would like at this point to place his remarks in the RECORD:

## REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE BROWN

The most urgent challenge confronting Congress today is the reassertion of its constitutional function controlling the power to declare war. Over the next few days great attention will focus on Vietnam and the insanity of the tragic adventurism which seems to be our major national pursuit. Many Congressmen endorsed resolutions supporting current efforts to redirect thinking on Vietnam and overall military/foreign policy. Yet last week many of these same men stood mute when the House of Representatives went through the motions of debating and passing a military authorization bill of \$21.3 billion. During general debate the procurement bill was discussed at a rate of \$5.3 billion per hour. Efforts to cut the bill were repeatedly defeated. The military authorization bills make up 70% of Congressional control over Federal expenditures. If Congress gives up 70% of its power, it obviously is unable to bring decisive weight on other areas and programs that so desperately need support.

At a time when at least ten million Americans are victims of hunger or chronic malnutrition and at least double that number exist in substandard housing, we wonder about the order of priorities in this "most affluent nation". We see something gravely wrong when the supposed representatives of the people can devote only one and one quarter minutes to an amendment eliminating purchase of twenty-three additional planes which have serious defects and are part of an overall strategy which was rejected by many military analysts. One Congressman found that just one of these planes, the \$43 million C5A, would build four and one half schools in his district each capable of educating 1,000 people annually for 30 years.

At a time when a recent Gallup Poll indicated that a majority of American people feel that the military budget is too large, we must seriously question a Congress which approves almost exactly what the Pentagon requests. Indeed Congress tends towards extreme overgenerosity; in the House, an extra billion dollars for ship procurement was added to the original DOD request.

Who are we to be making these statements? We are men who have opposed involvement in Vietnam and S. E. Asia from its very beginning. We have consistently voted against appropriations for that war and against an escalating military budget.\*

However, votes are not control. We can no longer remain silent about the inability of Congress to assert its constitutional responsibilities.

\* 1966 Vote in Vietnam Supplemental 393-4, Brown, Burton, Conyers, Ryan voting Nay. 1967 Military Procurement bill 401-3, Brown, Edwards, Fraser voting Nay. 1968 Military Procurement bill 363-15. 1969 Military Procurement bill 311-44.

Despite the greatest outcry since World War II about the size and content of the military budget, many members have remained almost totally oblivious to the growing malaise and increasing dissent outside the insulated halls of Congress. We can no longer ignore the need for structural change which would make Congress responsible to the needs of our society and capable of providing leadership. As men in public office we bear special responsibility to address ourselves to problems of institutional failure. For these reasons we have authored these bills.

The three bills which are being introduced in the House by Representatives Mikva, Ryan, Eckhardt and in the Senate by Senators Nelson and McGovern would create three new informational and auditing bodies directly responsible to Congress rather than to the Executive Branch. They result from a meeting last March of the Congressional Conference on Military Budget and National Priorities which brought together scholars, economists, former government leaders and members of Congress to assess the fundamental nature of change in American government and to ask some basic questions about economic, political and corporate institutions.

Because of the urgency of these questions and the crucial need to link the generalities surrounding the Vietnam war and military policies to the specifics of institutional change we have published the complete deliberations of the Conference. The book titled *American Militarism 1970*, will be released tomorrow by Viking Press.

A chapter dealing with new leadership in Congress discusses the necessity for a Congressionally-responsible Office of Defense Review, for a Joint Committee on National Priorities to examine total demands on the Federal budget, and for a Temporary Commission on National Security to determine the real security components of this nation.

The need for such new structures can no longer be ignored. Last week five dissenting members of the Armed Services Committee made a responsible effort to cut or slow down programs which are exorbitantly expensive and are extremely dubious in effectiveness. The results of their efforts are important for anyone interested in the future of representative government.

The House Armed Services Committee did not furnish its printed hearings—2,666 pages in length—to the House membership until three days before debate began. With barely any time to become acquainted with the voluminous material Congressmen consistently voted on items they knew nothing about. Crucial material was either "classified" or "top secret". Arguments on weapons systems which are of critical importance in the arms race were decided on emotional arguments such as the distinguished Chairman's argument that "if we can go to the moon we can build the ABM". Debate on an amendment to cut back on the controversial air defense system was allotted 45 seconds per man. Virtually all votes on these amendments were by division or teller—a means by which no record is kept of how individual members acted.

The simple fact is that responsibility for our enormous military budget, larger than China's total GNP, results not from uniformed military but from civilian leadership. The military-industrial establishment is not a conspiracy. It is an enormous, self-perpetuating institutional organism receiving such a disproportionate amount of Federal funds that it overwhelms all opposition. Decisions on issues such as the war in Vietnam and the ABM are generated from institutional momentum rather than as a result of conscious policy. Reassertion of control over this enormous bureaucracy is certainly not the job of Congress alone. But it must start here. Congress must translate public anxieties into political understanding. It is why we are here today—to try to begin that process.

The three bills which have been introduced today by Congressmen BOB ECKHARDT, ABNER MIKVA, and WILLIAM F. RYAN with 29 cosponsors would create an Office of Defense Review, a Joint Committee on National Priorities and a Temporary Commission on National Security.

The bills are being offered in the other body by Senators GAYLORD NELSON, GEORGE MCGOVERN, WALTER F. MONDALE, and WILLIAM B. SAXBE.

#### GENESIS OF NEW PROPOSALS

The genesis of the three bills goes back to a conference on the military budget and national priorities that was held in Washington on March 28 and 29 of this year. Many Members of the House and also Members of the other body served as sponsors of the conference. Many scholars participated, eminent in the fields of political science and pure science. A consensus of the conference developed amongst the congressional sponsors. On June 1, 36 of the Members of this body and nine of the other body issued a report which outlined the problems of the military budget and offered six recommendations for reasserting control of that budget and providing congressional leadership. In attempting to implement the recommendations of that report, we undertook a comprehensive review of the need for structural change within Congress. We found that Congress itself has by inaction contributed to Executive growth, to inflation of the Defense Department and to congressional decline. I would like to include parts of that study in the RECORD:

#### RESTORING CONGRESSIONAL PREROGATIVES

It is our purpose to re-assert the function of Congress as a co-ordinate branch of the government. We believe that the intention of the Founding Fathers, when they devoted Article I to the Congress, was to establish this body at a level no less than that of the Executive or the Judicial.

Unfortunately, many signs point to the dismal fact that Congress does not today enjoy that eminence.

An acute observer of our government today is Professor Alfred deGrazia. In his monograph, "Toward a New Model of Congress," published by the American Enterprise Institute in 1966, he stated:

"It is the consensus of the men who have undertaken the present study of Congress that the institutions of American government are currently being changed in a manner that is unsatisfactory. They believe, indeed, that in the course of the very attempt to cope with the major issues of our age three additional problems have been created.

"The first of these is the danger represented by an excessive reliance for the handling of all issues on an escalating bureaucracy, consisting of huge agencies of permanent civil servants who are not made effectively responsible to the larger society. The second is the danger of the kind of militarism that arises in the course of efforts to solve the issues of foreign affairs and their related domestic aspects. The third problem results from the increase of presidential personalism: the exaltation of an office above its stated powers and the capacities of the incumbent, which poses a veritable threat of dictatorship—or whatever one may wish to call the phenomenon of the people's overly great dependence upon the magical qualities of a person occupying an outstandingly prominent office.

"Thus to the list of the major problems of our age must be added these three problems of government, which are uniquely characteristic of contemporary times. As

these problems worsen, the fate of Congress and the whole concept of the legislative way of life are thrown into jeopardy. But on the other hand, the very solution to these problems lies in the strengthening of Congress. For if Congress can be made to work well—that is, if it can be sufficiently powered, properly staffed and financed, and rationally directed—then not only will the American democratic republic continue to stand, but it will prove fully adequate to its tasks of government both now and in the future."

Dr. James A. Robinson, a notable authority on the subject of Congress, observed that "Much of the decline must be attributed to the profound change in the requirements of public policy making, and to the failure of Congress to alter its organization to cope with the new demands made upon it." Further, he says, "It is not known what Congress' primary sources of information were at the beginning of this century, but as already noted it is clear that today its primary source is the executive branch. Indeed, Congress has no independent information sources." ("Decision making in Congress" American Enterprise Institute 1966.)

Today it is commonplace for a Secretary of the Department of Defense to hand down pronouncements on U.S. foreign policy. At the same time, on matters of defense, Congressmen are expected to vote on details that they are not supposed to know about. Deliberations of the Congressional committees on defense affairs are constantly conducted in executive session, preventing public scrutiny of many defense problems. Requests to the Congress for authorization of expenditures for weapons systems contain little reference to policy. At least this is true of the committee reports that finally enlighten Congressional members in advance of their voting. Here, if anywhere, the relationship of weapons systems to policy should be plainly stated.

It is highly significant that the Executive Branch operates about 4,000 computers, many of them in the area of defense, while Congress has but one or two.

Congress should reassess the posture of our national defense and national security, and examine the several agencies and departments active in those areas. We want national priorities to be defined so that defense does not secure an irremediable first priority, monopolizing our national resources, both human and material.

There is no doubt that the three legislative proposals come at a time when many abuses, errors and shortfalls have disclosed numerous and substantial faults in the area of defense and national security.

If it appears that they take advantage of a weak moment in the history of defense in the U.S., they certainly occur during a weak period in the history of the Congress. They are intended to redress that weakness.

Reasons to question activities in the area of defense and national security are not hard to find. We will not dwell on the recent sinking of the submarine "Guitarro" at her dock in Vallejo, or the tragic landing in the Bay of Pigs, or the evident effort to cover up billions of dollars in over-spending for the C-5A transport plane, or the U.S.S. Pueblo and EC-111 plane incidents. In a recent subcommittee report on the precipitate mass production of the tank and missile system, the following observation appears, "Under such circumstances the Project Manager became more of a captive than a manager of his project. . . ." How characteristic that observation is of the widespread subordination of individual decision to the inertial force of the defense Frankenstein. This condition is deplorable enough when it occurs at the technical level of project management. Yet the condition is even more so when it touches on selection of a massive weapons system such as the FDL, fast deployment logistics vessels, which would have a great deal to do with national policy. In this case, the system was plainly chosen without any

national decision to proceed with the highly provocative national policy that the FDL vessels would have implemented.

Even at the top-most levels where the very broadest decisions of national policy are supposedly to be made, there is very little evidence that individual leaders express judgments independent of the institutions to which they are attached.

Needless to say, the diminution of individuals in the face of institutional immensity, and the paralysis of independent judgment have consequences that go far beyond the disposition of our military resources. To a great extent the totality of our national resources, both human and material, have been subordinated to military priorities. Thus the whole subject of national priorities is laid wide open.

#### TEMPORARY NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, civilian control over the military is a fundamental precept of a democracy. Yet, since World War II civilian control has eroded as American society has become increasingly militarized, and the military-industrial complex, of which President Eisenhower warned, has achieved greater and greater power.

In the belief that Congress must exercise control over military policy and use available technical and scholarly expertise in analyzing the military budget and the policies which determine our priorities, two Senators and eight Members of the House initiated the congressional conference on the military budget and national priorities which was held in Washington last March 28 and 29.

Our conference set the stage for the debates on the military budget which later occurred in both the Senate and the House. Upon the conclusion of the conference we issued a report which made a number of recommendations for restoring democratic control over the military budget. The report of the congressional sponsors and excerpts from the conference deliberations have been published in book form by the Viking Press. The title is "American Militarism 1970," and I commend it to my colleagues.

We have put certain recommendations of the conference into legislative form and have introduced three bills today intended to reassert civilian control over the military.

Today I have introduced, together with 28 of my colleagues in the House and four Members of the Senate, a bill to create a Temporary National Security Commission. Simultaneously, the same Members of Congress have introduced two other bills. One would create an Office of Defense Review. The other is a joint resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on National Priorities.

The establishment of the Temporary National Security Commission will enable Congress to assert its proper role in the determination of foreign and military policy. The post-World War II assumptions upon which our national security establishment is predicated need to be reassessed. The world has been radically transformed since the late

1940's. The Temporary National Security Commission would examine the institutional structure of the military-industrial complex, the relation between military policy and the economic interests which depend on the Military Establishment, and the economic and social impact of the military-industrial complex.

Although the United States has a greater military influence around the world than any other country, we feel insecure. While we have been powerful militarily, our prestige and our position of leadership have suffered because of our misguided intervention in Vietnam. It is time for a complete reevaluation of the foreign policy considerations upon which military decisions have been made.

This legislative package should provide Congress with the means to analyze the national security establishment and reassess the role of the military within the overall framework of national priorities. The tragic war in Vietnam and the ABM issue have awakened the American people to the imbalance in our national priorities, and they are deeply concerned about the magnitude of the military budget and the neglect of urgent domestic needs. The military-industrial complex, powerful as it is—in this fiscal year some 56 percent of controllable Federal expenditures are budgeted for it—is no longer sacrosanct. The long fight in the Senate over the ABM and other weapons systems and the serious effort in the House to amend the military procurement authorization bill, although they did not succeed, made it clear that Congress is beginning to reassert its constitutional role.

On October 15, there will be a day of moratorium to protest the continued sacrifice of life and treasure 10,000 miles from our shores in a war which has never been justified to the American people. The outpouring of citizen concern over Vietnam, the ABM, and our distorted priorities, makes it imperative that Congress bring under control the vast array of executive agencies which are responsible for our national security.

The first step is to study all aspects of national security and military policy including the agencies established in the National Security Act and subsequently. That is the purpose of the bill to set up a Temporary National Security Commission.

The Temporary National Security Commission would consist of 17 members, five Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives, who would then appoint six eminent citizens to serve with them. These should be persons of the highest professional and technical capacity, some scientifically trained in matters relevant to defense, and others who are experienced in international affairs. The Commission would include no more than a single member of any one standing committee of either the House or the Senate. A representative of the Comptroller General would be the 17th member so that his fiscal knowledge would be available to the Commission.

The Temporary National Security Commission would cease to exist at the end of the 92d Congress and make its final report before January 1, 1973.

It is expected that the Commission members must necessarily be privy to some classified material and intelligence, and the bill cautions that on sensitive matters of national security the Commission shall heed the counsel of the Director of Central Intelligence.

The Commission would be expected to make a widespread study of defense and security areas. The bill does not stipulate exactly which agencies and departments are to be encompassed, for it is wise not to handicap any investigation by prior judgment which would limit its scope. However, the bill does specifically require a study of those agencies and departments established in the National Security Act of 1947. These include the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the one-time National Security Resources Board, predecessor of the Office of Emergency Preparedness. Likewise, all components of the National Military Establishment provided in the 1947 act would be included.

The Commission would study the foregoing agencies and their activities with a view to determining—

First, what are the current national policies and objectives in the area of defense and security and, in view of such policies and objectives, whether the national interest is being properly served by the existing agencies of Government;

Second, whether existing and projected weapons systems, military installations, management procedures, and fiscal performance of such agencies conform to national policy in the area of defense;

Third, to what extent the defense establishment as an institution affects individual judgment in the making and execution of policy; and

Fourth, whether the relationships between agencies of the Federal Government responsible for procurement and suppliers of goods and services require modification.

The Commission would be required to make recommendations—including suggested legislation—to the Congress particularly with regard to the improvement of policy for national security and the effectiveness of procedures and organization in those agencies of the Federal Government which function in the area of defense.

In sum, it is our thought that no aspect of defense or national security should be overlooked.

The concept of such a temporary Commission of investigation springs from the celebrated Temporary National Economic Committee set up in 1938 under Senator O'Mahoney, which conducted a study into the concentration of economic power. The extensive reports that resulted from that investigation are still admired.

The findings of the temporary Committee of 1938-41 gave impetus to the antitrust prosecutions of that period. They generated the atmosphere for judicial decisions which achieved reforms in such areas as resale price maintenance, the basing-point system of pricing and the patent system. The Committee studied the process of corporate mergers which were dealt with in later legislation such as the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950.

We have not overlooked the fact that

the President on June 30 announced the establishment of a blue-ribbon panel to conduct a year's study of the Department of Defense. It is significant that the President perceived the need for such a study, and it should be useful to him. However, it is our considered view that Congress must be involved in any review of the Department of Defense. Congress has a constitutional duty in this area. Unfortunately, Congress has failed to exercise to the fullest extent its responsibility—a failure which has contributed to the present crisis.

The Temporary National Security Commission would be in a position to conduct a more objective and detached analysis than the President's blue-ribbon panel which is responsible directly to the President and the Secretary of Defense.

Furthermore, our proposed commission would have a more extensive mandate than the President's panel which would survey only the Department of Defense and would concentrate on such activities as organization and management, research and procurement policies and practices.

The Temporary National Security Commission would serve a broader purpose, for it would examine defense policy in relation to foreign policy objectives, military performance, and the capability and relevance of weapons systems to their purpose. All aspects of national security would be scrutinized.

Certainly Congress not only has the right to know, but it must be fully informed in the areas of national security and defense policy. This is basic. The proposed Temporary National Security Commission is a minimal instrumentality to assist Congress in this vital area of national concern.

The following is a list of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who have joined in sponsoring the bill to create a Temporary Commission on National Security:

#### LIST OF SPONSORS

##### SENATE SPONSORS

George McGovern (S. Dak.).  
Walter Mondale (Minn.).  
Gaylord Nelson (Wis.).  
William B. Saxbe (Ohio).

##### HOUSE SPONSORS

William F. Ryan (N.Y.).  
George Brown, Jr. (Calif.).  
Phillip Burton (Calif.).  
Shirley Chisholm (N.Y.).  
William L. Clay (Mo.).  
John Conyers, Jr. (Mich.).  
Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (Mich.).  
Bob Eckhardt (Tex.).  
Don Edwards (Calif.).  
Donald M. Fraser (Minn.).  
Jacob H. Gilbert (N.Y.).  
William J. Green (Pa.).  
Augustus Hawkins (Calif.).  
Henry Helstoski (N.J.).  
Robert W. Kastenmeyer (Wis.).  
Edward I. Koch (N.Y.).  
Robert L. Leggett (Calif.).  
Allard K. Lowenstein (N.Y.).  
Abner J. Mikva (Ill.).  
Patsy T. Mink (Hawaii).  
William S. Moorhead (Pa.).  
Richard L. Ottinger (N.Y.).  
Bertram L. Podell (N.Y.).  
Benjamin S. Rosenthal (N.Y.).  
James H. Scheuer (N.Y.).  
Louis Stokes (Ohio).  
Robert O. Tiernan (R.I.).  
Lester L. Wolff (N.Y.).

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the text of the bill to establish a Temporary National Security Commission:

H.R. 14323

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the immense demands upon our national resources for purposes of defense and security have become a matter of deep concern in our society and that there is evidence that institutional momentum, rather than conscious policy, governs decisions relating to defense and national security. The Congress also finds that there is increasing criticism being made of the Federal agencies responsible for national defense and security with respect to their choices of weapons systems and procurement policies and practices. The Congress further finds that the rising costs of the military and the changing international situation, as well as the factors previously mentioned, require that a complete study and review of the national defense sector be immediately undertaken as a first step toward the solution of these problems.

#### ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 2. There is established a commission to be known as the Temporary National Security Commission (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Commission").

#### DUTIES OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of all activities with respect to national security and defense, including, but not limited to, the operation of all agencies established in the National Security Act of 1947, and any legislation subsequent thereto providing for the coordination for national security or constituting the national Military Establishment, with a view to determining—

(A) what are the current national policies and objectives in the area of defense and security and, in view of such policies and objectives, whether the national interest is being properly served by the existing agencies of Government;

(B) whether existing and projected weapons systems, military installations, management procedures and fiscal performance of such agencies conform to national policy in the area of defense;

(C) to what extent the defense establishment as an institution affects individual judgment in the making and execution of policy; and

(D) whether the relationships between agencies of the Federal Government responsible for procurement and suppliers of goods and services require modification; and

(2) to make recommendations (including suggested legislation) to the Congress with respect to subjects covered in paragraph (1) particularly with regard to the improvement of policy for national security and the effectiveness of procedures and organization in those agencies of the Federal Government which function in the area of defense.

#### MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 4. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 17 members as follows:

(1) Five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party and two from the minority party.

(2) Five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party.

(3) Six individuals from private life to be appointed, with due regard given to insuring

a balance of political viewpoint, by the members of Congress appointed under paragraph (1) and (2).

(4) One representative of the General Accounting Office to be appointed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining Members to execute the functions of the Commission and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made. At no time may any one standing committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives be represented by more than one individual chosen pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2). Individuals from private life appointed under paragraph (3) shall be appointed for the life of the Commission and shall be of acknowledged eminence in fields of study or activity of national importance.

(b) COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), Members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive \$150 for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(2) A Member of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of the subsection (a) shall receive no additional compensation on account of his service on the Commission.

(3) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, Members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) QUORUM.—Nine Members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, and actions by the Commission shall be determined by a majority vote of the Members present.

(d) CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the Members of the Commission from among those Members appointed under paragraph (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(e) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its Members.

(f) Any Member of the Commission may, if unable to attend a meeting of the Commission, authorize another Member to act and vote for him in his absence.

#### STAFF OF COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) STAFF.—The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(c) SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Commission shall establish such security requirements, restrictions, and safeguards as it deems necessary in the interest of national security. The Commission may arrange with the Civil Service Commission for the conduct of such security or other personnel investigations of the Commission's employees, consultants, and contractors, actual or prospective, as it deems appropriate. If any such investigation develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject thereof is of questionable loyalty, the matter shall be referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full investigation, the results of which shall be furnished to the Commission.

#### POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may for the purpose of carrying out this Act hold such hearings, sit and

act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission may deem advisable. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) **SUBPENA POWER.**—

(1) The Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter which the Commission is empowered to investigate by section 3. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(2) If a person issued a subpoena under paragraph (1) refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contumacy, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application by the Commission) order such person to appear before the Commission to produce evidence or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(3) The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a District Court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts.

(4) All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(c) **IMMUNITY.**—No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpoena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(d) **POWERS OF MEMBERS, SUBCOMMITTEES AND AGENTS.**—When so authorized by the Commission, any Member, subcommittee, or agent of the Commission may take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(e) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Commission such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission. During the course of its investigations and deliberations, and in making its reports, findings, and recommendations, the Commission shall exercise due care to protect classified information, sensitive intelligence sources and methods, and, in this regard, shall seek the advice of the Director of Central Intelligence. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "classified information" means information which is, for reasons of national security, specifically designated by a department or agency of the United States for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution.

(f) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with qualified educational institutions, other public or private organizations or agencies, or individuals for the preparation of studies related to the Commission's duties, except that any contract entered into under this subsection shall require that the services contracted for be completed before January 1, 1973.

**AUTHORIZATION**

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

**REPORTS**

Sec. 8. Before January 1, 1971, or as soon thereafter as is practicable, the Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress preliminary reports of the studies and investigations carried on by it, together with its findings and recommendations, and shall transmit to the President and to the Congress before January 1, 1973, the final reports on the studies and investigations carried out by it pursuant to this Act, together with its final recommendations transmitted by it pursuant to this section at the time of such transmittal, except that the Commission shall withhold from the text of reports and recommendations made available to the public or transmitted to the Congress any part thereof the release of which, in the Commission's judgment, would be detrimental to national security.

**TERMINATION**

Sec. 9. The Commission shall cease to exist on December 31, 1972.

**OFFICE OF DEFENSE REVIEW  
PROPOSED**

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. **MIKVA**) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **MIKVA**. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for myself and 27 of my colleagues in the House a bill to establish an Office of Defense Review. A similar bill is being introduced in the other body. The bill is designed to meet a need which House Members of both parties have been feeling increasingly since the beginning of this year, and which was demonstrated most vividly 2 weeks ago when we considered the military procurement authorization bill for fiscal year 1970. That need is for a source of independent, technically qualified evaluation of Defense Department programs, planning and weapons systems as represented in the DOD requests presented to the Congress. It is our hope that a statutorily authorized Office of Defense Review will adequately meet that need.

**PURPOSE OF OFFICE OF DEFENSE REVIEW**

The Office of Defense Review, as contemplated in the bill we are introducing today, would be an agency of the legislative branch of Government, reporting directly to a joint congressional board, the Joint Board of Defense Review. It is envisioned as a permanent part of the congressional machinery, with permanent responsibility for evaluating for Congress the defense proposals of the Pentagon. Its responsibilities would not overlap those of the Armed Services Committees of each House, since its work would be more basic—a combination of the Bureau of the Budget in the executive branch and the General Accounting Office which now functions as the permanent investigating arm of Congress. The ODR would have specific responsibility for preparing for Congress alternative defense budget proposals, based on a range of planning assumptions about United States foreign policy and military posture. It would provide a range of choices from which Congress could select, rather than the present take-it-or-leave-it approach.

**PROVIDE INFORMATION TO CONGRESS**

One of the most important functions of the Office of Defense Review would be to furnish to interested Members of Congress a detached, objective evaluation of weapons systems proposals advanced by the Department of Defense. In this respect, it would serve as a kind of augmented legislative reference service, concentrating specifically on legislative proposals relating to the national security community and national defense policy. Hopefully, the ODR would be able to furnish to Congressmen who are not members of the Armed Services Committee enough information on Pentagon proposals—and enough in advance of the consideration of those proposals—to make intelligent evaluation and debate possible. The staff of the Office of Defense Review would be trained in much the same techniques as employees of the Pentagon's Systems Analysis Office, and would be cleared to deal with material of the highest security classification. The ODR would work not for any one Member of the House or for any one committee, but would make its services available to any Member who desired to use them.

**SCOPE OF INQUIRY AND CONCERN**

It is proposed that the scope of the ODR's inquiries and investigations would be limited not merely to evaluating the finished product of the Pentagon—its budgetary and weapons systems proposals—but would include more fundamental concerns such as strategic planning, the validity of planning assumptions, the relations of military planning assumptions to overall U.S. foreign policy goals, and the contribution of individual weapons systems to U.S. national security. These are the kinds of fundamental questions which, all too often, no individual Congressman and no committee has had the time to ask. These are the kinds of unexamined assumptions which have led to the tremendous overemphasis on defense spending at the expense of both other elements of foreign policy and our domestic social and economic programs. One of the purposes of the ODR would be to help correct this imbalance in our national priorities.

**JOINT BOARD OF DEFENSE REVIEW**

The Office of Defense Review would not be left to operate on its own and wage its own battles with the behemoth of the executive branch. It would receive both support and guidance from a joint Board composed of three Members from each House of Congress. The members of the Board would select their own Chairman and Vice Chairman, and both parties would be required to be represented among the Members from each House. One of the continuing functions of the Board would be the supervision of the operations of the Office of Defense Review. Presumably it would also make known to the Congress the need for any necessary changes in the ODR's statutory charter.

**GENESIS OF THE OFFICE OF DEFENSE REVIEW**

The idea of creating an Office of Defense Review originated in the conference on the military budget and national priorities which was held in March and was attended by Members of the House and Senate. At that conference it became

clear that the responsibilities of Members of Congress and of the existing Armed Services Committees precluded the in-depth, comprehensive review of the assumptions behind national defense programs which was a direct constitutional responsibility of the Congress. Because of the lack of searching, comprehensive investigation, many programs were being carried out which either did not serve the purposes of U.S. foreign policy or which were so expensive and contributed so little to our security that their cost was not justified. The once-a-year look which Congress was able to give these programs simply was not sufficient, it was concluded, to provide the necessary check on defense activities.

#### THE CENTRAL QUESTION OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The real arm of the Office of Defense Review is the development of a cadre of technically qualified, career civil servants who will help the Congress evaluate defense policies and programs in terms of their overall contribution to the Nation. The ODR would not become an advocate for defense programs. Rather it would act as the Congress' representative in scrutinizing and evaluating these programs in terms of their real contribution to national security. As a permanent established arm of Congress, the ODR could give a continuity and expertise to this function which is not now possible. Most important, it would provide Members of Congress with the kind of objective information which they need if they are to weigh intelligently the requirements of national security against the pressing needs here at home. By providing this information in the form of alternative budget proposals, the ODR would enable Congress to pick and choose among programs and policies, and would enable it to balance the requirements of defense spending against the priorities of education, health, environmental quality, and general welfare.

We believe that the establishment of an Office of Defense Review could bring back into focus the true purposes of this Union. We formed this alliance of States, which has long since become one Nation, not only to provide for the common defense. Equally important in the eyes of the Founders were the responsibilities to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The Office of Defense Review can help to give us the perspective and objectivity which we need to balance the demands of national defense against those other pressing national purposes.

A copy of our bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to create an Office of Defense Review  
*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that expenditures for military purposes are ever mounting and constitute a large fraction of total government outlays and, therefore, that it is greatly in the national interest that provisions for defense and national security be subject to continuous Congressional review to insure, for example, that arm's length relations prevail between defense procure-

ment agencies and suppliers of goods and services, that defense procurement costs be properly estimated in advance of commitments and reported currently, and that the performance of weapons systems and the merit of military installations be evaluated before and after procurement in order that there can be a determination as to whether they serve national policy in the area of defense and national security. To effectuate such a review, the Congress needs the assistance of an office with a continuing mission to provide reports giving independent evaluations of defense and national security matters. Such an agency could also significantly aid the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives in meeting their immense responsibilities with respect to evaluation and oversight in the area of defense.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF DEFENSE REVIEW

SEC. 2. (a) There shall be created an establishment of the Government to be known as the Office of Defense Review (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Office"), which shall be independent of the executive departments and under the control and direction of the Director of Defense Review (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Director"). The Director is authorized to adopt a seal for the Office.

(b) There shall be in the Office the Director and an Assistant Director of Defense Review (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Assistant Director"), each of whom shall be nominated by the President from a slate of candidates submitted to him under section 5(d)(4) of this Act by the Joint Board of Defense Review, and appointed by him with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Director shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Director, and during the absence or incapacity of the Director, or during a vacancy in that office, shall act as the Director.

(c) The annual compensation of the Director shall be equal to the annual compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States. The annual compensation of the Assistant Director shall be equal to that of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

(d) The Director and the Assistant Director shall be an "employee" within the meaning of such term as used in section 8331(1) of title 5, United States Code, and service performed by them shall be creditable service for all purposes of subchapter III (relating to civil service retirement) of chapter 83 of such title.

(e) The term of office of the Director and the Assistant Director shall be four years and, unless removed under subsection (f), an individual appointed to such office is not ineligible for selection under section 5(d)(4) of this Act.

(f) The Director or Assistant Director may be removed at any time by joint resolution of Congress after notice and hearing, when, in the judgment of Congress, the Director or Assistant Director has become permanently incapacitated or has been inefficient, or guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment.

#### FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE

SEC. 3. It shall be the function of the Office, under the direction of the Director—

(1) to determine whether projected weapons systems and military installations accord with national policy in the area of defense;

(2) to determine whether the actual performance of procured weapons systems and installations in the area of defense is in accord with originally declared objectives and national policy in the area of defense and national security;

(3) to prepare for the Congress a defense budget for each fiscal year which shall be independent of that prepared by the execu-

tive branch and shall be available in the course of the appropriations process in Congress, for comparison with the executive defense budget;

(4) to prepare optional defense budgets based on alternative assumptions concerning policy and weapons systems for defense and national security;

(5) to report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to other appropriate Congressional committees, and to the Joint Board of Defense Review on all of the matters listed in paragraphs (1) through (4), together with (A) recommendations for conduct of national defense and security, and (B) one summary annual report to be submitted in advance of the submittal to the Congress of the annual budget of the executive branch;

(6) to provide information to individual Members of Congress, upon request, concerning matters of defense and national security; and

(7) to recommend to the Joint Board of Defense Review improvements in the operating efficiency of executive departments of the Government in the area of defense and national security.

#### POWERS OF THE OFFICE

SEC. 4. (a) In the performance of its functions under this Act, the Office is authorized—

(1) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind and amend rules and regulations governing the manner of the operations of the Agency;

(2) subject to the civil service and classification laws, to select, appoint, employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to prescribe their authority and duties;

(3) to use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal and other agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment and facilities; and

(4) to establish such security requirements, restrictions, and safeguards as it deems necessary in the interest of national security, exercising due care to protect classified information, sensitive intelligence sources and methods, and, in this regard, shall seek the advice of the Director of Central Intelligence, and

(A) to arrange with the Civil Service Commission for the conduct of such security or other personnel investigations of the Office's employees and contractors, actual or prospective, as it deems appropriate, and

(B) if any investigation under paragraph (A) develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject thereof is of questionable loyalty, to refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation, the results of which shall be furnished to the Office.

(b) Upon the request of the Director—

(1) the head of any department or agency in the executive branch shall furnish to the Director copies of any report submitted by such department or agency to the Comptroller General of the United States if the Director deems such report to be of consequence in the area of defense and national security, and

(2) the Comptroller General of the United States shall furnish to the Director copies of analyses of expenditures prepared by the General Accounting Office with respect to any department or agency in the executive branch if the Defense Review Director deems such analyses to be of consequence in the area of defense and national security.

(c)(1) The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Director reports of all exceptions taken by the Comptroller General to the financial or other activities of any department or agency in the executive branch in the area of defense and national security, and also reports of

any settlements or conclusions reached by the Comptroller General with respect to such exceptions.

(2) The Comptroller General shall transmit to the Director copies of all reports prepared by the Comptroller General pursuant to section 283 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 103).

#### JOINT BOARD OF DEFENSE REVIEW

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Board of Defense Review (hereafter referred to in this section as the "Board") to be composed of three Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In the case of the Members appointed from each House of the Congress, the majority party shall be represented by two Members and the minority party represented by one Member.

(b) Members of the Board shall serve for terms of no longer than a total of five sessions of Congress. The Board shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Members of the Board shall receive no additional compensation on account of their service on the Board but shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses incurred while performing work as Members of the Board.

(c) A member of the Board may, when unable to attend a meeting of the Board, authorize another such member to act for him in his absence. A vacancy in the Board shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Board, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. Four members shall constitute a quorum of the Board. Decisions of the Board shall be taken by majority vote and a tie vote shall be decided according to the vote of the chairman, or, in his absence, the vice chairman.

(d) It shall be the function of the Board—

(1) to receive reports from the Director relating to his activities,

(2) to aid the Director in the interpretation of national defense policy,

(3) otherwise to counsel and advise the Director in the performance of his duties, and

(4) in the event of a vacancy in the office of Director or Assistant Director, to submit to the President the names of five individuals who, in the judgment of the Board, are qualified to hold such office.

#### JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution to create a Joint Committee on National Priorities. This resolution recognizes the intense conflicts caused by competing demands for the country's limited tax resources, and seeks a more intelligent rationalization of these conflicts by Congress.

The resolution authorizes the joint committee to suggest national objectives and the allocation of resources needed to obtain those objectives; and to suggest legislation and other governmental actions needed to better serve the Nation's priorities.

The need for such a joint committee arises from the fact that we do not have enough tax dollars to do all that we want our Government to do. Our present deficiencies in such vital areas as health, education, and transportation make clear

that we cannot fight a war in Vietnam, be profligate in military hardware build every dam that can be dreamed up, and still provide the social progress demanded of a rich and civilized Nation. The people will not stand for higher taxes, and they should not have to. The tax dollar is now a poor investment for the American taxpayer. It is our task to make it a good investment.

A Joint Committee on National Priorities would help to correct the often unintended displacement of values and national demands that now plague our government. We are now faced with such spectacles as the Executive's simultaneously cutting back research on cancer and children's diseases and spending millions for a "main battle tank" that is obsolete even if it can be made to work. Development continues on a fantastically expensive supersonic transport which will reduce the flying time from New York to Paris by a few hours; but we have not even begun to solve the problem of efficiently transporting Americans to their daily jobs. Congress appropriates tens of millions of dollars for chemical and biological weapons, but is niggardly in its funding of food programs for the hungry.

Such distortions of our national values result in large measure from our fragmented approach to governmental policies, and in particular to governmental spending. Many programs continue to be funded simply because they exist. Virtually every area of governmental spending has its constituency of bureaucrats and special interest groups.

When we do respond to a critical need, we do so by drafting new promises and new programs, not by considering a reallocation of resources. The result is illustrated by the fate of the Clean Water Restoration Act. That act recognized the crisis presented by the pollution of our Nation's lakes and rivers by municipal wastes, and sought to provide our cities with \$1 billion per year to deal with this crisis while there was still time. Congress has since found that it is very difficult to appropriate that \$1 billion without cutting back other programs of less value to the country. Rather than considering the place of clean water in our national priorities and acting accordingly, we have simply failed to come through with the money authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Establishment of a Joint Committee on National Priorities would help us make the hard decisions that are needed if we are to act according to the urgency of our needs rather than according to which needs have been around the longest or pushed the strongest. The joint committee would give us the benefit of an informed overview of national needs and national resources. It would be a valuable first step in more intelligently matching our needs and our resources.

The text of the joint resolution follows:

#### H.J. Res. 949

Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to review, and recommend changes in, national priorities and resource allocation

Whereas national objectives, to the extent that they are affected by action of the Fed-

eral Government, ought to be more clearly formulated; and

Whereas national objectives can be realized only if all competing demands for priority in the allocation of resources disposed of by the Federal Government can be reconciled on a continuing basis; and

Whereas the immense demands upon national resources for purposes of defense and national security have become a matter of deep concern in our society; and

Whereas the Congress can meet its constitutional obligation as a coordinate branch of the Government more fully if it will consider the overall relationship of the many separate legislative demands: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on National Priorities (hereafter referred to in this joint resolution as the "joint committee") to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker. Of the seven Members appointed from each house of the Congress, the majority party shall be represented by four members and the minority party shall be represented by three members. No one standing committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives may be represented by more than one Member on the joint committee at any time.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized—

(1) to suggest national objectives and, on a current and continuing basis, to examine these objectives as they are affected by actions of the Federal Government;

(2) in the light of the examinations undertaken in paragraph (1), to suggest national priorities and to recommend, on a continuing basis, the allocation of resources disposed of by the Federal Government to such national priorities;

(3) to obtain from the departments and agencies in the executive branch annual posture statements on the operations and objectives of the departments and agencies as they relate to such national priorities and to assess such statements;

(4) to suggest legislation that will contribute to the attainment of national objectives; and

(5) to recommend courses of action, based on its findings and investigations, in the national interest to departments and agencies in the executive branch, to the States and political subdivisions thereof, and to regional agencies.

(b) The joint committee shall, before the close of each calendar year, submit to the Congress a posture statement on national priorities, which shall include a proposed Federal budget of income and expenditures covering a period of not less than the five consecutive fiscal years next succeeding the calendar year in which the posture statement is submitted.

SEC. 3. (a) A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members; except that no member may serve as chairman or vice chairman for longer than one Congress.

(b) An individual is not eligible to be a member of the joint committee after such individual has served as such a member for a total of eight sessions of Congress. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, service on the joint committee for a full session of Congress or part of a session shall count as one session of service.

SEC. 4. In addition to the reports required under section 2, the members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House of Representatives on the results of the joint committee's studies and investigations, together with their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 5. In carrying out its duties, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of section 192 and 194 of title 2, United States Code, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized (1) to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government and (2) to contract with educational institutions, public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals for the conduct of research or studies with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 7. The joint committee shall establish such security requirements, restrictions and safeguards over its records as it deems necessary in the interest of national security, exercising due care to protect classified information, sensitive intelligence sources and methods, and, in this regard, shall seek the advice of the Director of Central Intelligence. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or other places as the joint committee may direct under such security safeguards as the joint committee shall determine in the interest of the common defense and security.

SEC. 8. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman.

#### REPORT ON NATO TOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to represent the United States on the biennial military tour of the NATO Assembly. For a period of 10 days I inspected NATO military installations in the company of legislators and members of parliament from several NATO countries. I found the experience to be worthwhile and most interesting. I returned with definite ideas and conclusions regarding our NATO defenses which I have reported to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS.

Because my conclusions are that we should drastically reduce our commitment of men and materiel in the defense of Europe, and in light of the current national debate regarding our military posture, I thought the substance of my report would be of interest and thought provoking to all Members of Congress. The report follows:

The Military Committee of the NATO Assembly (formerly NATO Parliamentarians) conducts a biennial tour of Allied military installations in Europe. On alternate years the tour is conducted in the United States. Its purpose is to formulate reports and recommendations for consideration of the North Atlantic Assembly. This group, an unofficial body with no statutory powers, provides an important platform for discussions between parliamentary delegates from all NATO countries. It also serves to improve liaison between the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations and the legislative bodies of NATO countries.

#### PARTICIPANTS

U.S.A.—Congressmen Paul Findley and Charles S. Gubser.

Germany—Dr. Herman Kopf and Mr. Josef Felder of the West German Bundestag.

Belgium—Mr. Paul De Viles, Mr. Andre Bricout, and Mr. Wim. P. Geldof.

Canada—Senator Alexander Hamilton McDonald and M.P.s Alastair W. Gillespie, Patrick Mahoney, and Howard E. MacEwan.

Denmark—M.P.s Adam Moeller and Kjeld Olesen.

France—Senator Auguste Billlemaz.  
Italy—Senator Giuseppe Vedovato and Deputy Luigi M. Galli.

Luxembourg—Deputy Romain Fandel.  
Norway—Storting Members Finn Moe and Lelf Kolflaath.

Netherlands—C. E. P. M. Raedts and F. J. Goedhart, members, Chamber of States-General

United Kingdom—Mr. John Peel, M.P.  
Turkey—Senator Sirri Atalay and Deputy Nurretin Ok.

#### ITINERARY

The tour assembled at Brussels on September 1 and visited Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe in the afternoon, conducting a discussion with the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe.

On September 2 we were briefed at Headquarters for Allied Forces Central Europe in Brunsum. In the afternoon we visited the NADGE programming and training center at Glons.

On September 3 we were in Frankfurt at Rhine-Main Air Base and next went to Mannheim-Seckenheim for a briefing by the Central Army Group and U.S. Army Europe.

On the morning of September 4 I briefly left the tour to witness a firing of the Sheridan-Shillelagh weapons system at Grafen-

woehr tank range. I rejoined the group for a briefing by the Central Army Group and another program sponsored by U.S. Army Europe.

September 5 found us at Munich for a continuation of the Central Army Group and U.S. Army Europe program at Oberammergau and a briefing at the school conducted by these groups in that area.

After a free day on September 6, we spent time at Labr with the First Canadian Air Division on September 7. The rest of the day was spent en route to Muenster, Germany.

On September 8 we were at Bergen-Nohne to witness a brigade-size firing demonstration which began a large exercise conducted by the German Army called "Grosser Roesselsprung".

On September 9 we were at Bergen, Norway, at Headquarters for Allied Forces Northern Europe. After a briefing and tour of the Haakomsvern Naval Base, we departed Bergen for Northolt RAF Station near London.

On September 10 we visited the Headquarters of the Western Fleet and were briefed by the Commander of the Channel Command. Following this day, I departed the tour.

#### FINDINGS

The concentrated exposure to NATO military problems for a period in excess of one week and extended discussions with military personnel of all participating nations presented an excellent perspective of the threat facing NATO forces and the requirements for meeting that threat. However, the great benefit was more political than military. Constant close association with legislators from other NATO countries gave each participant a "feel" for the political problems which will inevitably have their effect upon military policy.

It is my considered view that the threat to Free Europe from the Soviet Union has not diminished to any extent. Quite to the contrary, I believe the recent Czechoslovakian incident has underscored the determination of the Soviet Union to maintain a high and superior level of military force which can be directed against Europe. I personally believe that Russia has superior air power, armor, and a superiority in numbers of trained troops. In the event of invasion by Communist forces, Russia would possess the advantage of picking an invasion route and timing the aggression to achieve maximum surprise and inconvenience to Allied defenders. This means that the defenders must be prepared to defend against any one of several possible invasion plans. To thoroughly prepare for all eventualities would be expensive and difficult.

While I do not consider myself sufficiently competent to draw a firm military conclusion, I cannot admit to holding much confidence that present NATO forces can stand up against a determined Russian aggression.

The military organization of SHAPE is excellent. Obviously it is manned by competent officers who have developed workable plans, but what concerns me is what appears to be a serious deficiency in military materiel, equipment, and personnel required to implement those plans. When France was an active military partner of NATO, we at least had geographic depth, but today we have neither geography nor the men and equipment with which to offer a conventional response to a Soviet invasion.

One hears a great deal of the new theory called "flexible response" which has been developed as a reassuring symbol of our ability to defend Europe without France as a full-fledged NATO military partner. In theory, "flexible response" would commit conventional forces and weaponry in the degree required to meet the threat against us. This is a fine theory, but it is worthless without the men and materiel to back it up. NATO has neither.

Under such circumstances, the alternatives

which NATO commanders and leaders of NATO nations would have in the event of aggression are limited to the extremes. Since I have no confidence that the present degree of conventional commitment by NATO nations could hold against a determined aggression, the alternatives would be (1) accept the fact that Russia can overrun Europe, or (2) resort immediately to the use of tactical nuclear weapons and the grave risk of escalating an invasion of Europe into a general war.

It is obvious that if the words "flexible response" are to be more than a cliché or an idle phrase and if the alternatives are to be broadened to include more than the extremes, a much greater commitment to NATO must be made by all nations and particularly by the European nations whose countries will be at stake.

While this latter problem was not directly discussed with NATO parliamentarians, it was clear to me that most of them felt that even their present commitment to NATO was either beyond what they could afford or what the present day political climate would allow them to commit. Learning this fact has led me to the conclusions and recommendations which appear below:

#### CONCLUSION

Unless European nations and other members of the NATO alliance are willing to make commitments of men, materiel, and money to the extent necessary to make "flexible response" more than a myth, the tremendous U.S. presence and expense to the taxpayer is a waste. Frankly, for political reasons, I foresee no possibility of this happening in the immediate future.

To be sure, the United States must "show the flag" in Europe, but this can be done with an Air Force wing and far less than a division of troops. Materiel can be stored and the pipe line kept open which would allow troops to be quickly airlifted if needed. The bulk of our force in Europe should be brought home, resulting in a considerable saving to the U.S. taxpayer.

While other countries withdraw, the United States, which is already overcommitted, cannot be expected to fill the vacuum they leave. The time has come for a complete re-assessment of our NATO military policy. We must stop "whistling in the dark". We do not have an adequate defense, we will not get it until other NATO nations assume a just share of their responsibility and, without it, we are wasting our money.

I strongly recommend that a complete re-assessment of our policy in Europe be undertaken at the highest possible Congressional and Executive Branch levels.

#### COLUMBUS DAY, 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this year marked a very special commemoration of October 12, Columbus Day, the anniversary of the great Genovese navigator's landfall in our New World.

For in this year men first landed on the moon, and this has been compared with Columbus' discovery of America. In fact, in honor of the great explorer, our American astronauts—Neil Armstrong, Edwin "Buz" Aldrin and Michael Collins—named their command ship "Columbia" in tribute to the admiral of the ocean seas.

At the time when our astronauts first set foot on the moon, the dean of American historians and definitive biographer of Christopher Columbus, Adm. Samuel

Eliot Morison, commented on the validity of the comparison. He stated:

I think there is validity in the fact that as Columbus' voyage was a tremendous breakthrough in modern history, the astronauts' voyage to the moon may well prove to be a breakthrough in our history with similar and beautiful results. But of course the technique of the two voyages was so very different, you can hardly compare the two.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, one of the key differences is incomparably greater scientific and technological resources of the 20th century. If the scientists of Columbus' time had had their way, he might never have made his voyage. For, as Admiral Morison stated:

He appeared before three different scientific commissions in Portugal and Spain and they all said he couldn't do it—and the amusing thing is they were right. He was aiming at the eastern coast of China and they all said it was twice as far as he thought it was and he could never get there and back in a sailing ship. Columbus went ahead just the same, but America happened to be where he thought China was.

It is interesting to note that the space effort that made our moon voyage possible cost the United States some \$25,000 million. And contrary to popular belief, Columbus' voyage was by any standard inexpensive. It is only a popular legend that Queen Isabella of Spain had to pawn her crown jewels to raise money for Columbus. As Admiral Morison explained:

I once made a careful computation of what Columbus' first voyage cost—it was fourteen thousand dollars in gold to outfit the fleet or at least two ships of the fleet. The cost of the other one was picked up by some of Columbus' friends and their monthly payroll was sixteen hundred dollars in gold for thirty-two months. You see, that is probably what the astronaut project cost in about five minutes.

Admiral Morison also contrasted the role of the astronauts and Columbus as individuals. And in spite of the necessity for collective effort and scientific precision on the part of thousands in space exploration, he stressed his firm conviction that individuality and initiative are as important today as they were in Columbus' time.

The admiral stated:

It was Columbus who had the big idea. The astronauts didn't have the idea; they were spearheads. Nonetheless they are to be honored for their courage. I think all three young men are essentially rugged individualists. There are millions more in our country. There is an enormous future for the rugged individualist in this country and all over the world.

During Columbus' time, Admiral Morison noted, there was a gloomy religious atmosphere that pervaded the 15th century because of the imminent expectation of the day of judgment and the horrors that were to accompany it. He compared it to the general feeling of pessimism in our own time.

So the historic voyage of Columbus was a unique and a shining beacon during those difficult years. And Admiral Morison's conclusion has significant implications for us today:

Columbus had really opened up something, a breakthrough that counted—that meant that Europe was not going downhill to eventual destruction, but that there was some-

thing fresh coming up. So I hope we will feel about the astronauts and their visit to the moon. Something new and fresh and extraordinary is coming up. We are not going to allow the atomic bomb to wipe us out. I hope, pray and believe that civilization in our day will be greatly affected for the good by the astronauts' work just as civilization in the fifteen hundreds was affected by Columbus' discovery.

Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege at our celebration of Columbus Day in Newark yesterday to participate in the parade and festivities and I was particularly pleased that Capt. Robert Marasco, the courageous Green Beret officer from Bloomfield, was able to attend the ceremonies and was honored by receiving the key to the city. I include two articles from the Star-Ledger and the Evening News of October 13, 1969, which describe the occasion, in the RECORD following my remarks:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Oct. 13, 1969]

GIVEN KEY TO CITY—COLUMBUS CHEER FOR BERET

(By Barbara Kukla)

The Mets took second place in the hearts of thousands of Essex County residents who lined Newark's Broad Street yesterday for the 61st annual Columbus Day parade.

With the temperature a summerlike 79, the throngs withstood the humidity for activities which began with a wreath-laying ceremony at Washington Park before the march down the main thoroughfare.

Probably the biggest ovation of the day was for Green Beret Capt. Robert Marasco of Bloomfield, who was presented with the Key to the City.

#### GREAT HONOR

Accompanied by Rep. Peter W. Rodino, who helped to engineer his release after the alleged killing of a Vietnamese espionage agent, Marasco looked rested and happy, posing for dozens of pictures and signing autographs.

"It's a great honor to be presented the Key to the City," Marasco told the audience in front of City Hall. "I never expected it. In fact, I didn't expect to be asked to speak."

He then thanked the American people, "and especially Congressman Rodino," for the support given him.

"There hasn't been much chance to rest yet," Marasco said later. "I've had to go to Washington and am still not sure when things will slow down."

Greetings also were extended by Gov. Richard J. Hughes, Sen. Clifford Case, former Gov. Robert B. Meyner, Newark Deputy Mayor Paul Reilly and Newark Police Chief Anthony Barres.

Mayor Hugh Addonizio, who presented a Columbus Day speech in the morning at the Robert Treat Hotel, spent the day with Meyner, turning over parade duties to Reilly.

Led by Grande Marshal Edwin Albano, state medical examiner, and Anthony J. Bartolotto, general chairman, the parade marched on.

#### BANDS, FLOATS

Following the first marching contingent, the Newark Police Department, were 15 bands and 20 floats with Miss Columbus Day, Linda Gialenina of Maplewood, and Miss New Jersey, Linda Wilmer, aboard two.

Danny Hope, president of Musicians Local 16, served as master of ceremonies and said "this is the largest crowd ever in front of City Hall." His musicians had performed for two hours before the parade, a tradition which Hope began in 1927.

For Newark teen-agers in the crowd, it was a day to cheer their school bands and boo the "rivals."

"We came because our school was represented," agreed a quartet of South Side High freshmen, Vicki Gawthney, Laverne Craddock, Nita Jackson and Elaine Cooper.

A group of boys from Weequahic, who had taken the bus downtown, had other reasons (or non-reasons) for coming.

"It was just something to do," said 15-year-old Alphonso Davis. "We would have listened to the Mets, but my transistor radio is broken."

Much of the crowd, however, was more enamored with the Columbus Day spirit.

With folding chairs already set up alongside the Court Street curb an hour before parade time, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Esannason of Newark listened to the chatter of their children, intrigued more with balloons, soda and hot dogs than the official doings.

"We haven't missed a parade like this in 20 years," said Esannason. "I guess you could say it's sort of a tradition."

#### COLUMBUS TOPS TV FOR MANY

(By J. Brian Smith)

Despite the television attractions of the World Series Mets and the World Champion Jets, more than 25,000 persons turned out yesterday to witness the 60th annual Columbus Day Parade along Broad Street in Newark.

A host of New Jersey, Essex County and city officials, including former Gov. Robert B. Meyner, joined the spectators, many of them youngsters, to view some 30 floats and bands, that marched through downtown Newark during the hour-long parade.

In pre-parade ceremonies, Army Capt. Robert F. Marasco of Bloomfield, recently freed of murder charges in the Green Beret case in South Vietnam, received the key to the city of Newark from Deputy Mayor Paul Reilly.

Marasco, who was in full uniform, received a standing ovation from guests on the City Hall reviewing stand. He was acclaimed a "hero" by several speakers, including Rep. Peter Rodino Jr., D-10th Dist., who was instrumental in winning the release of the eight Green Berets who had been accused of killing a double agent.

An unusually warm October day, accented by a near-cloudless sky, enhanced the excitement of the watchers and boosted the profits of soda and hotdog vendors.

#### TALKS BY DIGNITARIES

Ceremonies in recognition of Christopher Columbus, who 477 years ago set out to find a western way to India but instead discovered the New World, got under way shortly after 1 p.m. with a series of speeches by visiting dignitaries at the reviewing stand in front of City Hall.

Even the recent publicity given reports that the honor of finding America does not really belong to Columbus did not deter Columbus, notoriety were of Italian extraction.

Meyner, a Democrat seeking the governorship again this year, took note of that fact. "Today is the day that all people of Italian ancestry can throw out their shoulders and be proud that they are part of this country," he said.

"Columbus Day pays tribute to a stream of immigrants who have come to this country since 1492," he continued, "and have contributed much, whether in science, the arts or industry."

#### RODINO HOPE

Rodino, noting that Congress recently declared Columbus Day a national holiday beginning in 1971, said he hopes the measure will bring about "a rededication in the spirit of discovery of one another."

"Columbus is the father of immigration," Rodino said, "and we hope that the national holiday in his honor will be a springboard for a greater tomorrow . . . to heal the wounds, to bind the hurts between all ethnic groups and all blacks and whites."

The parade itself, whose route stretched from Lincoln Park to Washington Park, began about 2:15.

#### TEN BANDS IN LINE

Members of the Newark Police and Fire departments, including the Police Band, took part in the march. Bands from the city's eight high schools and the 21st Air Force Band from McGuire AFB provided musical interludes between the passing cars carrying the various parade dignitaries and celebrities.

Among those traveling the parade route were Miss New Jersey, Cheryl Carter; Miss Columbus Day, Linda Gialanella of Maplewood; Anthony J. Bartolotta, the event's general chairman; Newark Police Chief Anthony Barres, the parade's chief of staff, and Dr. Edwin H. Albano, New Jersey state medical examiner, who served as the grand marshal of the parade.

#### STEPAN BANDERA, UKRAINIAN MARTYR—OCTOBER 15, 1959

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Saturday afternoon here in Washington, D.C., at the statue of the renowned Ukraine patriot, Shevchenko, the Ukrainian National Memorial Committee commemorated their martyred leader, Stepan Bandera on the 10th anniversary of his assassination carried out by the Russian Secret Police—KGB.

At the time of his death, Bandera was 50 years of age and had suffered merciless persecutions in his unswerving dedication to lead his people to freedom by throwing off the yoke of Bolshevik colonialism. His lifelong goal was to regain independence and restore the Ukraine as a self-governing nation.

The Ukrainians, like their Polish neighbors to the North, are a people with a long history of independent culture. Also like the Poles they have been repeatedly engulfed and divided by stronger neighbors. In the early 1920's Ukrainian independence was crushed by Lenin and his Bolshevik horde. The basic motivation of Ukrainian resistance to Communistic imperialism is deeply rooted in their firm adherence to Christianity and the universal desire to be self-governing and free.

Bandera's threat to the international Communists was that he was an able organizer and disseminator of the truth of the annihilation and genocidal practices perpetrated against his people and other minority groups behind the Iron Curtain.

Bandera's murder—his martyrdom—inspired the free Ukrainians worldwide in their struggle to regain self-government and free their homeland from Soviet colonialism and exploitation.

Rallying behind the ideals of their fallen hero, Ukrainians in exile are more determined than ever to perfect the organization of the Ukraine Nationalists which he led. Bandera's death led to the development of close ties and cooperation of exiles of other nationalities, always striving to regain their liberty under God.

Following the memorial service some 300 orderly, well-dressed Americans of

Ukrainian descent paraded through Washington carrying signs dramatizing the enslavement of their people at the hands of the Russians—that 5 million Ukrainians had been murdered in an artificially created famine by the Soviets to force collectivization—calling for self-government for their 40 million people behind the Iron Curtain and calling for the arrest and trial of Alexander Nikolaevich Shelepin, member of the Politburo, and the murderer of Stepan Bandera.

Mr. Speaker, it was while observing the Ukrainian protest against Soviet atrocities that I first learned that our Government will permit no pickets or demonstrations within 500 feet of the Soviet Embassy which is located at 1125 16th Street NW. The Washington police in charge of restricting the Ukrainian demonstrators advised that they could not be permitted to picket or demonstrate within view of the Soviet Embassy for fear it might be exploited as an incident and embarrass the United States.

It is bitterly distasteful to Americans to know that our national leaders, who are so concerned over the Bolsheviks' feelings, permit pickets and protesters in front of the White House, on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, even inside the Pentagon, and at every national patriotic shrine, including Arlington Cemetery.

Free speech apparently stops short of offending Soviet sensibilities.

Evidently cooperating with the theory of not hurting Soviet ego, the Washington news media, so quick to front-page every minor leftwing protest, disposed of this genuine cry for justice in two sentences on an inside page.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the "Wanted for Murder" poster on Alexander Nikolaevich Shelepin and the Soviet listings from the District of Columbia telephone directory following my remarks. It is obvious that the Soviets enjoy special benefits and privileges in Washington, D.C. I think it is only fair the American taxpayers should know the size of the Soviet bureaucracy in our Nation's Capital.

The material referred to follows:

WANTED FOR MURDER—Alexander Nikolaevich Shelepin

Age—51.

Height—6 feet.

Weight—185 pounds.

Hair—Black (balding).

Eyes—Steel Gray.

1940—Joined Communist Party and Russian Secret Police.

1952—Central Committee of Communist Party.

1954—Director of Slave Labor.

1957—Order of Lenin and Order of the Red Star—Russia's highest decorations.

1958—Chief of Russian Secret Police.

1966—Appointed to Politburo—Russia's highest authority.

1969—"Advisor" to Russia's Arab allies on "Jewish problems."

Alexander N. Shelepin is an international professional murderer.

When Shelepin was barely out of his teens, Stalin spotted his talent for sadistic killing and made him an officer in the Russian Secret Police.

He learned murder under Stalin and became an expert at it under Khrushchev.

In 1954, when he was Russia's slave labor chief, he ordered tanks to crush 500 Ukrainian women prisoners to death. They sang

as the steel treads mauled their bodies. Their "crime" was asking Shelepin to stop the inhuman treatment of slave laborers.

Krushchev was so pleased with this that he made Shelepin chief of the Russian Secret Police (KGB).

In that job, Shelepin specialized in political assassination, particularly directed against the leaders of the 45 million Ukrainians who were trying to break the shackles of Russian slavery. In 1959, he ordered the murder of Stepan Bandera, leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. This was very nearly the perfect crime. In fact, Hollywood copied the murder weapon, a poison gas pistol, in the James Bond movie, "Thunderball."

For killing Bandera, the one man Moscow was most afraid of, Shelepin was promoted to the Politburo, the most powerful group in the Soviet government.

But this was too tame an assignment. Shelepin gets restless when he isn't killing.

So a few months ago, Kosygin sent him to "advise" Russia's Arab allies.

Alexander Shelepin masterminded the savage public hangings of innocent Jews in Iraq as "spies for Israel and the United States." And he is the force behind the recent outbreaks of Arab terrorism, including the hijacking of Israel-bound airplanes.

This demonstration is sponsored by Ukrainian-Americans who think that Shelepin and his Russian masters have done enough killing.

We are here, on the tenth anniversary of Stepan Bandera's assassination, to focus attention on this sadistic killer and the Russian Bolshevik colonial system he represents.

Shelepin's murder of Bandera was an official act of the Soviet government. In passing sentence on the KGB agent who pulled the trigger of the gas gun, West Germany's Supreme Court branded the murder as having been "carried out at the explicit orders of the (Soviet Russian) government. Political murder has now . . . become an institution."

We want this and Russia's other crimes against humanity to be a matter of world record.

Shelepin's activities in the Middle East are a clear threat to world peace. And we want our ambassador to the United Nations to say so.

Will you help us?

Write to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and tell him that you want Shelepin's criminal record exposed before the General Assembly, and charges lodged against the Soviet Government at the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

The Ambassador's address is: Hon. Charles W. Yost, United States Mission to the United Nations, 799 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017.

Write today.

Let's stop this killer now.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL MEMORIAL COMMITTEE.

315 EAST 10TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10009.

[From the District of Columbia edition, Washington metropolitan area telephone directory, page 499]

Soviet Embassy—

Ofc. 1125 16th Nw----- NATl. 8-7550.

Ofc. 1125 16th Nw----- NATl. 8-8548.

Secty. to Ambassador,

1125 16th Nw----- NATl. 8-8549.

Military & Naval Attache

ofc, 2552 Belmnt, Rd. Nw ----- DEctr. 2-3741

Miltry. & Naval Attache

ofc., 2552 Belmnt. Rd., Nw ----- DE, 2-3743.

Visa & Consular Ofc., 1609

Decatr. Nw----- 882-5829.

Res. 1706 18th Nw----- AD. 2-3092.

Coml. Div. 1706 18th

Nw ----- AD. 2-2917.

Inf. 1706 18th Nw----- AD. 2-3426.

Ofc. 1706 18th Nw----- AD. 2-3756.

Soviet Life Magazine

1706 18th Nw----- AD. 2-7768.

Ofc. 1706 18th Nw----- CO. 5-2607.

Press Dept. 1115 16th

Nw ----- 347-1347.

TRANSPORTATION OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Activities of which I am a member, recently held hearings on the problems involved in the transportation of hazardous materials. These hearings focused attention on the alarming increase in accidents involving explosives, poisonous gas, and other hazardous material. The hearings provided an opportunity for Members of Congress to learn about the causes behind this increase.

As the citizens of Iowa know, there is no room for delay in taking steps at the State and Federal level to improve and correct our transportation systems where hazardous cargoes are involved. Action is needed now on the Federal level to provide the basic information to the Department of Transportation that is needed to prevent dangerous accidents and catastrophes. Action in the Congress is needed to pass safety legislation governing our railroads. A large part of our railroad system is now uncovered by any safety legislation.

Radio station KYW, of Philadelphia, recently broadcast a series of reports on the transportation of dangerous material. Reporters Kirk Gardner and Dick Standish have done an outstanding job in highlighting for their listening public the many problems involved. They point to the very excellent job that my colleague, Representative R. D. McCARTHY, of Buffalo, N.Y., has done in urging corrective legislation. I wish to commend my colleague for his good work in this field. I also wish to commend station KYW for their contribution.

I am including the KYW reports in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

TRANSPORTATION OF DANGEROUS MATERIALS

(By Kirk Gardner and Dick Standish)

PART I

When the Army announced that it intended to ship the World War I poison gas phosgene across the country, public concern over the possible danger that might result forced railroad officials to take elaborate precautions to protect against an accident. The Canadian Government felt the threat was so strong that it refused to allow the train to take a shortcut across southern Ontario. KYW News has been told that at the same time that attention was focused on that Army shipment, a private industrial shipment of phosgene gas nearly became involved in an accident in Lackawanna, New York, that could have endangered the lives of thousands of people. That report comes from Congressman Richard McCarthy who had this account of the incident:

"On August 15 of this year two carloads of phosgene by mistake ended up in a rail yard in heavily populated Lackawanna, New York, the city immediately south of Buffalo. Because of this mistake they were put on a track and allowed to just sit there. While they were sitting there a hundred and twenty-five feet away, a derailment occurred on an adjacent track. The car was thrown right off its wheels and thrust into another car on the same track that these two cars of phosgene were sitting. Now, if that had occurred a hundred and twenty-five feet the other way and the wind was blowing at 10, 15 or 20 miles an hour, well, you would have had an absolute disaster."

Both the Penn Central and the Erie Lackawanna Railroad deny any knowledge of the incident. The Lackawanna city police say they have no report of the accident. But Congressman McCarthy says he has a copy of the accident report, pictures of the wrecked cars and an eyewitness account. The importance of the incident is that along with the publicity surrounding the Army shipment, it has aroused public concern over the potential danger that may exist on every railroad and highway in the country from the daily shipments of millions of pounds of dangerous industrial material.

This is Kirk Gardner reporting.

PART II

Crete, Nebraska; Laurel, Mississippi; Dunreith, Indiana, three of the towns that have known tragedy this year. All three of them victims of the industrial age, victims of railroad accidents that involved hazardous substances that resulted in injury, widespread destruction, and death. The railroads say the sudden rise in the number of accidents this year that involved such hazardous materials is just a quirk, a coincidence, that so many should occur in so short a period of time. But many officials see the story differently. They see a grave threat posed to public safety by the daily transfer of high concentrations of tons of hazardous materials on our highways, and our railroads. Some describe it as a potential holocaust. Jim Conman of the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry is one of those who has warned of the dangers:

"There is real danger in this state to the public from the dangerous materials that are transported over our highways and on our railroads."

Governor William Reed, former Governor of Maine, with the National Transportation Safety Board has stirred federal concern in this area:

"The National Transportation Safety Board feels there isn't any doubt that there is a serious hazard existing because of the transportation of these highly toxic and flammable materials. There's no question about it. Its been borne out in a number of accidents that we've investigated so far."

In coming reports we will try to examine further the question of how much of a threat may be posed by the transportation of hazardous materials both by rail and on the highways.

This is Kirk Gardner reporting.

PART III

The people who live on part of East Broad Street in Burlington City are fifty feet from the sidings where the Penn Central stores chemical tank cars which carry vinyl chloride. The railroad maintains it can't afford to build new storage tracks elsewhere in the general area. As I walked along the rails with a couple of residents, a tank car was giving off a white mist. Our eyes burned. The men talked about what it's like living here and each week hearing of chemical disasters elsewhere in the country.

"It doesn't give you a great feeling of safety, to say the least.

"Every now and then the length of the car is mistaken by an engineer and he really rams into it and you think that's it. You think you're gonna get the same dose the other people got in the other places."

They complained poor maintenance could lead to a derailment. On one siding the rails looked warped:

"You don't need no experts to see the conditions of these tracks around here."

The man speaking stopped, reached down, and with one hand yanked up a big chunk of wooden tie. It was rotten all the way through.

In Burlington City, Dick Standish, KYW Newsradio.

## PART IV

Millions of pounds of potentially hazardous chemicals are transported each day here in the United States by rail. With the increasing rate of accidents on the railroads, many officials have become concerned that an accident in a city involving such chemicals might result in a holocaust. There were eight thousand twenty-eight accidents on the rails last year representing an increase of nearly 100% in just eight years. Derailments in particular are up 80% in three years. A spokesman for the men who work the rails each day says that in his opinion a principal cause of these accidents is bad upkeep of equipment and roadbed. Al Chesser, the United Transportation Workers Union in Washington:

"This is caused by a deferred maintenance problem of the track, the roadway, by old equipment that has not been properly inspected and allowed to operate in a bad condition which it should have been repaired before the car was ever placed back on the train, and our people have called this to the attention of management on different railroads, a car that was what we call bad ordered because of some defect and they've been instructed to take the car and operate it anyway."

Chesser and the Transportation Union have called for government action to require tighter maintenance by the railroads.

"I had said down through the years if something is not done for maintenance of these railroad tracks and the roadbeds, if there's not better inspection of the equipment and the equipment repaired when it should be, that we're gonna face disaster after disaster, and its coming to pass. Look what's happened within the last year of all these wrecks. Now I'm sorry to say but it seems to me that it has taken these accidents to wake the public up to this fact."

Chesser feels that the recent tragedies involving the release of lethal chemicals in Dunreith, Indiana; Laurel, Mississippi; and Crete, Nebraska may have finally brought Congress around to seriously consider new rail safety laws.

This is Kirk Gardner reporting.

## PART V

Congressional attention has centered recently on the issue of rail safety, in part because of a number of tragedies this year resulting from the release of hazardous chemicals after a train wreck. The rising accident rate, especially the rising rate of derailments in the past year or so, have been blamed by many observers on faulty maintenance. The railroad companies deny that charge, saying that the rise in the accident rate is more apparent than real, and results in part from increased reporting of minor accidents. Lloyd George of the Association of American Railroads:

"I think some of it is merely chance, other parts of it are probably due to weather conditions that have affected right-of-way more than usual. Now just why that should be so I don't know, but I am quite aware of the fact that since the first of the year there has been a rather marked increase in the number of derailments occurring."

The companies do not deny that many of

the materials transported through the cities of the country potentially could cause havoc if they escaped but they stress they are safe if properly handled. George points out that many of the basic materials of our complex industrial society involve potentially lethal components.

"I think that there is some danger to the public. I think it's a minimum danger considering the values to be gained by transporting these materials. It's a small risk compared to many others we take in our daily life."

Despite the opposition to government action by the railroads, many observers say that action probably will be taken in Washington soon to increase rail safety regulations.

This is Kirk Gardner reporting.

## PART VI

A number of accidents have occurred in recent months involving the release of hazardous chemicals that resulted in damage, injury and death. As a result of these accidents many public officials have called for a review of the laws covering the transportation of hazardous materials. Although the greater part of these chemicals are transported by rail, many officials say that the greatest danger exists on the highways. William Reed of the National Transportation Safety Board in Washington:

"There's no question about it. This has been one of our major concerns is that we've seen it happen that fortunately so far in relatively rural uninhabited areas. However, there's no reason to think that we will always be as lucky, that you're quite apt to . . . could happen in a large metropolitan urban area, and the destruction could be very widespread and there could be many fatalities as a result of it. There's no question that these materials are hazardous and they've amply demonstrated that they cause widespread havoc and we have to be concerned."

The problem, according to officials, is their relative inability to determine which trucks may have hazardous cargos on board, and to control the movement of those trucks. Danger on the highway is the intimacy between those trucks and the general public as well as the relatively high probability of an accident.

This is Kirk Gardner reporting.

## PART VII

Millions of pounds of potentially lethal chemicals are shipped daily here in the United States and for most people the possible threat, should something go wrong, is most intimate on the nation's highways. Although there are a great number of laws and regulations covering the transportation of hazardous materials by truck, both at the state and federal level, many officials say there is a good chance that the truckers who ignore these rules will get away with it. The problem, especially at the state level, is the inadequate number of inspectors available to properly enforce the law. In New Jersey, one of those who have continually fought for more manpower for road inspections is Jim Conman of the Department of Labor and Industry:

"There are certain laws which we make no attempt at enforcement, for example, the transportation of dangerous articles Act is not enforced by this bureau. There are other agencies in the state which may or may not enforce it, but we do not perform the function that the law gives us because we do not have the personnel to do that work."

Last year Conman's office asked for 60 men to beef up its inspection staff and were given two clerks.

This is Kirk Gardner reporting.

## PART VIII

A number of major accidents involving the release of hazardous chemicals in recent months have attracted the attention of Congress to the problems of the transportation

of such chemicals. Among those who have taken particular concern in this area is New York Congressman Richard McCarthy, who has called for new laws to regulate the safety of such shipments of lethal chemicals but McCarthy points out care must be taken not to unduly interfere with commerce:

"This is one of the biggest issues of modern society. This is the whole environmental question. I mean how can an urbanized, industrialized, overpopulated society live in harmony with nature when we are threatening our entire environment with air pollution, water pollution, the erosion of our soil and our land. Now you add this other hazard of the transportation of lethal materials through these heavily populated areas. We can't turn the clock back. After all, many of these chemicals are essential to our society as it exists. The obvious thing, you know, we have to do is to recognize the danger and apply a strict safety standard that must be adhered to."

A number of bills stiffening the rules on the transportation of hazardous materials have been introduced in Washington, and their supporters say they have a good chance for passage.

This is Kirk Gardner reporting.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for October 13, 1969, and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for October 14 through October 24, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

Mr. ADAMS, for October 14 through October 17, on account of official business.

Mr. ARENDS, for October 14 through October 22, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of October 13, 1969, on account of official business at The Hague International Peace Corps Center.

Mr. MARTIN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for October 14 through October 24, on account of official business as U.S. observer to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for week of October 13, on account of death in family.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for October 14 through October 24, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for October 14 through October 24, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FRASER, for 60 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. RYAN), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MIKVA (at the request of Mr. RYAN), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ECKHARDT (at the request of Mr. RYAN), for 15 minutes today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PODELL, for 60 minutes, tomorrow.  
Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. YATES for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, October 14.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MANN); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. HALPERN, for 1 hour, on October 14.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin to extend their remarks following the President's message today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and Mr. McCLORY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) to follow the President's message today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Utah in 10 instances.

Mr. FISH.  
Mr. BUSH.  
Mr. DELLENBACK.  
Mr. WOLD.  
Mr. PIRNIE in two instances.  
Mr. KEITH.  
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.  
Mr. GUDE.  
Mr. SCHWENGEL.  
Mr. ADAIR.  
Mr. DENNEY.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE in three instances.

Mr. SCOTT.  
Mr. HORTON in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.  
Mr. CORMAN.  
Mr. POWELL.  
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.  
Mr. BLATNIK.  
Mr. MURPHY of New York.  
Mr. HAYS in two instances.  
Mr. PHILBIN in three instances.  
Mr. HEBERT.  
Mr. VANIK in two instances.  
Mr. MINISH.  
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.  
Mr. EILBERG.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly

(at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 14, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1245. A letter from the Secretary of the Army and Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting notice of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and national forest lands at Libby Dam and Reservoir, Mont., pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 505 a and b; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1246. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of disbursements for "Contingencies, Defense," during fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90-580; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1247. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notification of an increase in excess of 15 percent in the projected cost of a construction project proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1248. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1249. A letter from the chairman, National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, transmitting a portion of the 1969-70 annual report of the council; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1250. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on U.S. policies and procedures for obtaining NATO cost sharing of military construction projects in Europe, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1251. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the review of internal audit activities in the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1252. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the Federal voting assistance program, for the period from September 1967, through September 1969, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 296, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1253. A letter from the chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1254. A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to liberalize the provisions of law governing the payment of increased disability compensation as the result of examination or hospitalization in a nongovernmental hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 13194 (Rept. No. 91-560). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13767. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for Fort Donelson National Battlefield in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9163. A bill to authorize the disposal of certain real property in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Ga., under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 91-562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13950. A bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. STUBBLEFIELD):

H.R. 14306. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:  
H.R. 14307. A bill to amend the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 to provide that the Members of Congress who represent the counties of Maryland and Virginia adjacent to the District of Columbia shall be ex officio members of the National Capital Planning Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FREY, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 14308. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, and to transfer to such Department certain programs and functions currently being carried out by other Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:  
H.R. 14309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SHIPLEY, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 14310. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that Medal of Honor winners be presented with United States and service unit flags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:  
H.R. 14311. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 14312. A bill to amend section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 14313. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 14314. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14315. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 14316. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that service performed by an individual during World War II under a war service indefinite appointment in the Post Office Department shall constitute covered employment for purposes of determining such individual's entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 14317. A bill to provide for a study of weather modification activities, for the coordination and reporting of such activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 14318. A bill to create an Office of Defense Review; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 14319. A bill to create an Office of Defense Review; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 14320. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to provide adequate financial assistance and to increase the allotment to certain States of construction grant funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 14321. A bill to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 14322. A bill to amend section 405 of title 37, United States Code, relating to cost-of-living allowances for members of the uniformed services on duty outside the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ECKHARDT,

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.R. 14323. A bill to establish a Temporary National Security Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 14324. A bill to establish a Temporary National Security Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself and Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FREY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. HALEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. McDADE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. COWGER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. POLLOCK, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 945. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of January of each year as "National Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MIZE, Mr. WATSON, Mr. SMITH of New York, CONABLE, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.J. Res. 946. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of January of each year as "National Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SCHWENDEL, and Mr. CARTER):

H.J. Res. 947. Joint Resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111 which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.J. Res. 948. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON

of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. KOCH):

H.J. Res. 949. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to review, and recommend changes in, national priorities and resource allocation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to review, and recommend changes in, national priorities and resource allocation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 404. Concurrent resolution on withdrawal from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. KING, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. FARBSTEIN):

H. Con. Res. 405. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Power Commission should render a decision in the matter of the application in project No. 23-38, Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., to erect an electric generating station in Cornwall, N.Y., no later than 90 days after passage of this concurrent resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. KING, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H. Res. 578. Resolution providing for a study and investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the procedures of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON of California:  
H.R. 14325. A bill for the relief of Wing Chong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 14326. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy M. Kapsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

287. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Association of Chairman of City, Town, and Village Assemblies in Okinawa, relative to removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

288. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to creation of a national institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

289. Also, petition of the city council, Boston, Mass., relative to ending the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

290. Also, petition of the City Council, Worcester, Mass., relative to the creation of a

"Postal Corporation"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

291. Also, petition of Walter C. Grunthal, Lone Pine, Calif., et al. relative to pensions

for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM DEMONSTRATIONS

#### HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 13, 1969

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the Vietnam moratorium demonstrations set for October 15 could be of great value to the Nation if their focus was on provoking a thoughtful discussion of the problems involved in ending this war. I would hope that this moratorium be used not merely to denounce our involvement in Vietnam, but to consider seriously some of the implications of ending that involvement. An excellent article on this point was recently published in the Christian Science Monitor. As its author, William H. Stringer, points out:

The United States is accused of blundering into the war in Vietnam. It should not blunder out.

Some of the important questions which the article raises are these: What will be the fate of middle- and low-echelon Vietnamese officials after an American withdrawal? Should provisions be made to guarantee their safety or to grant them freedom to leave South Vietnam if they wish? And what will be the impact of an American withdrawal on the rest of Southeast Asia? Will it leave Peking and Moscow free to dominate the governments of that region?

Another point that merits discussion is what effect demonstrations such as these have on the Paris peace talks. While I would not question the propriety of these expressions of opinion, I do believe that responsible critics must do some thinking about how their actions will influence the speed with which a negotiated settlement is reached.

In short, I hope that October 15 will prove to be a day of constructive discussion—a true teach-in—rather than a purely emotional demand for an immediate end to the war. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### TEACH-IN?

(By William H. Stringer)

It would be useful if the Vietnam moratorium demonstrations set for Oct. 15 were to be "teach-ins"—candid discussions—of just what can and should be done to get the miserable war over as quickly as possible. There should be something more than mere "downing tools" that day, more than just calling the war "obscene," more than advocating, as does Dr. Spock, "immediate withdrawal" without any major conditions.

The United States is accused of blundering into the war in Vietnam. It should not blunder out.

Everyone should know precisely what is

being advocated. For instance, what is to be done about those thousands of middle and low echelon Vietnamese officials who might well be murdered if the United States should quit Vietnam tomorrow? Not the Kys and Thieus, who presumably could quit the country—some top figures have bank accounts stashed away in Switzerland. But many city and village officials like those honorable citizens of Hue who were murdered for being there and being neutral, when the Communists briefly held that ancient citadel. Can guarantees be obtained from Hanoi? Would anyone wishing to leave South Vietnam be free to go? Where to?

Or what about the impact of a swift American retreat on the rest of South and Southeast Asia? Does the United States pull out of Thailand, and Laos? It is considered to be factually correct that the Indonesian leaders found courage to frustrate the bid of Peking-style communism to take over their country, thanks to the presence of the Americans in Vietnam and the British in Malaysia. It is rather useful that all of Southeast Asia is not now in the grip of a communism oriented in Peking. Would total American withdrawal aid Peking, or Moscow, or whom?

A great and responsible nation does not bug out of an area which it has penetrated, with whatever mistaken motives, without considering more than the feelings of outrage felt by some citizens.

The major culprit here, it would seem, is the government in Saigon. It hasn't by any means broadened its base, brought in neutral and civilian viewpoints, cleaned out corruption, widened its public support. President Nixon thought that his slow pace of American troop withdrawals would pressure Saigon to see the light. There are those who fault Mr. Nixon for not pacing American troop withdrawals to the pace of Hanoi's reduction of its infiltration into South Vietnam. Certainly if the President were visibly tougher on Saigon, he would win further breathing space for his peacemaking.

But what Mr. Nixon's strategy is up against is the fact that some young Americans understandably want the United States to get out of the war, totally and right now, without considering the consequences on Hanoi of the protest movement they have set in motion. Those who dealt with Communist negotiators in Korea, or in the interminable meetings which finally moved the Russians out of Austria, know that such negotiations depend on many complex factors. These include, right now at Paris, the state of American opinion.

We are told that Henry Kissinger, at the White House, argued to several young Republican congressmen—who would move to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution—that every political protest which advised Hanoi of rising American antiwar sentiment, would be one more blow to the President's hope of compelling North Vietnam to negotiate an end to the conflict.

It surely must be obvious that if the United States should set a date—such as the end of 1970—to be out of Vietnam, bag and baggage, all Hanoi has to do is sit tight and await the day. This would be about as sensible as for General Eisenhower to have advised Hitler, on D-Day, that if the Americans weren't in Paris in two months, they would quit World War II and go home.

When the students go ringing doorbells on October 15, they should bring with them estimates, as accurate as possible, of the total consequences of what they propose.

### NEW LEMINGTON DEVELOPMENT: 18-MONTH FIGHT BRINGS HOUSING

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 13, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this House the fine efforts of a group of Pittsburgh citizens, who in their own way sought a solution to our national housing shortage. Acting independently, this group built their hopes of more housing for more Americans, into reality, an 87-unit moderate-income apartment building.

Their pioneer efforts were undertaken at great personal sacrifice as well as financial risk.

Their efforts and results are described in the following article which appeared in the October 6 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

#### NEW LEMINGTON DEVELOPMENT: 18-MONTH FIGHT BRINGS HOUSING

(By Bohdan Hodiak)

A group of civic-minded Pittsburgh residents closed a \$1.7 million deal with federal officials last week for an 87-apartment housing development in Lemington Heights, in the Lincoln Avenue-Lemington District of the 12th Ward.

The non-profit, moderate-income development took 18 months to arrange.

It was suggested and nursed by David Horwitz, a McKees Rocks optometrist who lives in Squirrel Hill and describes himself as "an absolute and complete amateur" in housing.

#### NEARLY CANCELED

To pass safely through the bureaucratic meat grinder took several thousand hours of work, the risk of thousands of dollars, and the help of a congressman and two U.S. senators, he said.

Even then the project was nearly canceled several times.

The local Federal Housing Authority (FHA) originally turned it down, the land purchase option ran out, there was not enough money, the contractor had second thoughts about taking on the project, and all the experts said, "We told you it couldn't be done."

It started in March 1968 at a meeting of the United Jewish Congress (UJC) in Squirrel Hill. "Everybody says the city needs housing," said Dr. Horwitz of 6316 Bartlett St.

"Why can't we form a corporation, get an FHA guarantee, and build some homes?"

#### AGREED TO HELP

Three men at the meeting agreed to help: Daniel Berger, an attorney, Jacob J. Gzesh, an architect, and William Behrend, a realtor, who said he knew of 6.5 acres of land that might be suitable. The UJC voted its approval.

The Metropolitan Pittsburgh Non-Profit Housing Corporation was organized with Horwitz as president; I. Martin Wekselman, an attorney, as vice president; Alma Fox of NAACP as executive secretary; and the Rev. David Malone, former pastor of the Lemington Presbyterian Church, as members.