

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD
COMMENDED

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the recent commissioning ceremonies for the Portsmouth-built nuclear attack submarine *Grayling*—SSN646—Rear Adm. Walter F. Schlech, Jr., commended the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard's skilled craftsmen. Admiral Schlech told the assembled audience:

The skilled efforts of the people here at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard have earned the Navy's confidence over the years. This Yard is a credit to the Navy and to this Nation. I take great pleasure, Captain Kern, in expressing for the Navy, to you and to your associates, my heartiest well done.

Admiral Schlech also said:

The building of a ship and its crew is a very delicate operation. This amalgam requires that both be ready for sea at the same time, and that each must be intimately familiar with the other. The officers and men of *Grayling* have completed the best submarine schooling in the world. Only the best—the cream—have made it here. I am pleased to single out the pre-commissioning accomplishments of the officers and men of *Grayling* in preparing this ship for its Naval role.

Nowhere in the Navy is the pre-commissioning inspection procedure more rigorous and demanding than when working toward the final 'thumbs up' on a submarine. Commander Baron, you and your men of *Grayling* can take great pride in achieving today's payoff.

The commissioning of USS *Grayling* provides an opportunity which I welcome to return here . . . twenty-five years ago I married my lovely wife right here in the Chapel. So my memories of Portsmouth are forever dear and personal.

This Yard has built ships for the old Navy, for today's Navy and now, in the *Grayling*, Portsmouth Yard builds for the Navy of the future.

I sailed on Portsmouth's ships of old. My second submarine was the Portsmouth-built *Halibut*. I joined her here in early 1942 as her Engineering Officer and served her later as Executive Officer. While I was aboard, she completed five war patrols in the Northern Pacific and she brought me back safely each time.

As commander of a submarine division, of two submarine squadrons and of Submarine Flotilla Six at Charleston, I have had many Portsmouth-built vessels under my command, and they performed with distinction.

The name *Grayling* has appeared on Navy subs since early in this century. The first in this series was Hull number SS18. The second and third *Graylings* were not submarines but patrol boats . . . While I was training for my own submariner's rating in 1940 and 1941, the fourth *Grayling* was under construction here in Portsmouth Yard.

She was commissioned in March 1941. On December 7, 1941, she was in port in San Diego, and sailed 10 days later for Pearl Harbor. On December 31, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz raised his Flag on *Grayling* as Commander, Pacific Fleet, and symbolically there began the Navy's long

fighting road back to victory at sea in the Pacific.

In April of 1942 *Grayling* drew her first blood and sank a 6,000 ton Japanese cargo ship—the twenty-eighth ship sunk in the Pacific in that war. She sank three more ships on patrols during the following year, while taking part in an extraordinary amount of action at sea in support of the American movement westward across the Pacific. She began her eighth Pacific patrol in July 1943, delivering supplies to guerrilla forces in the Philippines. She was not heard from after September 9, and was declared "lost with all hands" September 30, 1943.

The Commander of that *Grayling*, Lieut. Commander Robert M. Brinker, went down with his ship. He and his men gave their lives in the best tradition of the Naval service, in the heat of combat, in defense of their country. Mrs. Lee Cullen, daughter of that gallant officer, sponsored this new *Grayling* when this namesake of her father's ship was launched at Portsmouth in June 1967. I am pleased that Mrs. Cullen is with us now for the commissioning of this namesake of her father's gallant ship. Today *Grayling* rejoins the Fleet under command of Commander Charles R. Baron.

Grayling in World War II was among a relatively small group of submarines in the Pacific area which broke the back of a determined enemy.

More than 2,000 merchant ships, comprising almost eight million tons of shipping, were lost by the enemy in the Pacific. Sixty per cent of that loss was accounted for by this Submarine Force . . . which General Tojo later described as one of the main factors that brought final victory to the United States.

Our submarine history is one of brilliance—forged by the Navy men who operate such ships and by the technicians who have designed and built them. The present day brand of submarines and submarine builders have written a new book in the business of going to sea underwater.

In the years since the first *Grayling* joined the Fleet, submarines have leaped the technological barriers into the realm of the true submersible: the submarine which is at home in the undersea environment as much as the fish that dwell in the deep. These developments are exciting, especially when one considers the time frame in which they have been achieved, and the promise which such an advancing rate of development holds for us in the future.

From my own experience as one-time Commander of the Submarine School, I frequently point out to audiences the very technical and highly specialized nature of Naval ships, equipment and operation epitomized by the submarine . . . and the commensurate need to have so many good, qualified people to man them. The modern submarine is a prime example of how technically advanced a weapons system can become. Building such a system, as this Yard does, is a high achievement. The officers and men who operate these systems make an effective contribution to the security of this Nation which I feel is beyond compare.

The commissioning is only the beginning. Now you prepare for further tests of *Grayling's* material condition and operational readiness. I know these challenges are not easy ones, but the Navy is confident of your abilities to assure excellence in handling the complexities of modern submarine operation.

At the Annual Fleet Reserve Association meeting last month, the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John H. Chafee, talked

of a better "quality Navy." He said that the Navy of the future would be smaller in numbers of men and ships, but of even higher quality than we have today. Firm, outspoken leadership is important to all of us in the Navy, as it is to the Nation, for we have tough competition from abroad. The Soviet Navy is ambitious to become the best Navy afloat, and is working very hard to achieve that goal. If we were in the automobile rental business, perhaps we could accept being number two. In this business number two becomes zero. Our Nation and our Navy can't tolerate that. Our future security depends on the vitality and the strength of American seapower.

The *Grayling* is a game fish, even though of the fresh water species. This submarine *Grayling* is a fighter. The strong character of the ship's namesake will be the present and future trademark for those submariners who man *Grayling*.

You are a new ship in a new era. I would like to wish you smooth sailing, good luck and God bless you all.

TRIBUTE TO DOC

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, September 5, 1969, Frank Christian "Doc" Jensen of Boulder City, Nev., officially retired from his position as first aid attendant on the Boulder Canyon project. This was the massive construction project of the famous Hoover Dam near Las Vegas, Nev., on the Colorado River. Since 1932, Doc dedicated himself to this arduous task, first with Six Companies, Inc., and later with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

The son of Danish immigrants, Frank, or Doc as he later became affectionately known, at first sought a clerical career, attending Norwegian-Danish Theological Seminary in Minneosta. He also worked in the grain fields in the farming season and learned the newspaper trade inside and out. He devoted himself finally to the field of medicine, and attended medical school until the economic strain of the depression years forced him on the road again, a road which lead to the Boulder Canyon project. His enlistment there was the beginning of the longest career held by any one man on this project. As he recounted in his diary, he worked a 24-hour day, and a 6½-day week for the duration of his active career.

During World War II and the Korean war, Doc served Uncle Sam as an assistant flight surgeon, and received a citation from the Secretary of the Navy James A. Forrestal. A naval Reservist until 1965, Doc Jensen constantly enrolled himself in Navy correspondence courses, completing his service commitment with the highest cumulative scores of any man ever so enrolled.

A highly civic-minded man, Doc is a member of the Knights of Pythias, the

Elks, the Odd Fellows, and the American Legion. He has taught first aid to Boy Scouts and Sea Scouts. At last count, he had earned two 1,000-hour pins for volunteer duty at the Boulder City Hospital, and served on the Boulder City Hospital board for 2 years.

This year marks his retirement from the official rolls of Boulder Canyon project personnel. But Doc will continue to serve the people of Nevada, in his dedicated manner.

CONGRESS NEGLECTING PROBLEMS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 17, 1969]

PRESIDENT ASKS ACTION—CONGRESS NEGLECTING PROBLEMS

During his inaugural address nine months ago, President Nixon urged people of the United States of America to lower their voices so they could hear each other better.

Showing remarkable restraint more recently, the President followed his own advice when he asked Congress to accelerate action on executive legislative proposals.

It would have been easy for the President to pursue the same formula that was employed by President Truman—who won reelection in 1948 partially by campaigning against a "do-nothing" Congress.

But President Nixon chose not to follow this path. Instead he appealed to Congress with candor and calmness. In doing so, the President showed that his primary concern is for the welfare of the nation rather than the narrow matter of the 1970 congressional elections.

As President Nixon aptly noted, the majority of the people of the United States are more interested in positive accomplishments than in political posturing.

At the same time he would have been remiss not to note that this Congress has really little to show for nine months of session.

Only one of the major appropriations measures has been passed. And Congress has increased its own salaries substantially.

But the people of the United States have far deeper concerns.

A raging inflation has yet to be quenched. The crime rate is rising, pornography is flooding the malls, the post office is inefficient, selective service hangs over the heads of young men for half a decade, welfare costs are almost out of sight and schools are wondering where their next dollar is coming from.

The lethargy of Congress has failed to speak to these problems. It also has created new problems for all three branches of government.

At the Supreme Court the calendar has been adjusted to slow the pace because Congress has yet to confirm the court's ninth member.

The chief executive can hardly be charged with inaction when he does not know how much money he will have, what the congressional limitations will be on his programs, or even what he can plan on in the way of foreign aid. He is trying to run a government household without the assurance of a paycheck.

And because so much time has already been wasted, Congress will now either face a logjam as it approaches adjournment, or it will have to establish a set of rigid priorities to meet the obvious needs. To assure cogent legislation we recommended the latter.

For the welfare of the nation, Congress should accept the President's challenge for mutual action. That is the best kind of politics.

CLEVELAND WILL MISS BILL GORDON

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland is losing one of its most talented entertainers and Clevelanders are losing a good friend as Bill Gordon prepares to leave our city and go west. I have known Bill over the years as a dynamic and unique personality and I join with his thousands of other fans in saying that he will be missed on the airwaves. May he fare well in all his future endeavors. His own goodbye to Cleveland was eloquently spoken in an article in last Sunday's Plain Dealer, which follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Oct. 19, 1969]

THANKS FOR THE MEMORIES AND GOODBYE—STAY SMOOCHIE

Fare thee well! It is difficult to say when you really mean it. Today, due to over-usage, phrases and words drift through the air having neither substance nor meaning. "Good night," "good morning," "how are you?" and "good to see you" are empty sounds that pass among ourselves without carrying thoughts. For once, however, the meaning should be received as it is sent—fare thee well.

All too sadly, I am leaving Cleveland and truly wish each of you well. Read this and know it to be a note of appreciation to all the wonderful people who have been so kind, so good, so friendly to me.

When I returned last year and the Mayor proclaimed "Bill Gordon Day" in an official proclamation, I felt proud, very proud and happy and now, as I leave, I must thank you all in return.

I am moving west to Southern California and I am going to try to find a medium that hasn't heard of "format" or "middle of the road" or "hard rock" or "top 40." I am looking for a station that wants an individual—me, Bill Gordon. I'm the Bill Gordon who enjoys being on the air and communicating in the truest sense of the word with you, the listener. A personal type of broadcasting with an individual who is recognizable and distinctive.

I have no quarrel with the automated radio that seems to be creeping into our lives if that is what you want. I think, however, that almost anyone can read a cue card and say, "the time is now 8 o'clock and here's another great record from our new-oldies stack" or "with the ole thermometer at 56 degrees, we'll listen to the Deviated Septums singing 'Ain't Lake Erie eerie'."

I really don't want to leave. I have so many, many friends here but, sadly, the radio and TV media seem to be copying one another in blind homage to surveys. The absentee owners of the stations are concerned less with the sound and more with the ratings. They equate loose surveys with sales proceeds. This is so wrong. A strong,

single, individual effort is neither needed nor required.

Local managers look to the overall sound or, if you will, "Image" as reflective of the entire station during all broadcast hours. These formats are so similar that you—the consumer, the buyer, the listener—often cannot tell to which station you are listening. This is the numbers game that is now being played. When the numbers turn up against the local management, they find shelter in explaining that the format is being followed and, if it is not making money, it isn't their fault. And so it goes. And so go I.

I am grateful that I am being permitted to say goodbye in this way. I have so many wonderful letters on my desk and I'll never have the ability to answer—the wonderful lady who sent me a check and asked me to use the money to stay in Cleveland a little longer. The check returned—the thought retained. I want to thank all of you who remember "Stay Smoochie," "Has he gone yet?", "Apartment 13," "Dorothy and Bill" and "I'm not crazy, I'm listening to Bill Gordon." I will miss you, Cleveland.

I will miss being greeted and greeting all of you up and down Euclid Avenue and wherever we go. There is so much greatness here, more in Cleveland than the Orchestra, the Museum, the Browns, the Indians and the Terminal. As my friend George Condon noted in his book "Cleveland, the Best Kept Secret," it is obvious that there is potential for getting out of the rut we are in. This is a town of individual people. Why is it that we are on dead center and things are not progressing?

Everyone has the idea of how to solve it, but somehow the thought does not become deed. A strip of trees down the wide expanse of Superior—do it! The inflammable river should be cleansed—be it by City, State or Federal authority—do it! Stop the refuse from accumulating on the streets! Revitalize downtown! Don't fall into the format rut! Reach up and reach out and dare to do something because you know it is right. Don't listen to those who say it can't be done, or say it has never been done before. Format—status quo—death!

I only wish that I could have found a medium here and remained. I have been looking and searching and finally old Smoochie has had it. I'm not leaving Cleveland for greener pastures in California, for I have nothing of any substance out there. Yes, it will be warm and yes, it will be pretty, but I know I will miss each one of you, and I will think of you and thank you all for listening to me over all the years passed.

It has been wonderful for me and I appreciate it. Without sounding maudlin and just because it's true, thank you, thank you, thank you for the good years, the good times and the good memories that we have had together. Fare each of thee well! Stay Smoochie.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe all those interested in postal reform will agree with the Sheboygan Press in their editorial of October 14, 1969, entitled "Postal Plan Rebuffed." I think the Press continues to reflect the sentiment of Sixth District residents on this important issue, and I

include the text of their editorial as part of my remarks, as follows:

POSTAL PLAN REBUFFED

Sad to relate, it appears that the U.S. Postal Department is due to struggle through another year with the usual complaints about poor service and the ever-present deficit at the close of the fiscal year. For the House Post Office Committee in a 13 to 13 tie vote, failed to endorse President Nixon's request for a semi-independent postal corporation. Instead the committee favors some revision of the present system in the form of an alternate plan by Chairman Thaddeus Dulski, D-N.Y., to reshuffle the Post Office Department in its present framework.

But judging from past performances, we are not too optimistic about that kind of an arrangement. As years went by, new postmaster generals have come, each with a new broom to sweep out the inefficiencies of the present system, but none has succeeded.

Postmaster General Winston M. Blount said that Dulski's bill was inadequate. "I am concerned that some members of the committee continue to ignore the will of the overwhelming majority of voters in their own districts, as demonstrated in poll after poll," he said.

However, all hope for the Nixon proposal is not gone. Said Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Ariz., "This was certainly not a victory for the corporation concept, but I don't think you can write the death certificate yet." Also, President Nixon lists the corporation plan as one of his major legislative targets, and its backers insist it remain alive.

The present system having failed so consistently in the past, we believe the time has come to try something new. For that reason we hope that President Nixon persists in his proposal, as he apparently intends to do.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as October 19-25, 1969, will be recognized as National Business Women's Week, I think it particularly timely that the activities and achievements of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., be acknowledged.

With over 180,000 members living in every congressional district in the United States, women of the national federation have continually distinguished themselves and their organization in a broad manner of ways.

For the past 50 years, members of this outstanding organization have maintained an informed awareness on all manner of legislation. We have all benefited from their timely responses to indicated needs of the future, responses which have been representative of the sort of citizenship that has made our country strong.

This moment in time—today—is a critical period for all of us. It is one of those periods calling for leadership with the ability to motivate and unify us even stronger in behalf of our country. Such leadership is represented in the membership of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

Its members are among us everywhere

today. They are women possessing the capabilities required to deal with the complex and urgent circumstances of these times.

As we salute National Business Women's Week, let us similarly applaud the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. Their search for truth in these times of vast paradox and change, has been a notable one.

ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEY-CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS, INC.

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, there is meeting, in Boston, at this time, a very important group of professional people—members of the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc., gathered at its annual convention to exchange ideas, thoughts, and information and to further the interests of the two professions in which each is licensed: law and accountancy.

The important stature of this association is clearly shown by the presence at the convention, as keynote speaker, of Morris B. Abram, president of Brandeis University, and by the participation of three other distinguished individuals in the convention's educational seminar, Prof. John F. Sutton, Jr., of the University of Texas, Dr. Paul Vatter, Harvard professor, and Andrew Barr, chief accountant of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

It happens that this convention also commemorates the fifth anniversary of the founding of the organization, which was created in October 1964, to safeguard and advance the professional interests of all men and women in the United States who are qualified and licensed both as attorneys and certified public accountants; to protect the right of the public to select individuals so qualified if they choose; to advance the professions of law and accountancy; to promote and maintain and to guide members in observing the highest professional and ethical standards in service to clients, and the public at large where so required; and to aid the public in general and the members of the legal and accounting professions in particular by publication and dissemination of discussions of technical problems which the members of the association may be particularly well qualified to discuss. Because there are in all of the 50 States fewer than 3,000 people who fulfill both qualifications, they constitute a group of individuals who are recognized as highly skilled and competent in their chosen fields.

That the association, in its relatively short history, has been successful in accomplishing one of its prime objectives can be demonstrated by its collaboration during the development stage of the new code of professional responsibility, in working with the American Bar Association

in the formulation of the rules with respect to the dual practice of law and accountancy. A committee of the ABA had previously issued opinions that no attorney could hold himself out as also being a certified public accountant, which has been interpreted by some State and local bar associations as a denial of the individual's right to claim both licenses, even though he had earned them. The new code of professional responsibility of the American Bar Association, however, does not specify accountancy by name, but recognizes the right of an attorney to engage in another profession or business, asking only that he observe certain rules concerning letterheads, business cards, door signs, and listings.

This was a major victory for the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc., and the American public, but the association's work is only commencing.

At this convention, the members will be charged with the responsibility of expanding their public service program, of seeking new ways in which they can utilize their combined and unique talents in behalf of the American people.

In addition to the ethical considerations, the association has made progress in other areas. The national organization is comprised of 14 regional associations covering 15 States and the District of Columbia, and there are members in practically every State of the Union. Many of these regional associations have already organized public service programs, such as serving on State tax boards, assisting minority business enterprises, and serving as arbitrator for the American Arbitration Association. The organization is presently voting to create scholarship programs at the Nation's leading universities to involve young law students in accounting, and vice versa, and has already made a grant to one such university.

More time will be devoted to programs involving the public welfare. Also, the association is stepping up its professional and intellectual development programs through forums, publications, and seminars in order that its members may better serve the people of this country.

Becoming a member of the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants is not an easy task. An individual must be licensed to practice not only as an attorney but also as a certified public accountant. When one considers what is involved in achieving both of these licenses—the long hours of study, training, and apprenticeship, and diligent dedication to two disciplined and important professions—it is a wonder that as many as 3,000 have achieved the goal. It is a truly dedicated individual who strives and completes all that is required to acquire both skills.

It is in this light that I offer congratulations to the members of the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc., on the occasion of its fifth anniversary. The American public indeed is indebted to these individuals for their service to the Nation, and we all join in wishing the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc., a long, useful, and successful life.

RURAL AMERICA STANDS UP FOR PEACE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 a broad spectrum of America stood up for a new policy in Southeast Asia.

Political and news commentators have noted the involvement of the poor, the well-to-do, the disenfranchised, the men who once held power and the men who currently hold power. But no one has noticed or spoken about the feelings engendered by the moratorium in rural America.

Rural America was involved on October 15. The Vietnam moratorium involved small towns across America like Meridian, Calif., in my congressional district. With a population of 400, the people of Meridian decided to add their small voice to the voices being heard from the big cities and many campuses. The people of Meridian circulated a petition calling for an immediate and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam by the end of 1970.

It is refreshing to see Meridian, Calif., stand up and be counted among those desiring peace, even though the ambitious timetable would be difficult to achieve. It was refreshing to see students nonviolently protesting on October 15 on their views toward peace balancing BARRY GOLDWATER before the National Convention of Old Crows last night pleading to end the war by bombing the dikes and the railroad lines in Hanoi. I believe that peaceful protest solution by the students, the middle aged and the folk of rural America is more reflective of majority national opinion than the nationally defeated Senator GOLDWATER. The Meridian petition follows:

OCTOBER 15, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: It is our purpose to bring to your attention the deep concern over the Vietnam conflict that has spread to all facets of American life.

Meridian is a small community about sixty miles north of Sacramento. On October 15, which was nationally designated as Vietnam Moratorium Day, we circulated a petition which called for a complete and immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. Enclosed is this petition.

It must be hard for you to realize the importance of a petition, that, compared to others you have received, seems to contain very few signatures. You must take into consideration, however, that the total population of the town, is only 400.

Voices have been heard from the big cities and many campuses, while rural America has remained virtually silent. We realize we have no one but ourselves to blame for this silence. As members of one such community, we have shouldered the responsibility of arousing our town in hopes it will spur other silent towns into decisive action.

It is our sincere hopes, that our hard work and dedication in the interest of rural America will not be ignored.

Our government was originally designed with the idea that through the voices of the people, the majority would be heard. If these conditions exist, the obvious outcome is

withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam by a reasonable date—December, 1970.

Sincerely,

LINDA WILLIAMS,
HILA NEWTON.

MERIDIAN, CALIF.

We, the below signed, feel the fighting in Vietnam to be immoral and unjust and call for an immediate and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops.

Hila Newton, Linda Williams, Linette Lynch, Florence Brown, Gloria Reische, Sally A. Bisby, Joyce Upton, Glenda Dornan, Mabel Phillips, E. Imfress, E. C. Webb, Fred Nigsch, T. J. Pague, Doris E. Lynch, Isabell Fleharty, Ira Nichols.

Mildred Briscoe, Maxine Longwill, Randy Longwill, Mamie Bielar, Mary Self, Chet Self, Thelma Coleman, Judie Gillespie, Pauline Phillips, Carolyn Crumby, Ron Banning, Cornelia Nichols, Linda Lomis, Fred Ray, Violet Shipp, Norman M. Sanorn, Ellen Parrish, Louise Rohleder, Gordon Rohleder, Jane Olivera, Terry Fleschman, Mrs. Fred Heitman, Harold O. Reische, Jeanette Reische, Marilyn Reische, Nolan Said, Patricia Said, Beverly Christensen, Andy Christensen, Marilyn Ette, Daryl Ette, Diane Tarke, Anna Tarke, Richard Tarke, Elaine Tarke, Leo Carothers, Frances Hensen, Thomas Hensen.

THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE: A SERVICE FOR THE JUNK MAILER

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I was very disturbed by a news item which appeared in today's Washington Post reporting:

The Internal Revenue Service is considering changing its rules to allow direct mail advertisers to pinpoint the neighborhoods they want to send their mail to—the rich, the poor, or the middle class.

This could be done by furnishing complete zip code numbers from the IRS' published income tax data.

The IRS data is sold to anyone who wants to pay the cost.

It is true that this IRS data can be a very useful aid to State and local governments in the formulation of public policy. I object, however, to this information being compiled for the use of advertisers seeking to fill our mailboxes with unsolicited advertisements and junk mail. Confidential economic data compiled by the Government is being distributed to profitmaking groups so that they may pinpoint prime markets. The distribution of this economic data for private purposes is, in a very real sense, a violation of privacy of the individual resident and the communities within the zip code area.

Further, these "mailing lists" will be sold at a price intended to cover the cost of compiling them to the Internal Revenue Service—but will it even begin to cover the cost to the Post Office of increased junk mail and magazines? It is my understanding that publishers' mail, largely magazines, currently carried under second-class mail are subsidized

to the tune of approximately \$267.1 million per year.

It is my hope that the IRS will carefully reconsider this plan and abandon it in the public interest.

IN DEFENSE OF BLACK STUDIES

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important statements I have read is contained in the paper I wish to introduce into the Record. It is important because it drives to the very heart of the domestic crisis that confronts this Nation today. It is that black Americans do not demand handouts of bread, but equitable distribution of power. They are powerless in a society that respects only power.

Make no mistake about it, they are out to change that society, once they have achieved an equity in power. They will not rest until it respects other values, such as the dignity of human life, and the brotherhood of man, goals not very disparate from those inscribed in this Nation's Declaration of Independence.

I do not mean to imply that this Nation should scrap its distribution of food stamps or its programs for open housing, equal opportunity, and improvement of schools, for until black Americans have power over their own lives, they will never be able to provide these for themselves, and it will remain incumbent on the powerful to assure these protections for the powerless. Non-black America should remember, however, that without a sincere and equitable redistribution of power, these other programs total up to paternalism that does not erase the oppression of racism.

In the face of demands for power, the powerful have responded with their usual tokenism. It has become patently clear that its power is the one thing white America is most reluctant to share. It has consistently refused to accept the fact that this is at the root of the turmoil. For where is the confrontation over power most visible but on the white campuses, where white America learns how to build and use its power, where black America wants in, and where white America refuses most vehemently to yield? The outcry of white America is loudest over black student demands for studies that are relevant to the experience of being black in white America. At last, white and black America have joined the central issue.

It is for that reason that this paper should be studied by my colleagues. Its author, Dr. James Allen Moss, is an eminent educator who is serving as chairman of the Select Committee on Equal Opportunity at the State University of New York at Buffalo. In a dispassionate but clear voice he states the case for black studies and the demands by black students that they be allowed to build black communities at the white citadels of

learning. Without black community, they remain socially ostracized and their chances of relevant black experience—the phrase most often heard in all of the angry discourse over black studies—is destroyed. If their just demands are not met, our Nation's traditional white education will continue what it has always done, turning black students into whitened sepulchers to assure the stability of the status quo and deny black Americans the opportunity ever to exercise power over their own lives.

As Mr. Moss points out, today's black students are not seeking a return to segregation, nor are they seeking to destroy the quality of education. They ask only to expand that education so that it might provide them an understanding of their roles as black Americans, not the roles that have been defined by white America, but roles they themselves define, as masters of their own destinies, in the best traditions of democracy.

The paper previously mentioned, follows:

IN DEFENSE OF BLACK STUDIES
(By James Allen Moss)

Not since Stokely Carmichael issued his call for Black Power some three years ago, have the Black Establishment and White liberals been so up in arms as they are today. Only today, the issue is not Black Power, but Black Studies programs and Black militant action on the campuses of American colleges and universities. It is striking, however, that the anxiety and concern currently expressed over Black Studies programs does not extend to predominantly Negro colleges. Student demonstrations, regardless of how serious or minor at Cheyney State College, Bowie State, Howard University, Tuskegee Institute, Prairie View, Central State University, Atlanta University and a host of other institutions, receive only scant attention outside of their own institutional environments. It is Black Student demands on predominantly White campuses that are being subjected to often intemperate criticism, faulty and inaccurate subjective assessments, and in more extreme cases, to counterdemands for legal action or governmental intervention on behalf of the dissolution or drastic revision of such programs. Why is this so? A recently issued report by the Southern Regional Educational Board affirms the fact that predominantly Negro colleges have been equally as negligent as White institutions in the matter of curricular attention to the background and educational needs of Black students.¹ To be sure this is what the Black student revolt is about on most college campuses—Black and White. I would hope that we are not witnessing reverse racism in this instance. Most of us raised in Black communities remember the double standard of law enforcement in the cities in which we lived. If crime occurred in the Black community, involving only Black people, then one could expect to get off with a light sentence or no sentence at all. But if the same crime was committed in the White community or committed by a Black person against a White, then one might expect to pay the full penalties of the law. We do not need a double standard in either the quality, substance or accessibility to higher educational facilities in the United States. If Black Study programs are threatening to the educational process in predominantly White schools, they should be equally so in Black schools as well.

¹Footnotes at end of article.

For the past year and a half, I have been intimately involved in the development of Black student programs at the State University of New York at Buffalo. President Martin Meyerson, speaking at a memorial service for Martin Luther King in the Spring of 1968, called for a re-dedication of the University to both the principles and practices of equal opportunity for all citizens, as a living testimonial to the causes for which Martin L. King lived and died. Shortly thereafter, President Meyerson appointed a Select Committee for Equal Opportunity to assist him in formulating policies in support of expanded opportunities for minorities, both on campus and in campus-related activities within the community. President Meyerson gave the following charges to the committee:

First, "to enlarge substantially, the proportion of non-white and Spanish-speaking students attending our University."

Second, "the Committee and the Office must review our employment practices and the composition of our personnel, to find ways of training, hiring and upgrading non-white workers at all levels of our employment roster."

Third, "the Committee and the Office must explore channels through which we can dramatically enlarge the non-white members of our faculty."

Fourth, "the Committee and the Office must explore and develop other channels through which the University can better serve the needs of the Negro community."

Finally, "we must determine how we can bring the influence of the University to bear upon the attitudes, and the fears of a white community, which is just beginning to sense the urgency and the importance of achieving understanding and rapport with our non-white brothers."

I was asked by President Myerson to serve as the Chairman for the Select Committee. Other members of the Committee were drawn from the ranks of administration, students (black and white), faculty and the Black and Puerto Rican Communities. While formal appointments to the Committee numbered 14, there has seldom been a Select Committee meeting with fewer than 20 people present. The meetings which for most of the first year were weekly, but most recently biweekly, were open to all who chose to come. For most of this past year, the meeting place for the Committee has alternated between the campus and various locations within the Black and Puerto Rican communities.

The University established simultaneously with the appointment of the Select Committee, an Office of Equal Opportunity, with a former Dean of the School of Education at the University as its first Director. The Office serves as the administrative arm of the Select Committee, with the power to initiate action on its own within the spirit and intent of the Committee and to implement proposals acted upon favorably by the Committee and originating either within or from outside of the University. Those of us working with the Equal Opportunity program at the University are very cautious about giving external publicity to our accomplishments which I think have been considerable and to our failures of which we have had our share. First of all, we have accepted the notion that having so far to go in bringing Blacks and Puerto Ricans into our University Community, no matter how much we do, it will be insufficient to close the gap. Then, too, we feel that we are in a continuing experimental effort—an effort which seeks to involve in a partnership, diverse elements within the University and the City of Buffalo, on a basis of mutual support and trust. It seems to us then, that to boast of each new accomplishment, and perhaps, to gloss over our failures, would be to engage in gamemanship of the most cruel and insensitive nature. I think

with few exceptions, those of us at the University of Buffalo feel that we are earning the confidence and support of the Black and Puerto Rican communities, both off and on campus, and that this trip together is a very challenging and rewarding one indeed. We have not nor are we operating in an atmosphere of fear, but in an atmosphere of innovation and exciting change. We have come to admire the dedication, the sense of timing and strategy, and the commitment to both a high quality and relevant education reflected in the programmatic goals and accomplishments of our Black students.

My experience with Black Studies on other campuses recently, limited to be sure, has not been substantially different. Although they may be studying in different educational milieu and come from slightly different socio-economic backgrounds, the demands that they are making upon their respective institutions to be relevant to the kind of world in which they will live and justify the high purposes that these institutions claim for themselves, has been almost uniformly the same. During this past year, I have come to know well students at Howard University, where I taught two courses in African Research Methods, served as discussant or consultant on Black study programs at such varied kinds of institutions as Vassar, the State University of New York at New Paltz, the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and very recently have had the occasion to become familiar with the Black students and their projected program at Harvard University. The most notable thing that marks off this generation of Black students from any that I have known previously is their singleness of purpose with respect to full inclusion within the University communities of this country and their close links and identity with the Black communities in which they live or study, and black communities elsewhere in the world. It is because I see Black students through these kinds of lenses—tinted I am sure—that I find it hard to comprehend the plethora of criticism and abuse which is increasingly being mounted against them and their programs. Because of the growing attacks on Black Studies programs, and a deafening silence from those who support them, I have decided to stand up and be counted among those who strongly endorse the underlying motives for such programs, the predominant direction which they have taken, and the present and potential contribution that these programs are making to a re-evaluation of the purposes to be served by higher education in a democratic society.

The kinds of criticism lodged against Black Studies are cast in legal, emotional, intellectual, racial and, indeed, comical molds. Similarly, the attacks touch upon curricular, cultural, social, political and personnel aspects of these programs. I would like to discuss first the kinds of criticism read and heard most frequently about Black Study programs.

The first legal assault upon Black Studies programs has been threatened by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in response to the establishment this past academic year of separate social and living facilities by Black Students at Antioch College in Ohio. At about the same time Black students had successfully negotiated similar arrangements at Northwestern, Cornell and Harvard Universities among others. Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary of the NAACP, addressing his remarks to the demands of Black students for separate social and study facilities, labels these facilities "Jim Crow Schools" and charges colleges and universities that permit such arrangements with encouraging and supporting racial segregation:

"The system of segregated education must not be revived. It must not be invited back at the request, nay, the ultimatum of black

students themselves . . . The key word in the current spate . . . of demands of black students is 'autonomous.' No university administration faithful to its trust can grant this. There is substantial informed opinion that tax money cannot be used to set up racial enclaves within campuses. I am sure that sooner or later a court test would arise."³

Indeed it is reported that Mr. Wilkens has threatened to file suits to block the establishment of autonomous Black Studies departments on the ground that they are unconstitutional.⁴ The first concrete step in this direction, however, has been taken by the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare in a memorandum issued on March 5, 1969. In the memorandum the Office warned that separate housing, social activity, space and separate Colleges, Schools and Institutions stand in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁵ The Office warned colleges and universities that HEW "must enforce the Congressional intent of prohibiting federally assisted institutions from offering services and benefits which result in segregation on the basis of race." Thus, the stage has been set for the initiation of legal action against any federally assisted college or university that establishes separate black student facilities.

A more didactic, but no less tautologically incorrect position on separate black facilities is that expressed by Sir W. Arthur Lewis in an article published in the *New York Times Magazine* section in May, 1969.⁶ Professor Lewis views the role of education for Blacks in America as serving the technical and managerial leadership requirements for a predominantly White American society. In Professor Lewis' view, about fifty American colleges and universities turn out nearly all of the top people in American corporations and other leading institutions. If Blacks want to move into this top stratum of the power structure of American society, he argues, they cannot do so in isolation from the Whites who now control these positions. Thus, writes Professor Lewis:

"Blacks in America are inevitably and perpetually a minority. This means that in all administrative and leadership positions, we are going to be outnumbered by white folks, and will have to compete with them not on our terms but on theirs. The only way to win this game is to know them so thoroughly that we can outpace them. For us to turn our backs on this opportunity, by insisting on mingling only with other black students in college is folly of the highest order."⁷

Professor Lewis, however, is evidently not opposed to segregated higher education *per se*, but only to segregated higher education in predominantly White institutions. Neither the NAACP nor Professor Lewis seem prepared to carry the case of segregated Black colleges and universities into the courts, although only a token number of white students attend these institutions:

Alabama A & M College, 6 White students of 1900 Blacks.

Miles College, Alabama, 4 White students of 1000 Blacks.

Arkansas A & M, 7 White students of 3000 Blacks.⁸

In fact, Professor Lewis is quite prepared not only to accept the fact of segregated Black colleges and universities, but he is equally prepared to assign to them the training of Black students for more limited, mediocre roles strictly within the Black community. In this regard, he asks the question:

"What can the good white college do for its black students that Howard, or Lincoln or Fisk cannot do? It can open the road into the top jobs . . . To put it in unpopular language, it can train them to become top

members of the establishment . . . if what one wants is people trained to live and work in black neighborhoods, they will do much better to go to the black colleges, of which there are, after all, more than 100, which know much better than Yale or Princeton or Dartmouth, what the problems of black neighborhoods are, and how people should be trained to handle them."⁹

The point that I am emphasizing is that the goals of Black students in predominantly Black institutions are not substantially different from those in White colleges and universities. Perhaps the Black colleges differ in only one particular—segregated spatial, social and instructional facilities—for these they already have—without anybody's complaints. Some comments from a Black Fisk student suggest that he perceives his present educational objectives and future objectives through different eyes than those of Professor Lewis:

"The goal of this black program (Fisk University) on campus is simple: make this educational institution speak to the needs of the black community; that is structure the curriculum so that it educates and frees the black mind to deal with the system. The goals are limited and are a step in the process of changing the total society."¹⁰

Black students, North and South, in the community and on campus know full well that the dividing line between themselves and their economically less fortunate brothers and sisters is as thin and fragile as a thread. These students are sophisticated and knowledgeable enough to know that they are both the products and victims of a racist society, and that to survive in that system calls for societal structuring and transformation in the direction of unbargained, non-negotiable equal opportunity for all Blacks. The anger and rage of Black students is no less at Fisk, Howard and Atlanta Universities than at Harvard, Cornell or the University of Buffalo. A Fisk student summarizes the mood on Fisk's Campus: "As a black student at Fisk, I don't feel that we have been quiescent at all. The fact that we have not sought publicity in the white news media, however, might have indicated this."¹¹ I doubt seriously that apparent deafness is at the heart of the White media's ignoring of black student protest within the context of Black educational and cultural experience. More than that, I see the scant attention devoted to activities on the predominantly Black campuses by the white media as clear indication that they perceive the Negro colleges as of little consequence for the current changes taking place in race relations in this country, and of even lesser significance to those in position to determine the major directions in which American society is to move in the decades ahead. Thus, the criticism lodged against Black Studies in predominantly white colleges and universities takes on more than casual importance. Those who oppose such programs on White campuses have a ready audience—a growing population, fearful of the threats to the status quo that these programs pose on the major campuses, and by inference generalizing these criticisms where they suit their purposes to Black student programs across the country—black and white.

Thus, Professor Lewis capsules a variety of descriptions of Black Studies programs in two relatively short paragraphs:

"In its most extreme form, what is asked is that the college should set aside a special part of itself which is to be the black part. There will be a separate building for black studies, and separate dormitories and living accommodations for blacks. There will be separate teachers, all black, teaching classes open only to blacks. The teachers are to be chosen by the students, and will for the most part be men whom no African or Indian or Chinese university would recognize as scholars, or be willing to hire as teachers."¹²

Since I know of no Black Studies Program in the country that fits Professor Lewis' example, I not only consider it arrant nonsense, but an affront to the Black students who have and are devoting their time and energy to developing curricula of cultural and intellectual significance with an admirable respect for academic integrity. Their demands for separate social, educational and cultural facilities are no different in kind than those presently available to Jewish students in Hillel Houses or to Catholic students in Newman Clubs (and one could cite other examples where exclusion is based upon such accidental features as class or sex) on college campuses across the country. Directors of Black Studies Programs such as Hollis Lynch, an African Historian, my colleague at Buffalo last year, but who now joins the faculty of Columbia; Charles Hamilton, a political scientist, and St. Clair Drake, who contributed so much to the program at Roosevelt, and the distinguished roster of Black scholars suggested by Black students to direct the program at Harvard—may not be known by "African or Indian or Chinese Universities . . . as scholars," but these universities would, or should be honored by their presence. I consider, therefore, Professor Lewis' description of black faculty members associated with operating Black Studies programs of which I have knowledge, equally as gratuitous as his remarks about black students.

If it is "bewildering" to Professor Lewis that proponents of Black Studies programs should favor Black faculty over Whites in teaching subjects of significant interest to Black students, and that in their rhetoric, at least, some Black Studies programs exclude Whites from their courses dealing with various aspects of the "Black Experience," I'm afraid I do not find it so. If the scholars in the fifty major colleges and universities to which he refers have in good conscience and with the intellectual rigor fashioned and interpreted American history and the role of Blacks in American culture in such a way as to either exclude or demean Black contributions, then let these same distinguished scholars and their students with equal objectivity and passion rewrite the history and culture of American Negroes as it should have been and as it is. They do not need either the encouragement or presence of Black students or faculty to do this. Indeed, it is a special obligation which truth and candor imposes upon them to do this on their own. Black students, and I would think even Black artists, writers, and just plain Black common folk, are tired of trying to be sensitively viewed and seriously heard by Whites who are both blind and deaf to the beauty of their souls and to the anguished cries from their heart. While I, personally, feel that if White students and faculty want to sit in on special courses for Black students, and can sit quietly and learn and absorb much of what they know little (and few Whites can do this), then I would favor permitting them to share in this search by Black students and scholars for an integrated perspective on what life in America can and does mean for the life chances and hopes of its Black citizens. I cannot, however, share the venom that the critics of Black Studies programs feel about this issue, nor can I assign the importance to this aspect of the program as do they.

Professor Lewis continues:

"I yield to none in thinking that every respectable university should give courses on African life and on Afro-American life, which are of course two entirely different subjects, and I am very anxious to see such courses developed. It is, however, my hope that they will be attended mostly by white students, and that the majority of black students will find more important uses for their time; that they may attend one or two such courses, but will reject any suggestion that black studies

must be the major focus of their programs."¹³

This same delusion that Black Studies programs seek to supplant substantive courses required for successful pursuit of traditional vocational and professional careers is shared by other critics of these programs: Martin Kilson, Assistant Professor of Government at Harvard University, himself a Negro, describes Black Studies programs as exercises in "ethnocentric manipulation" and supporters of such programs as "blissfully unaware that their bigoted and paranoid outlook makes shambles of scholarship and learning."¹⁴ More acrid, bitter and crude denunciation of Black Studies programs has been made by Bayard Rustin, prominent labor and civil rights leader: Rustin in a recent interview accused American colleges of taking "a cheap way out by agreeing to Negro students' demands for Black Studies programs." He views it as "tragic" that Black students, instead of taking advantage of their opportunity for learning... are reducing the situation to a series of courses that cannot really prepare them for the kind of life they have to live."¹⁵

Elaborating on this same theme, Rustin, in a commencement address to the College of the Virgin Islands, inveighed against Black student militance and what he called "confrontation tactics." The kinds of changes that Black people seek to effect in present day America can only be achieved he argues "through honest politics and... those youngsters who are wasting their time in college, learning how to cook pigs feet are going to be in very serious trouble."¹⁶

While all of the foregoing critics of Black Studies Programs are Black, grumblings from Whites are similarly in vogue. They too, like most of their Black counterparts have had little or no direct experience with Black Studies programs, but this fact does not seem to them to suggest qualified assessments nor sensitive questioning of these programs. In a recent article entitled *Black Studies: Trouble Ahead*, Eugene Genovese categorically states the problem:

"No problem so agitates the campuses today as that posed by the growing pressure for Black Studies Programs and department... The universities must now choose between three courses: a principled but flexible response to legitimate black demands; a dogmatic, repressive adherence to traditional, liberal and essentially racist policies; and a cowardly surrender to all black demands, no matter how destructive to the university as an institution of higher learning or to American and Afro-American society in general. This last option, which has been taken in a notable number of places, ironically reflects as much racism in its assumptions and implications as the second, and it takes little skill in prophecy to realize that its conclusion will be a bloodbath in which blacks are once again the chief victims."¹⁷

While moderate in tone as compared with other pieces written on the same subject, Professor Genovese does not instruct us as to what are the "notable number of places" which have fully surrendered to Black student demands and how such surrender has destroyed the fabric of both American Institutions of higher learning and Afro-American society in general. One would even hope that the Black and White opponents of Black Studies Programs would "get themselves together." It is ludicrous for Rustin as a Black, to make the absurd statement that "There is no Italian history of the United States. There's no Jewish history, there's no black history, there is American history..."¹⁸

It is less than perceptive for Oscar Handlin—although not a vocal opponent to Black Study programs—to equate the experiences of Blacks in America, brought here against

their will and left bereft of any family and cultural ties to the countries of origin, with European immigrants who came to this country of their own free will and permitted to build upon sustaining skills, traditions and social foundations while moving into the mainstream of American life.¹⁹ On this issue, Genovese appears more sensitive to the Black Studies impulse than either Rustin or Handlin when he writes:

"The demand for Black Studies and for special black studies departments needs no elaborate explanation or defense. It rests on an awareness of the unique and dual nature of the black experience in the United States. Unlike European immigrants, blacks came here involuntarily, were enslaved and excluded from access to the mainstream of American life, and as a result have had a special history with a profoundly national-cultural dimension. Unlike, say, Italo-Americans, Afro-Americans have within their history the elements of a distinct nationality at the same time that they have participated in and contributed immensely to a common American nationality. Despite the effort of many black and some white scholars, this paradoxical experience has yet to be explored with the respect and intellectual rigor it deserves."²⁰

But, while generally open to the possible legitimacy of Black Studies programs, Genovese raises also the familiar spectre of the intellectual mediocrity of Black students and consequently any programs proposed by them; the irresponsibility of Black students for proposing courses and departments that would exclude white students and faculty, and thereby imposing a racist cast on American universities inconsistent with their high purpose and obligation to society. He bemoans the "shortage" of well-trained Black scholars and views as unfair the imposition upon American universities the major responsibility for closing the educational gap between Whites and Blacks. Finally, while making the same laudable effort to weigh the pros and cons of Black Studies programs, Fred M. Hechinger nevertheless concludes:

"The drive toward separatism in black studies is a reaction to the all-white history that has often been academia's standard fare. The 'black is beautiful' approach in history, as elsewhere is an absurdity comparable to, say, the 'white man's burden' concept. It is of little help in the task of weaving an honest non-racist pattern of history, research and teaching."²¹

One is prompted to ask how can supposedly knowledgeable people about Black America stray so far from reality in their assessments of Black Studies Programs? Is it naïveté? Is it a lack of sophistication about what is happening in current American race relations? Is it purposeful distortion of the truth about Black American scholars in order to forestall what to many of us seems inevitable, namely a demand for a reordering of society in such a way that all men, regardless of color or condition of birth will and can experience the reality of the democratic experience? Whatever the answer, the charges hurled against Black Studies programs are far removed from what I have discerned to be the general pattern of their development. First of all, Black students are no more in revolt against the inequities of the system than are White students both in this country and abroad. If White students are calling for a return of scholars to the classroom so that they may both experience human contact with their professors and challenge them to relate learning to the cumulative knowledge of man about himself and his environment, so are Black students calling for the same measure of relevance with regard to the particular life experiences of Black people in America. If White students are calling for increased participation in the decision making process on issues that directly affect their life and their life chances, so are Black students calling for the same rights. If White

students are increasingly looking beyond their own shores for clues to the universality of human oppression and human challenge, so are Black students becoming internationalized in their orientation. If White students feel frustrated about their chances for effecting change within the existing social system because of the imbalance of power between the "haves" and the have-nots" so are Black students selecting the universities and colleges of this country as testing grounds for proof of America's integrity and worth as the major democratic power in the world today. These are aspirations which Black students share not only with White students in America, but with "have-not" students in other parts of the world as well. But there are particular, legitimate aspirations which Black students seek to satisfy as Black students over and above the communality of concerns that they share with white students. Let me try to enumerate some of them.

Black students drawing upon a legacy from the past of educational, cultural and psychic damage imposed by Whites upon the Black community refuse to accept any longer fragmentary, Pollyannaish solutions to the very serious racial ills in this country. Whether they look at their older siblings or back upon the life experiences of their parents, they observe with bitterness and anger that their own chances for survival are not substantially better than it has been for other members of their family. Token integration and piecemeal improvements in the social and economic spheres are seen for just what they are—an insult to the intelligence and role perceptions of Black people who are supposed to be grateful for gradual progress.

The professional nigras experts (white and negro) are fighting each other, each one trying to be the first to board the plane to Washington in order to testify about our problem... 'What we need is more housing, jobs, schooling, etc.' is the expert's stock answer to what they perceive to be our problem. What these dumb hustlers refuse to understand is that many of the freedom fighters came out of the so-called better ghetto housing, better known as 'the projects' and also off the college campuses and that they in many instances were not hurting for lack of bread. We do not want housing, we do not want handouts—we want real (economic and political) power. Power with which we can build our own houses, design our own environment.²²

The demand for a more equitable distribution of power within the Black and White communities in this country lies at the core of Black Studies programs regardless of the predominant racial population of the University involved. Black students know: That in order to confront the White power structures in their campuses, in their community, in their nation, and in their world, they need to see their survival as a function of their own organized strength and unity, thus the demand for more Black Study Programs, centers, Black Students and faculty.

Black students (and I consider myself a Black student as well as teacher), both past and present, know that next to the corporate structure, universities are perhaps the most racist enclaves within our social system. If one teaches or studies in a predominantly Black institution, he knows that the White professor on that campus is likely to enjoy a faster rise in the structure as well as earn higher pay than his Black colleague in the same institution. My experience, over recent years at Howard University, suggests that there is very little social or intellectual intercourse between White and Black faculty on staff. Nor is the picture brighter at predominantly White colleges and universities. During my freshman year at Fordham University, I was the only Black student enrolled, and I took an oath of no association with any of my classmates after they refused to permit me to attend our freshman class

dance. In later years while teaching at Union College in Schenectady—where, somehow, Union could only manage to accept one Black student a year—I asked a Black student what was his social life like that year. He replied, "Dr. Moss, you know there is only one Negro girl at Skidmore (an all-girl college 50 miles away) and I'm the only Negro freshman at Union, so you know who I'm dating." Only up to recently, if a Black student, enrolled in a predominantly White institution, elected to live on campus, he had no choice but to live in practically all-white dormitories, where social tastes, events, and interaction was shaped and dominated by White students. The Black student had no alternative to this arrangement unless he chose to move off campus. Since Black students have seen the proportion of Black to White students in predominantly White colleges and universities move dramatically since the founding of the Republic from 0% to about .03% ten years ago to something slightly better than .05% this year, the possibility of any kind of Black cultural experience on the White campus is almost nil.

Is it any wonder then that Black students on white college and university campuses are calling for a substantial increase in the enrollment of Black and Puerto Rican students. Yet, I know of no major civil rights organization or leader—Black or White, who has even threatened to sue American institutions of higher learning for the social and cultural isolation which has been the Black students' lot to endure. If facts are needed to substantiate the pitifully small number of Blacks or Whites who attend integrated institutions of higher learning, one needs only to refer to recent statistics compiled and published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 21, 1969:

THE ENROLLMENT OF BLACK STUDENTS IN PREDOMINANTLY WHITE INSTITUTIONS

University of Alabama, 128 of 10,000.
 Arizona State, 141 of 1,400.
 University of Arkansas, 80 out of 7,000.
 University of California at Berkeley, 381 of 16,000.
 UCLA, 421 of 18,000.
 University of Connecticut, 167 of 9,000.
 University of Illinois, 690 of 22,000.
 University of Iowa, 84 of 13,000.
 University of Massachusetts, 158 of 12,000.
 University of Chicago, 104 of 2,700.
 Harvard University, 154 of 4,000.
 University of Michigan, 546 of 21,000.
 Princeton University, 95 of 3,000.
 State University of N.Y. at Albany, 104 of 6,000.
 State University of N.Y. at Binghamton, 40 of 3,000.
 State University of N.Y. at Buffalo, 400 of 11,000.
 State University of N.Y. at Stony Brook, 125 of 5,000.
 Brooklyn College, 450 of 10,000.
 Queens College, 222 of 11,000.
 Hunter College, 270 of 5,000.
 City College, 500 of 10,000.

What these statistics tell us is that even in the large State Universities, Black students comprise even less than one per cent of the total student population. The presence of Black faculty in these same institutions is minuscule.

I think that the all but token presence of Black Faculty on the campuses of predominantly White colleges and universities has been a particularly painful thorn in the side of Black students and scholars. Throughout my entire college career—Fordham University, The New School for Social Research, and Columbia University—I never had the experience of studying with or under a Black professor. Since my research for the Ph.D. was on Black Professors in predominantly White colleges in New York State, it was felt proper that a Black scholar experienced in research on racial integration should at

least sit on my committee. Dr. Kenneth Clark of City University generously agreed to undertake the assignment that should have fallen within the province of a regularly appointed professor in the Sociology Department of Columbia University. I have always felt that research areas close to my heart—much influenced by the exposures and experiences I have had as an American Negro—were not those that fell within the professional concerns and interests of my peers or professors. Incidentally, throughout my whole tenure as a Ph.D. candidate at Columbia, I was the only Black student in residence. So the sociology that I learned, and the concepts which I intellectually internalized were all cast within the framework of white perceptions and white interpretations. Indeed, while many will dispute this, the sociology which I brought away with me from Columbia was the sociology of the White experience with its Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic roots. It certainly did not nor does it now touch, except peripherally, upon the sociology of the Black experience either in this country, in Africa or the Caribbean. I don't think the experience has been substantially different for most other Black scholars in America: Dr. Charles Hamilton of Columbia University recalls his experiences:

"I graduated from Roosevelt, I got a law degree from Loyola University and I got a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. And I'm going to tell you very clearly that my education over that twelve to fifteen year period was geared toward making me a middle-class Black Sambo. Nothing devious in that, and I'm not blaming my professors. It's just that that was their orientation. They were saying to me in no uncertain terms that in order to succeed, I would have to orient myself to a Western Anglo-Saxon culture."

The White stereotyping of subject matter in the social sciences is strengthened and reinforced by White stereotyping of the "ideal" college or university professor. The middle-class, White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, male prototype of the university professor and administrator in the predominantly white college, is too well known to elaborately document here. But for purposes of this paper, he certainly is not Black. In fact, he is not even faintly brown. When the writer asked Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, the distinguished historian and sociologist, what he thought the role and contribution of the Black teacher in the White college to be, and this was over a decade ago, his reply was, "none, he's not even there." Ten years ago there were not more than 40 Black teachers in positions leading to tenure in all of the colleges and universities in New York State. This was about one third of the total number of Black teachers employed in predominantly White institutions across the country. Five years ago in a repeat survey, the number of Black teachers in New York State had increased to 70. Given the pitifully small number of Negroes who go on to complete the Ph.D. (the minimal entry requirement for permanent appointments in major colleges and universities), one can anticipate that there will not be a substantial increase in the overall supply of Black candidates for teaching positions in predominantly white institutions at any time in the near future. Ironically, however, although almost without exception, Negro holders of the Ph.D. degree received their degrees from major white institutions, they are almost universally confined to predominantly Black schools. I recall the remark made to me seven or eight years ago by a Black scholar who had just received an appointment as chairman of a department in a large Eastern university. When I asked him had he anticipated the possibility of such an appointment, his reply was: "I have earned an international reputation as a scholar in my field, and I was determined not to solicit or seek appointments elsewhere. If America was content to

restrict my professional career to teaching within the predominantly Negro College, that was where I was prepared to remain."

More recently, I had the opportunity to discuss with the Dean of a professional school in a predominantly Black university the possibility of assuming a similar post at the University of Buffalo. When I asked him how he felt about leaving the university where he had demonstrated remarkable leadership in developing a school with a national reputation for excellence, he replied: "I am still relatively young in my professional career and I have gone as far as I can go where I am. I need new and more demanding intellectual and professional challenge if I'm to continue to set increasingly higher standards of performance for myself." In spite of the hue and cry raised by those critics of Black Studies programs who argue that there is a shortage of competent Black faculty to man such programs without raiding the staffs of predominantly Black institutions, there is still shameful underutilization of Black faculty who are able and willing to advance themselves through transfer to larger and more prestigious colleges and universities. The faculty recruitment standards of the State University of New York at Buffalo are high when compared with other major public or private universities in this country. The Select Committee for Equal Opportunity, anticipating Black Student demands for a larger number of Black faculty at the university, met with disappointing failure in its efforts to intensify Black faculty recruitment and appointment by individual departments within the university. When, however, the administration of the University set up a Black faculty recruitment task force, in late May of this year, and freed ten lines for such appointments, within two weeks the task force received more than sixty recommendations for new Black faculty appointments—mostly from within the university itself. Without damage to either traditional criteria or customary high standards, our ten slots were filled within a two month period. If predominantly White universities want to enlarge the number of Black teachers on their faculties, they can take steps immediately to enter into joint appointments with very able Black scholars in predominantly Black schools, sharing the expertise of these scholars between the two institutions. Since there are, perhaps, not more than two dozen Black scholars holding full professorships in major white institutions, they can include in their competition for such slots more Black professors locked in at the lower ranks in lesser White colleges and universities.

These institutions can begin to seriously look at their present cohort of Black graduate students to see what additional financial help and professional encouragement is needed in order to expedite their completing their Ph.D. work and thereby qualify for faculty appointment in their own institutions. Finally, graduate schools should tax their resources and recruit in larger numbers Black graduates from predominantly Negro schools and, with financial help where necessary and intensive academic support, enlarge the pool of Black graduate students from which Black teaching personnel may subsequently be drawn. Despite the almost total absence of Black teachers on White faculties in the United States, I know of no major civil rights organizations—Black or White—that have systematically sought to remedy this situation, or even threatened to do so. Black students need and should have the psychological perspective and dimension of a Grier and Cobbs, a Kenneth Clark and an Alvin Poussaint as much as they need the insights and intellectual contributions of a Freud, Fromm or a Kurt Lewin. Black students deserve the sociological excitement of a C. Eric Lincoln, a Hugh Smythe, an Andrew Billingsley, a Hylan Lewis and an Oliver Cox as much as they can flourish and grow on the contributions of a

Talcott Parsons, a Robert Merton, a Paul Lazarsfeld or a Seymour Martin Lipset. Black students should be able to question the relevance of the anthropological teachings of an Elliott Skinner or a James Gibbs, as much as they are encouraged to test the theories of a Margaret Mead or a Carlton Coon. I do not want to be caught in the verbal trap as to whether or not there is such a thing as a Black psychology, or a Black sociology, or indeed, a Black anthropology. I do contend, however, that there are widening vistas of knowledge about human experience, that shaped and modified by varying cultural, social and even physical milieu can and do suggest possible recasting and reformulating existing theoretical constructs and concepts about human behavior. That is what Black professors focusing on the Black experience in the Social Sciences can do for us and we should welcome it. Thus, the alienation and isolation of Black students from all but a mere semblance of their cultural roots and experiences makes their demands for substantial increases in the number of Black students, faculty and staff legitimate and compelling. I took the position earlier in the paper that current Black student demands reflect the long and unmet insistence of the Black community in America for full inclusion into the American social system. Dr. Gloria Joseph states the Black student position well:

"The black students' problems at the universities are largely based on the fact that White America has not included Black America in its mainstream of life. Now that numbers of intelligent, militant and dedicated black youths are demanding a first-class role, the institutions of higher learning should embrace them jubilantly. For in so doing universities have an opportunity to rectify one of our most glaring problems . . . If one were to examine the 'demands' made by Black students to their colleges, one would be hard pressed to find an unreasonable or irrational request. The vast majority of these demands and requests are things that the university should have implemented years ago."

Let's look at a sampling of the "demands" that have variously been described as "folly," "ridiculous," "fascistic," "stupid," "bigoted" and "paranoid."

The Black Studies program at the University of Buffalo was conceived and designed by members of the Black Students' Union. Its chief architects were two Black Ph. D. candidates in History. The original proposal, though approved in principle by the Select Committee in the Summer of 1968, underwent several revisions before becoming the present working document for the program. With student consultation, Dr. Hollis Lynch, newly appointed as Associate Professor of History, was named as the first director of the program. Faculty members, both Black and White, teaching courses pertinent to Negroes were asked by the Black Studies Committee to consider reorienting their courses where feasible to take into account some of the more current issues and problems facing the Black community. Some professors were asked if they would be willing to initiate new courses that would focus upon one or more dimensions of the Black experience. Support from the faculty was quite gratifying. Twenty-four professors, mostly from the social sciences and the humanities joined the program as Associates. This Fall these men will be strengthened by the addition of 10 half-time faculty who will divide their time between teaching assignments in their respective disciplines and serving as core faculty in the Black Studies Program. Students can major or minor in Black Studies social sciences or Black Studies Humanities; with two courses required for admission into the Program:

Black Studies 100: The African Background: An introduction to the History and

Culture of traditional Africa. Also to be surveyed are the slave trade, the black diaspora, survival of Africanisms in the New World and the attitude of New World Blacks to Africa.

Black Studies 200: The Afro-American Today: Problems and Prospects.

There is a strong international dimension to the Black Studies program at the University. The Black Studies Program in cooperation with the Council for International Studies at the University sponsored this past Spring one of three conferences on the subject of Africa and Afro-Americans, with participants drawn from the United States, Africa and the Caribbean. A second conference is scheduled for late Fall or early Spring in Ghana and a third for the latter part of 1970 in the Caribbean. Further inter-ethnic cooperation and support has been assured by the assignment of one of the most attractive buildings on the campus by the University as a Center for Inter-Ethnic Studies. The Building will house in addition to the Black Studies Program, a Black Student Lounge, an International Student's Lounge, Offices of the Experimental Program for Black and Puerto Rican minority students, the offices of the Select Committee for Equal Opportunity, library and research facilities for the Center for the Comparative Study of Race and Ethnicity, the African, Latin American, Pacific and European Research Committees, and the Offices for Foreign Student Affairs. The Black Studies Program is integrally tied in with a facility located within the Black community of Buffalo, formally identified as the Educational Service Center, but more popularly known as the "University of the Streets". At the Center, courses for credit and non-credit are offered on subjects of immediate bearing and interest to Black Students and members of the Black community.

I had come to know some of the Black women at Vassar fairly well during two visits on campus to discuss with them and the administration a proposed Black Studies Program. But the high point of my visits there was a session which I attended where the Students Afro-American Society (SAS) came in a body to present their "demands" to the Dean of the College: The slightly less than fifty students accompanied by a community leader and Ossie Davis, the Black actor, whose daughter was in the group, displayed a quiet dignity, calm and sense of determination that is so often the occasion of adult pride in this generation of young people. The students called for the establishment of a center for black studies in downtown Poughkeepsie. The center, for which funds will be sought independently, will engage in research into and offer courses "on the experience of being black as well as the education of black students in their history, their present situation in America, and the positive steps necessary for the betterment of their lives in the future." Study at the center will focus on such specific areas of action, as Black Philosophy, psychology of racism, Black religion and contemporary Black art. Although students will receive credit for work carried out in the Center, most of their college work will continue to fall within regular Vassar courses. The Director of the center may either be appointed as a member of an existing department, employing the traditional criteria for faculty appointments or may be appointed as an administrative officer upon recommendation of the Dean of the Faculty and the Faculty committee of the urban center. In either case the appointment would be made in consultation with the members of SAS.

Black students at Vassar have also proposed the creation of a black center on the main Vassar campus. This center will provide housing accommodations for a limited number of Black students and also serve as a cultural and social facility for other Black

students. Finally, Vassar students have asked for the appointment of a Black advisor for black students, and a budget to support black-oriented cultural and educational activities on campus and in the community.

Harvard offers a final illustration of Black student maturity to which I would like to refer. At the invitation of a committee of Black students representing the Association of African and Afro-American Students of Harvard and Radcliffe, I spent a day on the Harvard campus discussing their plans for an Afro-American Studies Program. For one and a half hours, I enjoyed one of the most intellectually stimulating and provocative discussions that I have ever had barring age, race, sex or level of educational attainment. The topics ranged from political ideologies to parameters of Black student action within the Harvard structure, the Black communities adjacent to Harvard and the Black communities from which they come and to which many of them hope to return. As I discussed with them requisite qualifications for their first senior appointment to their program, it was evident that they had given much thought to this search. One student, a freshman, remarked to me, "We want a man who is not only intellectually sharp in his discipline, but one whom we can be proud of when he stands up to speak for our program and for us before the faculty." The following are pertinent excerpts from the Harvard Report on American Negro Studies:

"Black students feel alienated from, even neglected within Harvard; but so, as we know, do many whites. Black students seek and expect 'relevance' from their Harvard education, but obviously they are not alone, at this time, in voicing such an expectation."

"However, the black experience is not simply a mode of the general student experience, it is different, and not merely in degree of intensity, from that of Harvard's white students . . . The absence of course offerings in many areas of Afro-American culture is emphatically a matter of more than academic or pedagogical concern to black students. Indeed, it seems likely that the absence of such offerings is the single most potent source of black student's discontent at Harvard . . ."

"Among black students there is a strong and definite, indeed presumably unanimous, desire for the creation of a social and cultural center for black students. Such a center is conceived as something of a counterpart of Hillel House, the Newman Center or the International Center."

The University Committee charged with responding to the above Black student concerns offered the following recommendations:

1. Development of undergraduate and graduate degrees in Afro-American Studies.
2. Appointment of new faculty members—term, tenure, and visiting—in Afro-American studies and other degree granting programs within the university to conduct these degree programs and offer appropriate courses.
3. Greater emphasis on the experience of Afro-Americans in courses offered by departments and committees.
4. Stimulation of increased research in Afro-American studies, throughout the university.
5. The establishment of a research center or institute concerned with Afro-American studies.
6. Among black students there is a strong and definite desire for the creation of a social and cultural center for black students. It is recommended that the dean urge all appropriate elements of the university to use their good offices in securing and financing a building and providing continued support to the activities of such a social and cultural center.

One can only conclude from the excerpts cited above that Black students are not asking for any diminution in the quality of education demanded by all students in American universities. Rather, they are calling for

increments to the higher educational process previously overlooked or ignored.

This generation of Black students in their demands upon our colleges and universities for an education relevant to their quest for equality in America, continues a tradition that spans over 200 or more years. Denied any meaningful role in the economic sector for American Blacks, education has been traditionally viewed as the most salient instrumentality for upward economic and social mobility in the United States. For some, like Phyllis Wheatley and Sojourner Truth, education was obtained through the paternal benevolence of a charitable slave master. Others such as John Chavis and Henry Russwurm secured their education in leading White universities, although their life's work was to be spent in behalf of enslaved Black peoples. Still others were to be first students, then teachers and finally administrators of the more than 200 predominantly Black colleges and universities located mainly in the South. Finally, Black students and faculty began the emotional and intellectual push into predominantly White institutions of higher learning. Out of this historic educational search for a wider, deeper, cultural and social outreach into American life, at no mean economic and personal sacrifice, have come the major core of Black leadership in this country, past and present. They worked against almost insuperable odds. They frequently made inhuman demands upon themselves in performance and goals—but they made it. It is in this same spirit and tradition that I view Black student development in the present period. They are telling us that they are prepared to come from some of the worst housing of any major minority group in the United States; that they have sustained some of the most serious educational damage, in some of the worst educational systems in our country; that they have had to run faster to catch up with advantaged Whites than any other disadvantaged minority; and that regardless of the cost in social tension and stress, there is no turning back for them. Nor is there any turning back for their universities either.

The presence of black students in the white college communities has been a jolt to many people who thought that the scholarly world would be immune to the problem of racism. It has brought some academic practices and habits of mind to the surface where they can and must be examined. Our universities and colleges are in an excellent position to help us understand and deal with the racial problem. There is no rigid formula to present to universities that would enable them to solve the problems that their institutions must confront and meet. Primarily, the colleges must realize that there is no overnight cure and that things cannot be swept under the rug. Indeed, to try to do so may be to guarantee a social explosion of incalculable dimensions. Rather, the task of the university is to face these problems squarely, openly, and compassionately. . . . The problem of achieving a truly democratic campus may seem impossibly intricate, but there is no turning back.

While Black students deserve much more than they are demanding, they cannot, nor should not be asked to settle for any less.

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Black Studies Programs and Civil Rights Violations," American Council on Education, Special Report, April 8, 1969.

² *The Gazette*, State University of New York at Buffalo, May 10, 1968, pps. 2 and 3.

³ "The Black Mood on Campus," *Newsweek*, February 10, 1969, p. 57.

⁴ *Buffalo Evening News*, February 8, 1969.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, A.C.E. Special Report, p. 1.

⁶ "The Road to the Top is Through Higher Education—Not Black Studies," W. Arthur Lewis, *New York Times*, May 11, 1969, p. 1.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p.

* *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, April 21, 1969.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, W. Arthur Lewis, p. 44.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, *Newsweek*, February 10, 1969.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, *Newsweek*, February 10, 1969, p. 59.

¹⁵ *Congressional Record*, May 13, 1969.

¹⁶ *The Daily News*, St. Thomas, V.I., June 11, 1969.

¹⁷ "Black Studies Ahead," Eugene D. Genovese, *The Atlantic*, June, 1969, p. 37.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, Rustin, *Congressional Record*.

¹⁹ See article, "Historian Says Negro is Gaining as Migrants from Europe Did," *New York Times*, June 1, 1969, p. 47.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, Genovese, p. 38.

²¹ *New York Times*, January 19, 1969.

²² *Liberator*, Vol. 7, No. 8, August 1967, p. 3.

MISREADING THE RECORD

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I found the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal to be most incisive:

MISREADING THE RECORD

Richard Nixon came to the presidency asking people to lower their voices, to speak softly, calmly, responsibly. Yet at times he ignores his own advice.

At the recent Governors' conference he said of federal social programs during the Kennedy-Johnson era that, "far from solving our problems, these expenditures have reaped a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration and bitter division." Then he declared: "Never in human history has so much been spent by so many for such a negative result."

What were the elements of this supposed disaster? They were things like Medicare for the elderly; Medicaid for poor families; aid to education that helped millions of grade, high school and college students; housing programs for millions of low- and middle-income families; spending for cleaner air and water, for hospital construction and health manpower, for libraries, for vocational rehabilitation, for attacks on cancer, heart disease, mental retardation, mental illness, street crime, juvenile delinquency.

Not all programs have worked well. Many mistakes have been made. Too many promises were uttered and not kept. But to characterize these and other federal efforts in the social field as a kind of collective catastrophe is nonsense. An enormous amount of good has been done. Significantly, the Governors, after politely listening to Nixon, came out in favor of enlarged federal programs in vital areas.

As for expenditures, they may appear relatively large, but often they have been tragically inadequate. Too many programs, such as the "war on poverty," were given enough funds to falter, but not enough to achieve dramatic breakthroughs. Despite howls about the cost of welfare grants to the poor, the nation spends at least twice as much on alcoholic beverages. The total outlay of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1968 for over 250 programs (including social security) came to only 4.8 per cent of the nation's gross national product; defense took a bite twice as large.

Nixon, to be sure, has inherited troubles. But to attribute them so heavily to the activism of the Kennedy-Johnson era is to forget what matters would be like if the federal government had been docile and indifferent.

Surely Nixon is not suggesting a return to the leisurely Eisenhower period, when a President would do such things as seek elimination of federal grants for water pollution control at precisely the time the problem was moving into the acute stage.

RURAL HOUSING—AN AID TO URBAN HOUSING

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, in the committee report for H.R. 13827, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, the following is stated:

The Census Bureau projections for 1970 and other studies indicate that there are a total of 5.9 million substandard housing units in the Nation and that 4.2 million of them, more than two-thirds, are in rural areas.

Throughout my district, indeed, throughout many of my colleagues' districts, there is a crying need for housing. There is no question about it. And yet, could not our housing problems be contained if we would direct our priorities to solving the rural housing situation as well as the urban. All areas of our Nation need improved housing and we must begin today to give it. It is my belief that if housing in the rural area is improved the pressure on our cities will be proportionately reduced in this area.

Mr. Speaker, section 411 of H.R. 13827 covers rural housing in this bill. I support this section and hereby insert it in the Record so that all may know that we are moving in the right direction:

RURAL HOUSING

Section 411(a) would extend for a 1-year period from October 1, 1969, to October 1, 1970, the various rural housing authorities which would otherwise expire this year.

Section (b) removes the \$100 million ceiling applying to the amount of unsold insured mortgages that can be held at one time by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The fund was taxed to capacity last year to make about 50,000 insured home loans, a volume which can be classed as only tokenism in terms of the Nation's rural housing needs, indicated by a backlog of 70,000 loan applications on hand at Farmers Home Administration in May of this year.

The Census Bureau projections for 1970 and other studies indicate that there are a total of 5.9 million substandard housing units in the Nation and that 4.2 million of them—more than two-thirds—are in rural areas. Moreover, this rural housing recession is even more severe when it is viewed beside census data showing that 46 percent of the Nation's poverty stricken—11 million people—live in rural areas despite the fact that rural America has only 30 percent of the Nation's total population.

Rural America suffers from a chronic shortage of adequate housing. In many rural communities the only source of loan funds, outside of Farmers Home, is the local bank. More often than not the bank's resources are too limited for it to extend long-term credit for housing while trying to meet other credit demands of the area it serves. The result is that Farmers Home has been—and is—the only vehicle consistently supplying mortgage funds at reasonable rates in most of rural America for credit worthy families

who cannot obtain loans from any other source.

Farmers Home Administrator, James V. Smith, testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee Housing Subcommittee that 300,000 assisted housing units must be supplied annually in rural America if the Nation's housing goals are to be met within the 10-year period established by Congress in the 1968 Housing Act. His estimate is one-half of the total assisted housing required annually for the entire Nation.

Meeting the assisted housing needs for rural areas alone will require an annual investment of at least \$3.6 billion, or \$36 billion for the 10-year period—and this is a conservative estimate when it is assumed that the average cost of assisted housing would be \$12,000 per unit.

Again utilizing the \$12,000 per unit figure, a conservative estimate for rural America's entire housing needs would be 780,000 units a year, or 7,800,000 units in 10 years. This in turn would require a total investment of \$10.9 billion a year or \$109 billion for the 10 years.

At first glance, such estimates may seem to be unrealistically high, but they are supported by data developed by the Commission on Mortgage Interest Rates which reported the average annual cost of the investment required to meet the Nation's housing goals is \$49.4 billion. To say the least, this parade of figures makes it imperative that every effort must be made to marshal the resources needed to meet rural housing needs, which are far more severe on a proportionate basis than those of urban centers.

This is particularly true in terms of expanding the capacity of Farmers Home Administration since it is the only vehicle which has consistently supplied mortgage credit in rural areas and, under the present circumstances, it is the only vehicle which can be expected to do so in the future.

By the same token, there should be no hesitancy to recognize and respond to the needs of Farmers Home through the special assistance fund of the Government National Mortgage Association. Farmers Home should receive treatment proportionately equal to that afforded to all other Government housing programs.

Section (c) would amend the Rural Housing Act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell insured notes in blocks, as well as individually. These transactions are to be treated as the sale of assets for budgetary purposes. Proceeds from the sale of such notes would be invested in insured mortgages, or part interest therein, so that the investment of the purchaser would remain constant over a period of time.

At present Farmers Home is restricted to the sale of individual mortgage notes to investors. Under the best of circumstances, this arrangement must be described as awkward. The nonstandard character of the paper now requires that purchasers keep records on the notes, which are subject to return to Farmers Home for periodic servicing as well as liquidation. They also create the task of continual reinvesting of the proceeds by the investor.

These circumstances are viewed as troublesome by investors, with the result that Farmers Home must pay $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 percent more in interest rates as compared to other Government agencies when it sells its paper on the open market.

These conditions contributed to a crisis in Farmers Home last spring when it had a very large backlog of unsold paper which could not be moved on the open market—beset then, as it is now, with a high interest-tight money situation. The amendment is proposed to streamline the structure under which Farmers Home sells its notes so that its paper can be purchased and handled as similar obligations normally are.

Section (d) amends the act to allow Farmers Home to make advance commitments to

builders so that a number of homes can be constructed at one time where a definite market exists. Thus, a far greater number of homes, possibly at lower costs due to volume construction, can be provided in a given time period. As it stands now, Farmers Home is authorized to obligate funds only after a loan is approved and the contractor starts construction only after the loan is closed, with the result that building is done on a single-unit-at-a-time basis. Volume construction is made virtually impossible. Under this amendment, Farmers Home could agree in advance to make home ownership loans to qualified families for houses built in accordance with approved plans and specifications and for sale prices that do not exceed the appraised value and other specified limitations. The builder would understand that the house is his responsibility until all Farmers Home conditions have been met and the sale has been completed.

Section (e) amends the act to merge the Farmers Home Administration direct home loan program with the insured home loan program.

Until 1965 Farmers Home was restricted to making direct loans only. In that year Congress, in order to significantly expand the home loan capacity of the agency without a corresponding increase in annual appropriations, created the insured loan program with an allocation of \$100 million. The insured loan program was inaugurated through establishment of a revolving fund with the sale of insured notes on individual mortgages in the open money market, bring private money into the program. Specifications governing the operation of the insured loan program have meant that, from 1965 on, almost all the home loans approved by Farmers Home for low and moderate income families were made through the insured loan account which, as stated earlier, is totally inadequate to meet rural housing needs. Since that date, the main focus of the direct loan program has been on the issuance of relatively small loans to low income families for home repair purposes, and for loans to persons whose homes were damaged or destroyed as a result of a natural disaster. During the following years the payback on outstanding direct home loans, coupled with the appropriation that was made in preceding years, has produced about \$250 million in uncommitted funds in the direct home loan account. These funds are desperately needed for the insured home loan program because almost all home loans are being made from it. Merging the direct home loan fund into the insured home loan fund will assure the utilization of money which was specifically appropriated for home loan purposes. In addition, the amendment would serve to streamline the Farmers Home loan program.

All Farmers Home Administration loans being made are, in essence, direct loans, whether they are insured or not because borrowers receive the funds from the agency. The difference between the two rests on the fact that, in the case of direct loans, a number of years pass before the borrower is able to refinance the loan and retire the obligation to Farmers Home whereas, in the case of insured loans, the money is replaced within a year through the sale of notes on the open market. Over the years it has become apparent that there is little logic in having two separate housing loan accounts.

It should be emphasized that the amendment in no way diminishes the authority of Farmers Home to continue making direct home loans. The importance of such loans cannot be overemphasized since they provide the only avenue for many low-income rural families to finance improvements that move them toward adequate housing.

Section (f) repeals the 5,500 population limitation which applies to areas in which Farmers Home now serves. In effect, the Secretary of Agriculture is left to determine

what areas of the country are basically rural in nature and, therefore, can be served by the agency.

The rural housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration have reached with increasing effectiveness into most of our small rural communities. But because of the arbitrary 5500 population limit in section 520 of the act, many families living in other areas which are just as truly rural have not had access to credit needed for decent and adequate housing.

The committee's purpose in proposing the repeal of section 520 is to remove an arbitrary fixed barrier and, instead, entrust to the agency which has had 20 years of experience in administering rural housing loans, the responsibility of defining rural areas in a manner consistent with the basic purpose and limitations of the title V program. Rural areas should be defined by the agency so that the program will be able to serve families living in a community which is truly rural even though its population exceeds 5500 or it lies within the boundaries of a municipality containing a total population in excess of 5500.

The committee does not intend that rural areas be defined so as to permit rural housing loans to be made in a community which is geographically or economically part of or closely associated with an urban or suburban center or complex or in any other urban-type community where home mortgage credit is normally available to low and moderate income families in adequate supply.

It should be clearly recognized that even with the expanded capacity of its insured home loan program proposed in this act, Farmers Home will, at best, be able to finance little more than half the assisted home loans required to meet the Nation's housing goals as they apply to low- and moderate-income rural families.

The gap between need and response is even more pronounced if the requirements of families at or below the poverty level are viewed alone. Over the past 20 years Farmers Home Administration has provided financial assistance for approximately a quarter of a million rural families through its housing programs but there still are some 4 million families living in substandard homes in rural areas.

None of this is meant to slight Farmers Home, which has done an excellent job despite the restrictions of inadequate loan funds, administrative budget, and staff. Nevertheless, these restrictions, even with some expansion of the insured home loan program, gives rise to the question of whether this agency can realistically be expected to meet the housing needs of rural America.

It was never the intent of Congress to make Farmers Home responsible for all the insured and assisted housing loan requirements of rural areas. But it clearly was the intent of Congress that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is to serve the entire Nation, both rural and urban and that in fact HUD was created to be the Nation's housing department.

An analysis of cumulative figures supplied by HUD for its low rent public housing projects, 221 housing program and water and sewage programs leaves no doubt that the vast bulk of that Department's resources have been concentrated in the Nation's urban centers and that rural America has been virtually excluded from the assistance that it by law is supposed to provide.

As of December 31, 1967, HUD had provided a total of 680,664 low rent public housing units for the Nation, but only 100,090 units, or 14 percent of the total, were for rural communities of 25,000 population or less.

As of March 31, 1969, HUD has provided 150,285 units under its 221 assisted housing program, but only 4,847 units, or 3.23 percent of the total have gone into rural America.

The conclusion to be drawn here is that the Nation has two housing programs, nei-

ther of which is even approaching adequacy in terms of rural housing requirements. If the Nation's housing goals are to be met—including those of rural America—then the structure, funding, and operational procedures of both HUD and Farmers Home should be closely examined from the point of view of developing necessary improvements.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of today's most impressive and energetic overseas programs is the Partners of the Alliance—a unique and successful conception joining States of the United States with similar areas in Latin America. They are united by the common goal and desire of working together to attain social and economic development through a people-to-people relationship.

An article describing the Partners' activities in Latin America recently appeared in the National League Journal and I am pleased to insert it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE ALLIANCE HAS MANY PARTNERS

On May 14, 1969, in Salt Lake City, 350 delegates from 17 hemispheric nations rose to their feet and cheered as they unanimously adopted a special resolution requesting air transport assistance for the movement of program volunteers and donated equipment in grassroots projects of the Partners of the Alliance program.

Their action was not the result of conventional platitudes and resolution-passing, but of a demonstrated need.

In 1968, funds provided through the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance by A.I.D. enabled 350 program volunteers to work on Partners projects. During the same period, private donations in the United States enabled 1200 project volunteers to travel in Latin America, and funding from Latin America enabled 560 Latin American volunteers to work on activities in the United States.

Last year, more than 660 tons of new and carefully screened used equipment were shipped to Latin American Partners through privately arranged means.

The tragedy, however, is that the Partners committees in the United States could have made available several hundred more professional and technical volunteers and literally thousands of tons of hospital equipment for rural hospitals; tractors and other implements for agricultural schools or cooperatives; educational equipment and supplies; steel cable for suspension bridges to bring isolated villages into national life; generators; engines; new books for libraries; rice hullers for Amazonian settlements; and countless other types of commodities for people-oriented projects.

The problem was transportation.

This was the setting in Salt Lake City when the private sector leaders from throughout the hemisphere sprang to their feet and cheered in support of the resolution which called for the assignment of one airplane to the Partners of the Alliance... one airplane to be devoted to bringing together the citizens of the Americas in an action program dedicated to the cause of understanding and peace.

The airplane—and the program itself—can be justified by the cost-benefit ratio in

terms of dollars, but the real value of the Partners of the Alliance and the contribution which could be made by the assignment of the air transport is to be found in the intangibles which come from people working together with people in a spirit of partnership.

After the resolution was passed, a petition was presented to the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Charles Meyer, by action of the delegates to the IV Interamerican Conference of the Partners of the Alliance.

But what is the Partners of the Alliance? Who are the people who met in Salt Lake City, and what are they trying to do?

The Partners are people... people doing something about hemispheric understanding by working together in an action program. They are men and women of many fields of interest bound together by a common determination to help make the hemisphere a better place in which to live.

They are such men as Rex Baker of Houston and Arthur Tonsmeire of Mobile; Royden Derrick of Salt Lake City and Hickman Price of Washington, D.C.; Will Pirkey of Denver and Edgar Ribas of Curitiba, Brazil. They and thousands of their private sector colleagues from throughout the hemisphere are working in the cause of orderly development and hemispheric peace.

In its early days, the Alliance for Progress was little understood by people throughout the hemisphere, and while its goals were nobly expressed in the Charter of Punta del Este, its translations in terms of citizen participation was lost in the organizational drive of government-to-government programs.

To the rural campesino or to the citizen living in the barrio of an urban area, there was little understanding and little visibility in the early stages of building a savings and loan system even though such a system would help meet the basic need of housing and ultimately have high visibility. The expansion of institutions of higher education, the development of distant ports, the improvement of communications, and the effect of agricultural research were lost in the maze of day-to-day problems of the campesino or barrio dweller.

To them, the Alliance for Progress had meaning to the degree to which there was response to their own self-help efforts... a roof for a school which they had constructed of adobe; a pump for the well they had dug; hand tools with which to convert a trail into a farm-to-market road; or a loan to a cooperative for the purchase of a truck to haul products to market.

These high-impact but economically low-priority activities could not fit into the nation's economic development plan. The citizen level initiative, however, reflected the spirit of the Alliance for Progress at its best.

While a need existed to respond to local level self-help activities in Latin America, many citizens and private organizations in the United States were ready and willing to help. In the early days of the Alliance, those who were working in the government-to-government programs were asked by highly skilled and motivated individuals, "What can I do? Is there a constructive way in which I or my organization may give of time or means to the Alliance?"

The answer could have been, "Write your congressman and ask him to support the foreign aid bill." This, however, would have been neither effective nor appropriate.

While support of the AID appropriations was vital, the people wanted to be involved directly. No means existed, however, to articulate that interest in the form of an operational program of private citizens.

In bringing about involvement of people at the grassroots level, another factor had to

be considered, the factor of human dignity. The people of Latin America, just as the people of the United States, strongly resent and properly reject any program which is put forward in a patronizing way. While real and recognized needs in the economic and social areas were receiving attention, very little thought was being given to the contribution which Latin America could make to the United States.

A need existed to bring the people of Latin America into the role of participants, rather than recipients. Combining this principle with the fact that the people of other American Republics have much to contribute to the United States, we had the elements of "partnership" activities which give full recognition to importance of "dignidad." Private sector groups in the United States can respond to local self-help efforts in Latin America, but they can also receive contributions from their Partners in the form of touring art collections, visiting teachers in language, music, art, history, and other fields.

Thus, the Partners of the Alliance was born of a set of opportunities, as well as needs.

First conceived on a cold and bouncy train ride from Puno to Arequipa on the high plains of the Peruvian Andes, the Partners of the Alliance now involves citizens in 37 states and 37 areas in 16 Latin American nations. The goal: to bring people into the action orbit of the Alliance for Progress, and by so doing establish friendships that transcend not only official national borders, but national differences in terms of official policies on trade or aid.

The Partners of the Alliance office in AID was established to serve as the initial catalyst to bring together private citizen groups in the United States and Latin America. Partners of the Alliance committees are formed on a state-wide basis by interested leaders in the fields of education, business, health, labor, agriculture, and finance. Civic clubs, student groups, trade associations, and individual citizens can participate through the instrument the Partners committees.

Following the formation of the counterpart committees and after basic information has been exchanged, funds provided by the Agency for International Development are made available for the transportation and per diem expenses of a "program development team" representing the U.S. Partners committee to meet with the Latin American Partners organization.

For approximately two weeks, the U.S. team visits schools, hospitals, agriculture projects, rural medical posts and hospitals. They eat the dust and wade in the backwash of the rivers. The final two days of the team visit are given to discussions from which evolve mutually identified projects of a self-help nature which the Partners will implement from private resources.

Most Partners projects fall into the categories of: (1) education, (2) public health and medicine, (3) agriculture and rural development, (4) business and industry, and (5) cultural exchanges.

By March of 1969, the U.S. Partners had been responsible for a flow of more than \$13,000,000 in hard contributions to their Latin American partners. This figure does not include another \$2,000,000-plus from Partners-inspired foundation assistance.

Nor does it include very significant contributions in the form of packing, shipping to port, transporting donated equipment by sea or air, room and board for students on scholarships or for volunteer participants from Latin America, or local administrative costs and a significant amount of local and international travel.

As the resolution says, one airplane—designed for purposes for war to be converted to serve the cause of peace and understanding in the hemisphere—is wanted by the Alliance for Progress Partners of the Alliance.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said during the past several weeks with regard to the preservation of the Point Reyes National Seashore as a unique and pleasant recreation area to be enjoyed by the people of this Nation.

The Point Reyes National Seashore was authorized by Public Law 87-657, enacted September 13, 1962. This legislation provided an authorization for the appropriation of \$14,000,000 for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interest therein, and incidental costs relating thereto in accordance with the provisions of the act.

Approximately 4 years later, Public Law 89-666, enacted October 15, 1966, increased the authorized appropriation from \$14,000,000 to \$19,135,000.

To date, a total of \$19,135,000 has been appropriated pursuant to the provisions of the authorizing legislation for Point Reyes.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, for various reasons, principally the escalation of land prices in this area, it has been determined that an additional appropriation of funds for land acquisition of between \$47,000,000 and \$57,000,000 is urgently required for the acquisition of the remaining acreage at Point Reyes. According to information furnished the House Appropriations Committee, approximately 20,000 acres have been acquired of the total 53,000 acres authorized for acquisition.

The current crisis is caused by the fact that much of the acreage still to be acquired by the Federal Government is facing the immediate threat of development by various construction contractors. Naturally, if this should occur, the price of the developed acreage could increase to the extent that the Federal Government would be unable to acquire it.

The House Committee on Appropriations on numerous occasions has been implored to "do something to save Point Reyes." Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity today to make the record clear that there is not much we can do through the appropriations process at this time and place to alleviate the current predicament.

The full amount of the authorization has been appropriated. We cannot appropriate additional funds for Point Reyes until the authorization has been increased. In view of the current position taken by the Bureau of the Budget, even if we did have the additional authorization and additional funds were appropriated, I cannot be certain such action would ease the Point Reyes situation. The Bureau of the Budget says it is necessary to limit expenditures in view of the current budgetary situation, and that priorities must be drawn.

The recent amendment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act provided that a total of \$200 million would

be available each year for 5 years for the acquisition of recreation areas. The budget estimate we received for fiscal year 1970 was for \$124 million. That was the amount appropriated. Previous experience has shown that when the executive branch is disinclined to use funds for a particular activity, even though the Congress may appropriate additional funds, the excess appropriation is very likely to be placed in budgetary reserve.

I have followed very closely the dialog my colleague, the esteemed chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had with the Bureau of the Budget with regard to the use of land and water conservation funds. I must say that I am in agreement with his philosophy, that it is useless for Congress to authorize new parks and recreation areas if the executive branch is not willing to allocate funds for their acquisition.

So that there will be complete understanding of the problem involved, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the letter of September 10, 1969, to Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, from Mr. Robert P. Mayo, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D.C., September 10, 1969.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter reflects the separate views of the Bureau of the Budget which the Department of the Interior advised your Committee we would be transmitting in regard to several bills establishing new Federal park and recreation areas or increasing the monetary authorization for such areas.

As you know we have been deeply concerned over land acquisition problems and particularly the problem of escalating land costs as they have related to the acquisition of areas for Federal park and recreation purposes. We know that your Committee has fully shared our concern.

We believe there is general agreement that agencies should acquire parks and recreation areas as promptly as possible after authorization in order to (1) avoid the cost of prolonged land price escalation; (2) avoid the possibility of adverse developments in the authorized areas; and (3) minimize the period during which property owners are adversely affected by imminent Federal acquisition. However, despite a substantial increase in the funds available for parks and recreation land acquisition through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, in many cases it has not been possible to acquire the properties necessary for properly administrable areas.

While our concern extends to all three Federal agencies for which amounts are budgeted under the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the National Park Service accounts for the largest and most specific share of the commitments against the fund and typifies the problem that concerns us. We can illustrate the problem and its implications by discussing the acquisition program for the National Park Service.

The acquisition program for the National Park Service after FY 1970 would cost about \$275 million assuming no new areas are added and assuming current land prices. While we do not know at this time what the 1971 fund availability for the National Park Service land acquisition program will be, we see little likelihood of the FY 1971 program being larger than the FY 1970 program. In fact, even to maintain the 1970 level of pro-

gram obligations will require substantially increased budget authority, since the 1970 acquisition program is being financed in substantial part by balances carried over from prior years, all of which will be used during 1970.

If budget constraints approximately equal to the present ones continue in 1971, 1972, and 1973, and at current prices, the Department of the Interior will not be able to complete its program for land acquisition in existing areas by the end of fiscal year 1973, when the current augmented fund authority expires. Thus, even without authorization of new areas and under optimistic assumptions about the stability of land prices, deferrals in the Park Service land acquisition program in recently authorized areas or a reduction in the amounts proposed for acquisition of inholdings in older areas, or both, will probably be necessary. The allocation of funds for acquisition of areas yet to be authorized would require still greater reductions in funds for acquisition of existing areas or inholdings. This would also be the case if funds were allocated under proposed increases in land acquisition authorizations, as for Point Reyes.

Even if the 1970 budget authority for the National Park Service were doubled in 1971, 1972, and 1973 to \$75 million annually—which would utilize less than the total authorization available—not more than \$44 million would be available for not yet authorized Park Service areas. (Some additional amount would be available for acquisition of not yet authorized Park Service areas if it is unnecessary to use the full amount authorized for appropriation for the Redwood National Park.) However, in order to have as much as \$44 million available for such new areas the present constrained levels of inholding acquisition by the National Park Service would have to be maintained during those years. Also, to the extent land prices increase above their present levels some part of the \$44 million would be absorbed just to complete acquisition of already authorized areas.

This difficult situation, which has continued despite augmentation of the funds available for land acquisition purposes, has led us to give a great deal of thought to the possibility of developing and establishing generally acceptable priorities for proposed areas. We have been unable to accomplish this within a time frame that would avoid unduly delaying Congressional consideration of pending legislation.

The priority of a particular area seems to us to be a complex product of perhaps six principal and several additional factors, most of them highly judgmental. These six principal factors are: (1) the priority of the principal Federal purpose to be served by the area (bearing in mind that areas are authorized for a wide variety of purposes), (2) the overall quality of the area for its principal purpose (recognizing that most areas are authorized for more than a single purpose), (3) the relative supply of other areas serving a similar purpose for potential users as well as the number of such users and the proximity and accessibility of the area to them, (4) the relative cost of the area compared with other areas which would serve a similar purpose, (5) the threat to the area by conflicting purposes or adverse development, and (6) price escalation potential, particularly as escalation might be affected by authorization.

While we believe these are the key factors, we have not as yet been able to apply them in sufficiently precise fashion to provide a clear and objective basis for allocating a higher or lower priority, for example, to Point Reyes acquisition than to Cape Cod, or to give a seashore recreational area higher or lower priority than areas with other principal purposes. We believe, however, that these criteria are appropriate ones for both

authorizations and appropriations involving land acquisition for park, monument, and recreational purposes. We intend, therefore, to work further on this difficult task with Interior and other interested agencies, especially through the Environmental Quality Council.

While in the circumstances we would have no objection to enactment of H.R. 3786, increasing the authorization ceiling at Point Reyes National Seashore, H.R. 1187 and H.R. 5246, increasing the authorization ceiling at Cape Cod National Seashore, or S. 853, establishing the Sawtooth National Recreation Area, we must reiterate that funds likely to become available will not be sufficient to permit acquisition of such areas without extensive curtailment in already programmed land acquisition.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director.

WAS THIS TRIP REALLY NECESSARY

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the following article was written by Reporter Tom Kuncel for the Davenport, Iowa, Times-Democrat. I believe the story should have wide distribution.

IOWA BOY'S "TRIP" PROVES NEARLY FATAL (By Tom Kuncel)

He didn't answer roll call at Davenport West High School last Wednesday morning. The boy was "off on a trip."

A drug trip, that filled four days with terror and pain, and nearly killed him.

When they found him last Saturday in Blue Grass he wasn't a boy anymore. He was like a whimpering animal, only half conscious, sobbing mindlessly in pain.

Wearing only undershorts and socks, he had run through the timber for a day, maybe two days. He doesn't know for sure.

Hundreds of cuts criss-cross his arms and chest. His hands and legs are gashed and swollen with infection. His knees look like raw hamburger because for some part of his tortured journey he crawled through rough country on his hands and knees.

Much of the skin from both his ears has been torn away. From his nose, too. Even his eyelids are cut above his vacant and staring blue eyes.

He ran through barbed wire, through brush and corn and bumped into trees and limbs, but doesn't remember much of it.

What he can remember is being patiently drawn out piece by piece by Scott County deputy sheriffs who have been with him in the intensive care unit of Mercy Hospital, Davenport, for many hours since he was found.

Saturday night, Deputy Ken Paulsen was sure that what had happened would never be known.

"The doctor said we were going to lose him because of what the pills had done. So we prepared to try for a dying declaration from him, to try and find out where he had got the stuff," Paulsen said.

"I'd rather have taken a beating. I didn't know how to tell a 15-year-old kid he was going to die," Paulsen said.

To take the dying declaration, and satisfy the law, Paulsen would have had to give it to him straight—that he was going to die.

Someone pulled a miracle, and the boy lived. Monday a Times-Democrat reporter listened at his bedside as he tried again to

put the story together for Sheriff William Strout and Paulsen.

He headed for school Wednesday morning and met a friend outside. They didn't go in, but hitchhiked to Blue Grass and went to the house of another boy whom they both knew. There was another guy there, too. He had some pills.

"He had some that were black and yellow and some that were green and yellow. He had some more that were white and red.

"He was high and said he had some real good stuff, and it wouldn't hurt you unless you got an overdose.

"He said he could build me up to the right level and then taper it off," the boy in the hospital bed said.

Through the first day he remembers taking 10 of the capsules which he guessed contained a drug the junkies call "Speed." After that he doesn't remember another thing until three or four days later when he found himself in the woods, with most of his clothing gone.

"It started to rain and I hollered and hollered for help, but nobody could hear me. I was on my knees and I couldn't make my legs get me up.

"I tried counting to three and then pulling myself up, but I couldn't.

"I crawled out of there on my hands and knees and finally I was in front of this house and I tried to get in.

"The woman who came to the door must have been alone and she must have been afraid when she saw how I looked, she wouldn't let me in," he said.

The woman called police and the boy continued to crawl on his hands and knees into a nearby garage. They found him there and took him to the hospital.

His mother and father were stunned. They had reported the boy missing when he failed to come home from school. They were sure that something had happened, but nothing could prepare them for what they saw at the hospital.

"We were sure he was going to die, it just didn't look like he could make it," his father said.

"We'd talked to him about drugs before. His brother had been in California and seen what it could do. We thought we'd told him all the right things," his mother said.

Did they think something like this could ever happen to their son?

"You want to believe they have more sense," his father said.

"Every parent must be afraid it could happen. Now we know it can happen," his mother said.

The anguished mother said that when her son became able to speak again he told her he thought God had deserted him, out in the timber, when he couldn't get to his feet.

"I told him maybe it was the other way around," she said.

"We've tried to be religious people," his father added.

In the hospital room. Strout asked the boy, "Why?"

"I didn't think anything like this could happen. He said it would be a good trip. Then I was in the woods and I thought I'm going to die down here, and no one is ever going to find me."

"Never again," he said, "Never again. I know it all now. I know all about it. There's nothing in it. Nothing for anybody."

Strout said Monday his department is continuing to put the pieces together.

One of the major problems in such cases is getting solid enough evidence against "dope pushers" to make a criminal charge stick.

"It's got to be stopped and stopped fast," Strout said, "or it's going to be out of control here.

"The youth is still in a dazed condition and efforts to question him about the identity of those responsible are slow at this point," Strout said today.

The investigation is continuing as the sheriff's offices seek those responsible for supplying the drugs.

"I wish every parent of teenagers could see the terrible condition of this boy to be convinced of the danger in use of drugs," Strout said.

"There's got to be more education. The government has got to get behind it; these kids have got to know what this stuff can do to them," he added.

For the boy's shaken parents there is anger and sorrow in the wake of what happened to their son.

"If I ever saw the kid that gave him those pills I would kill him, and I'd do it slowly," the boy's father said.

But in their shock the parents want also to help.

"You tell the real story," his father said. "Our boy has learned his lesson, but how many other kids are playing with drugs?"

"If I didn't think it would hurt his recovery I'd ask the high schools to send every one of their classes to the hospital to take a look at him," his mother said.

"They couldn't want to take a chance with their lives after that."

M-DAY FROWNED UPON BY MAJORITY IN SURVEY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 18, 1969]

M-DAY FROWNED UPON BY MAJORITY IN SURVEY—SINDLINGER POLL OF 995 PERSONS FINDS RISE IN SUPPORT FOR NIXON'S VIET POLICY

NEW YORK.—A majority of Americans polled following national moratorium day were unsympathetic to the antiwar demonstrations and an even larger percentage endorsed President Nixon's Vietnam policies, it was reported Friday.

Sindlinger & Co., a marketing and opinion research organization in Norwood, Pa., conducted the survey by telephone Thursday, the day after the moratorium observance, questioning 995 persons throughout the country. Most of those questioned were over 25.

NIXON BACKED BY 68.5 PERCENT

The firm said that of the 78.6% who knew about moratorium day, 57.4% thought it was "an overall bad idea," 31.7% thought it was an "overall good idea" and 10.9% had no opinion.

Asked whether they believed Mr. Nixon "is doing all he can to settle the war in Vietnam," 68.5% said "yes," 20.9% said "no" and 10.6% had no opinion.

This was a rise in support for Mr. Nixon's Vietnam policies since a similar Sindlinger poll conducted in September. In that poll 61.5% of those questioned supported Mr. Nixon on Vietnam and 23.3% thought he could do more.

The support did not, however, reach the level of a Sindlinger poll in June when 72% backed Mr. Nixon and only 13.4% thought he could do more to end the war.

Albert E. Sindlinger, president of the firm, said it was significant that the percentage of persons with no opinion dropped from 15.2 in September to 10.6 in the latest poll.

"I think the moratorium actually solidified support for Nixon," he said, "The people

we questioned were more vocal on this than on any survey we have ever done before."

Of those who did not endorse Mr. Nixon's Vietnam policies in the new poll, 67.9% wanted the war stopped with an immediate troop withdrawal and 27.6% wanted the war stepped up to "get it over with." The remaining 4.5% believed that Mr. Nixon should concentrate on domestic problems which they considered more important than the war.

NO LITTLE PROBLEM—NICKEL

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed with a problem that confronts a large number of small manufacturers in Connecticut, attributable to prolonged strikes of Canadian nickel producers.

I have called upon the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable David M. Kennedy, to take immediate action to release nickel from the Treasury Department's reserve supply in the interest of the economic welfare of manufacturing firms and their employees who rely upon a normal nickel market. I have called upon the Treasury Department to release nickel because it is my understanding that there is on hand 40 million pounds of nickel, an accumulation equal to 4 years' supply for coinage.

There are strong indications that settlement of the Canadian strikes is imminent. However, it is anticipated that following settlement of the strikes there will be a period of several months before the nickel market can be expected to return to normal. For this reason I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to act immediately and I urge my colleagues who recognize the urgency of the situation to join with me in this effort.

I enclose herewith a copy of my letter to Secretary Kennedy.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1969.

HON. DAVID M. KENNEDY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in the interest of a large number of metal products firms in the State of Connecticut which face serious financial difficulties because of the high cost of nickel and the difficulty of obtaining supplies. I am hopeful that the settlement of the STELCO of Canada strike will serve as a pattern for other settlements and help restore the nickel market to normalcy.

Despite this one settlement and the prospect of others, however, it is apparent that there will be several months delay before the nickel shortage is eased.

In the interest of the economic welfare of the manufacturing firms and their employees who rely upon a normal nickel market, I urge that you take immediate steps to release nickel from the Treasury Department's reserve supply. I am informed by official sources that the Treasury Department currently has 40 million pounds of nickel in reserve which, I understand, is a four-year supply.

I am hopeful that action to release nickel may be completed administratively, but if Congressional action is necessary I am im-

mediately available to cooperate with you toward that end. It is urgent that immediate action be taken.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

KINGMAN BREWSTER'S VIETNAM MORATORIUM ADDRESS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about last week's Vietnam moratorium and those who planned and participated in it. On reflection I was impressed not only with the order and decorum of those events I attended and at which I spoke but the many profound statements made by a good number of speakers at observances throughout the country. One of the most impressive was the speech by Yale's Kingman Brewster at New Haven.

The New York Times' Anthony Lewis has captured the spirit and intent of the moratorium and, particularly, Brewster's remarks and I am pleased to insert his article in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1969]

A THOUGHTFUL ANSWER TO HARD QUESTIONS

(By Anthony Lewis)

NEW HAVEN, CONN., October 16.—There was no ambiguity in this city about the effectiveness of the Vietnam Moratorium. It was a moving, an unforgettable expression of deep public desire to get the United States out of the war.

The police said there were 50,000 people at the meeting on the Green, which would be a third of New Haven's population. It was a mixed crowd, old and young, square and hip. And the speakers also covered the spectrum, old-style politicians and reformers, white and black, leaders of business and labor. For two hours they sounded the theme that we must get out.

But even in New Haven, one could not forget that there are Americans on the other side. A sound-truck filled with counter-demonstrators circled the Green, bearing a savagely simple sign: "Destroy, Not Appear."

And in Washington it is clear that the politicians worry about the other side. They fear that if things go wrong after an American withdrawal—if people in South Vietnam are killed, if respect for our other world commitments is eroded—there may be a delayed and damaging public reaction. Some call this fear the Weimar syndrome, one aroused by memory of the German feeling after World War I that victory had been frustrated by a stab in the back.

KINGMAN BREWSTER'S SPEECH

That is why the most impressive speech on the Green in New Haven yesterday was one that lasted barely five minutes. It came at the end, and it was by the president of Yale, Kingman Brewster Jr.

In a dozen paragraphs of understated rhetoric, he addressed himself to the basic political concerns that held Lyndon Johnson in Vietnam and that obviously inhibit Richard Nixon in his search for a way out. Eschewing the simple emotion of righteous anger, he told those who understood him that hard political questions had to be faced if the war was now to be brought to an end.

"Let us not make the mistake of saying that defeat is easy to take," he said. "If our

country is to survive this wound, let us be more honest in the pursuit of peace than we have been in the pursuit of this war.

"Let us admit that it is not easy to stop short of victory in a cause for which so many have fallen.

"Let us say simply that we cannot tolerate the abuse of their memory as a justification for continuation of the killing and the dying at the behest of a corrupt Saigon Government which rejects both democracy and peace.

"Let us admit that it is not easy to abandon the anonymous masses of South Vietnamese who have relied upon us.

"Let us say simply that their interest as well as ours can no longer be served by the perpetuation of terror and death.

THE POLITICAL RISKS

"Let us admit that the retreat of our power in the face of a persistent enemy might invite other aggressors to doubt—and doubting, to test—our will to help keep the peace, in Europe, in the Middle East, in Asia.

"Let us say simply and proudly that our ability to keep the peace also requires above all that America once again become a symbol of decency and hope, fully deserving the trust and respect of all mankind."

Kingman Brewster would not pretend that his answers are a program; he has separately offered specific suggestions for a cease-fire and a timetable of withdrawal. But what he said on the Green—in those few phrases, almost Gettysburg-like in their simplicity after so much oratory—should have significance for both President Nixon and his critics.

He admitted to supporters of present policy, and reminded its critics, that there is a political risk in a bold program to withdraw on a fixed schedule and thus put the Saigon government at hazard. But there always is a risk in hard political choices, and Mr. Brewster's argument was that to temporize further in Vietnam carries even more terrible risks. Perhaps, because he recognized the difficulties, the Administration will listen.

DICK CASEY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this week joyously ended the 1969 baseball season with "Mets" day in New York City. I would like to add to the long list of accolades in this extraordinary season, Bernard "Dick" Casey, a lifelong Red Sox fan was greatly honored by the city of Boston a few weeks ago when the Town Field at Fields Corner was renamed in his honor—the Dick Casey Field.

Dick Casey has had a long career serving the public in many areas. He served for many years in the Great and General Court of Massachusetts with my good friends and colleagues, EDDIE BOLAND, JIM BURKE, and myself. Yet Dick Casey's most lasting and vital contribution to the citizens of Boston was his work pursuing his favorite hobby, baseball. He formed the Dick Casey Club and in 1934 joined the Boston Park League and subsequently helped the league gain its status as the best known semipro league in the Nation. Mr. Casey, therefore, was able to provide good and wholesome recreation for the young men of Boston. He has

always been one of the Boston Red Sox best fans. He started working at Fenway Park as an usher in 1915 and has continued to attend most of the Red Sox games since then.

Baseball has always been America's favorite sport. As we all witnessed last week, New York City, a city of much diversity, was united under the Mets banner.

Dick Casey had added copiously to the world of baseball and, through his efforts in this area, to the basic fibers of this great country. I am proud and grateful that Dick Casey comes from the great city of Boston.

SECRETARY FINCH TAKES STRONG STAND ON QUESTION OF PUBLIC HEALTH

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor carried a fine editorial today with respect to the actions of Secretary Finch on the question of cyclamates. I concur wholeheartedly in the comments contained in the editorial. Secretary Finch is certainly to be commended for taking this forthright action. I hope this type of action continues to be a hallmark not only at Health, Education, and Welfare, but throughout President Nixon's administration. The editorial follows:

FROM CYCLAMATES TO POLLUTION

The United States Government's ban on the use of cyclamate artificial sweeteners is bold, far-reaching, and first-rate. It:

Demonstrates a federal readiness to move swiftly and decisively to protect the public health.

Raises hopes that Washington will also begin to move with like toughness against other health and comfort threats, above all the sundry kinds of air and water pollution now besetting life in America.

Lifts the standard of federal concern over whatever can be clearly shown to be inimical to the public interest.

This newspaper has never advocated or accepted the theory that public authorities, particularly health authorities, have the right or the duty to regulate individual treatment of the human body. Such interference should be kept to a minimum. But the banning from sale of a product which can be shown to carry physical danger does not constitute interference. It is a normal measure of protection.

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch's order to withdraw all products using cyclamates (other than with a physician's prescription) is a justified use of federal policing power.

Furthermore, it shows considerable governmental boldness when it is recalled that the cyclamate industry is reckoned to be a billion-dollar one and the products affected have been highly popular and sought-after.

We hope that, where it is right and fitting, the government will act with equal boldness in other fields where only broad governmental action can do away with a continuing threat to human well-being. The foremost of such fields is that of pollution.

As is well known, the American public is now fully ready to give strong support to measures to end the disgraceful befouling of the nation's air and waterways. In fact, there is an increasingly sharp note in the public's demand to know why more is not being done on this crucial challenge. This public dissatisfaction is heightened by the feeling (supported by official studies) that air pollution (and indeed water pollution as well) is still rising. One federal study reckons that 140 million tons of contaminants are being loosed into the American air every year compared with 130 million tons just two years ago.

HEW has acted bravely and well in the matter of cyclamates. Let us hope that it will find the legal means to act with like boldness where pollution is concerned. There is one thing of which the government can be sure. And that is that the public will heartily back it in any such efforts.

A LACK OF FAITH NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared recently in the Ogden Standard-Examiner of Ogden, Utah, regarding the neighborhood development program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Since the situation described in the editorial is of considerable consequence to the city of Ogden, and I am sure of considerable importance to those other cities which have made NDP applications, I wanted to share this editorial with you:

OGDEN'S NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT: BOGGED DOWN BY INACTIVE CONGRESS

The authorities operating the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) are almost like a mother hen who has but one worm to pop into open mouths of 10 hungry chicks.

There's one important difference.

Mother HUD doesn't have the worm—yet. We're worried.

Ogden's among the hungry chicks.

Unless Congress gets off its inactive, politically glue seat the NDP in Ogden and at least 299 other U.S. cities will die of starvation.

If it does succumb, it'll be next to impossible to revive.

The story, like the tale of Mother Hubbard and her renowned bare cupboard, is long and sad.

Ogden voters earlier this year enthusiastically responded to the call of a citizen's committee, the Ogden City Council and administration and this newspaper by voting to participate in a Neighborhood Development Program.

The Ogden vote was in defiance of the previous trend in Utah. Salt Lake City had turned down an ambitious urban renewal program. Provo had done the same.

Instead of being No. 2 in Utah our city, for a change, was going to be No. 1 in the long-overdue movement of upgrading the housing of its less fortunate residents.

We "bought" the NDP program on the promise of HUD representatives that for every dollar our municipality spent there would be matching federal funds.

"Great," Ogden voters said as they went to the polls.

But they didn't realize (Who did?) how the Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate and Washington would go to almost any length to embarrass the Republican administration of President Richard M. Nixon.

Historically, the appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1 are voted by the Congress just before or just after that year begins.

It's different this year.

The calendar insists it is now Oct. 19. But most of the departmental appropriations for fiscal 1970—the financial year that began three months and 19 days ago—are still hung up along the winding tracks of the congressional route.

HUD's one of the casualties.

Like the other departments who don't know what they'll be able to spend this year for sure, HUD has been operating on a basis of assuming—with Congress' permission—that it will get as much as it did in fiscal 1969 for basic missions.

The Neighborhood Development Program's not quite basic.

The requests by Ogden and 299 other cities for funds can't be honored until the actual appropriation is in hand. HUD and the administration asked for \$1 billion for all urban renewal activity in fiscal year 1970. This is \$63 million less than appropriated for fiscal 1969. But the House, following the recommendation of its appropriation committee, approved only \$850 million. The Senate hasn't voted yet so anything can happen there.

Even if the administration-HUD request for \$1 billion had been doubled and been granted by Congress, all 30 requests for neighborhood development funds couldn't have been satisfied.

If the House figure holds, that worm Mother HUD will get for those hungry chicks will be skinny and not capable of providing nourishment for all the communities that have their mouths open.

A spokesman for HUD, calling us at the request of Rep. Laurence J. Burton, told the Standard-Examiner on Thursday that all 300 NDP applications were "under review" pending some determination of what the final policy will be.

Ogden's is among them.

"The requests we have on hand far exceed," he said in a masterful understatement, "the amount of money likely to become available."

That's bad.

But there's one thing good, comparatively.

Both the House and Senate are considering legislation, in different forms, that would extend the deadline for credits to be granted for local improvements. Without such an extension the matching fund credit for the thousands of dollars spent on the new Weber County Library wouldn't count, if and when regular funds become available.

The Senate has already passed a bill that extends from three to four years the period of eligibility for matching funds in NDP applications filed before last Aug. 11—about the time our library credit ran out under the three-year limitation.

A House version, reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee, would give a similar extra year for both NDP and urban renewal credits for "which pending applications were filed on or before the date of enactment of the bill."

This is even better—for Ogden—than the Senate proposal.

Our HUD source predicted that favorable action on a compromise extension should come soon.

That's only a temporary victory, however.

In the first year of NDP projects, only 35 cities were approved for funding. And that was when HUD actually had funds.

So, if and when Congress finally passes the overdue HUD appropriation for fiscal

1970, our odds on getting our matching funds are around 10 to 1. Or less.

We think we should get the grant so we can show the way to better housing in Utah. After all, Ogden voters did believe the federal authorities when they said "approve this legislation and you'll get better housing." If we don't get the HUD funds, it'll be a cold day in Utah before we believe any word from Washington again.

STIFFER LAW URGENTLY NEEDED TO KEEP SMUT FROM MAILS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Operations Subcommittee of our committee is continuing its hearings on legislation to ban smut mail from being sent to homes where minors reside. The bill I introduced some weeks ago is among those being considered.

In today's session under the leadership of the able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Nix), there was further impressive testimony in behalf of enabling legislation. Full study of the problem and possible remedies is essential.

Among those testifying were two other members of our full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, our vice chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON), and the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN).

Others who gave their views were Mario Procaccino, comptroller of the city of New York; Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union; and Randel Shake, director of the American Legion's National Child Welfare Commission.

Mr. Speaker, today's testimony of my colleagues, Mr. HENDERSON and Mr. OLSEN, merits the attention of all Members and I include their texts with my remarks:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE DAVID N. HENDERSON AT HEARING ON CONTROL OF SMUT MAIL

Mr. Chairman: First of all, I want to commend this subcommittee for the interest it has shown in moving to take prompt action to restrict smut mailers.

The press release issued by Chairman Nix on October 6 was, I am sure, welcome news to thousands and thousands of citizens who have been outraged by the receipt, unsolicited, through the mails of pandering advertisements with pictures and descriptions lurid almost beyond belief.

All of us know the background which has brought us to our present state of affairs. Obviously, we do not all agree on what is and is not obscene and pornographic.

It has been pointed out that the Venus de Milo and Michelangelo's David might be considered obscene by some. It has been pointed out that Shakespeare and the Holy Bible use four-letter words and describe sexual activity.

And seizing upon this fact and the ruling by the Supreme Court that not only must material, to be obscene and pornographic under the meaning of present statutes, be designed to appeal primarily to prurient interests, but must also be utterly without redeeming social value; smut mailers have been

able, virtually with impunity, to flood the mails with unsolicited advertisements that almost literally would make your hair stand on end.

I believe that no matter what this committee and this Congress do, the question of what is and is not obscene and pornographic is going to continue to be raised in the Courts and is going to continue to plague us for a long time.

And as we all know, the House Judiciary Committee is going into this question in a broad and general way.

ANTI-PANDERING LAW GOOD START

Our full committee reported; the Congress adopted and the President signed into law the present anti-pandering law. It is good, as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

It provides a tool by which a recipient of offensive mail can sign a form which the local Postmaster will send to the mailer and have the recipient's name taken off the list of that particular mailer.

The weakness here is that the protection is only after-the-fact protection and protection against only a particular mailer.

In the President's proposal on this subject, which many of us have introduced, is a provision for a nationwide list to be made up of persons who do not want to receive pandering advertisements.

The list would be sold, at cost, to those intending to mail out such advertisements, and the mailer would subject himself to penalty if anyone whose name had been on the list for as long as thirty days received any such material.

This is a step in the right direction, but in my judgment after considerable thought and study, it has three serious drawbacks.

The first is that it is cumbersome, complicated and would undoubtedly result both in administrative headaches and considerable expense to the Post Office Department.

The second is that there is a 30-day time lapse between the placing of the name on the list and the affording of protection. Revised lists would have to be issued every month.

The third is that the smut mailer would be delighted to get his hands on such a list as he would save a lot of expense by deleting those names.

COMMISSION MADE INTERIM REPORT

Last year the Congress created a Commission on Obscenity and Pornography and directed it to report back to us and to the President in January, 1970 its findings and recommendations with regard to this vital subject.

Although not directed to do so, this body filed an interim report in August of this year, and the only specific recommendation it made for action now is the provision incorporated into HR 13585 and related bills.

HR 13585 takes the approach of the President in establishing a list of mail patrons who do not wish to receive sexually-oriented materials, but makes it a local list to be maintained at each local post office. The procedure is quite simple and should not involve any serious administrative burden or much cost.

The bill directs that the Postmaster General, through normal administrative action, devise a symbol. This symbol would be required to be placed on the cover of any piece of mail containing sexually-oriented matter as such matter is described in the bill.

Then it provides that any mail patron can advise his local Postmaster that he would like his name and the names of minor members of his household placed on a local list to be maintained in the local Post Office. Then any mail received bearing the designated symbol simply would not be delivered to anyone whose name was on the local list.

The bill does not attempt to declare that sexually-oriented mail is obscene or porno-

graphic. It does not attempt to declare that such material cannot be sent through the mails. It does not attempt to prohibit a transaction between consenting adults involving such material. For these reasons, I believe that the Constitutional arguments involving the First Amendment and freedom of expression do not come into play at all.

AIMED AT UNSOLICITED MAIL

All the bill does is provide the mail patron with a mechanism for exercising his right not to receive any such mail unsolicited.

It is superior to the President's nationwide list in that:

(1) It is much less of an administrative burden and much less expensive.

(2) It affords the patron immediate protection from the time his name goes on the list.

(3) It does not do the smut mailer a favor by forewarning him not to send his materials to certain persons.

To guard against a mailer pleading that placing the symbol on the cover violates his Constitutional rights against self-incrimination, the bill specifically provides that compliance by a mailer with this law cannot be used as evidence against him or as a basis for initiating or pursuing an investigation against him.

It does not, of course, grant him immunity from prosecution under the basic laws governing obscenity, but it does guarantee him that the compliance with the law involving the symbol shall not be a basis for such prosecution.

We need other laws, such as the one so many of us have introduced providing for the protection of minors.

ONE MORE STEP—AND NEEDED

But this one bill, which goes a step beyond the present anti-pandering law, but which avoids the bramble thicket of what constitutes pornography and obscenity is one which we should enact separately and without delay.

It is one in which this subcommittee and our full committee has unquestioned jurisdiction since it relates only to the use of the mails.

It has been co-sponsored by a substantial majority of the members of our full committee, both Democrats and Republicans and thus would be assured of favorable consideration by the full committee if reported by this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this subcommittee report HR 13585 and its companion bills promptly as a separate measure; one which does not bog down in complications as so many of the other measures do, and one which we can use as the vehicle of fulfilling the pledge so many of us have made to give to our postal patrons some real protection against receiving unsolicited smut mail.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ARNOLD OLSEN BEFORE POSTAL OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman: I want to take this opportunity to endorse the work of this Subcommittee in taking up the matter of obscenity legislation.

The subject is an emotional one. Those who express their opposition to any regulation of pornography do so by means of ridicule rather than meeting the issues.

Over 250 thousand Americans have applied for postal orders banning erotic advertising from their homes under the pandering law passed during the 90th Congress as the result of hearings held by this Subcommittee and as a result of an amendment to the postal rates bill.

The pandering law authored by Congressman Cunningham went into effect a year and a half ago. It was a courageous first step on a long road.

But much needs to be done and the quarter of a million Americans who have complained to the Post Office Department, and

the thousands of outraged constituents who have complained to the Congress want more help and their voice will not be silenced by ridicule.

I am confident that this Subcommittee will answer their indignation with sensible and constitutional legislation.

MUCH MISUNDERSTANDING OF RULINGS

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the position of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject of obscenity regulation.

The Court's basic position in the case of *Roth v. United States* 254 U.S. 476, 1957 was a common sense one. This decision reversed a 100-year old English case, *Regina v. Hicklin*, which held that the basis of obscenity legislation was the protection of weak persons from themselves by keeping pornography out of their hands.

It made the standard for all reading matter childlike in order to protect children and the immature. What is more, under the decision a book could be judged not only by its cover but by portions of it rather than as a whole.

This decision, while establishing a more restricted standard for obscenity regulation, should not have interfered with obscenity prosecutions. It did interfere because law enforcement officers prefer to proceed against a book or thing rather than the person selling pornography.

Because of the conflict over procedure, the method of prosecution, Court decisions became confusing in that the Court itself, as stated by Justice Marshall in *Redrup v. New York* 386 U.S. 767, split into 5 schools of thought over the definition of obscenity on a 9 member court.

THERE IS COMMON FRONT ON COURT

What has emerged, however, is a common front on the part of a majority of the Court on matters they do agree on and that agreement covers considerable territory.

The Court in the *Redrup* case pointed out that the State and Government in general had an interest in protecting the morals of children, in protecting the privacy of the home and individuals from offensive salesmanship and in protecting the public from what the Supreme Court had defined as pandering advertising in *Ginzburg v. United States* 383 U.S. 463, 1963.

This Subcommittee has before it bills which specifically define nonmailable matter in medical terms, places the administrative burden for keeping pornography away from the homes of those who specifically request that the Government so protect them, and protects children through provisions based on a New York State statute discussed in *Ginsburg v. New York* 390 U.S. 629, 1968.

This is the approach taken in H.R. 10867, a bill by Mr. Dulski, the distinguished Chairman of our Committee. I agree with this approach and I support it.

ABOUT DENMARK SITUATION

I know that in the near future we are going to hear that Denmark has abolished its obscenity laws. The implication will be drawn that Denmark has little or no obscenity regulation. I disagree.

A staff study based on personal discussions with the Subcommittee Staff reveals that Denmark has extensive local regulation of obscenity. Shops, for instance, are not allowed to display erotic matter in shop windows. In addition, there is no third class mail advertising industry.

As a result, the Denmark example has no bearing on the hearings today which are aimed at mail advertising and establishing protection for the privacy of individuals.

The problem we are all interested in is a specific one. It is a Federal problem and it deals with a Federal instrumentality—the United States Postal Service.

I congratulate the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Mr. Nix, in his effort to keep the issue specific. His diligence will overcome the

defense of those who will attempt to escape from the need for sensible action by wrapping themselves in the flag and the constitution.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT ACTION

Such individuals have their constituents and we have ours—the American people. I don't believe that 250 thousand Americans are wrong, and I believe that literally millions more want action to protect the family mailbox and their children from smut mail.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to have submitted for the record examples of the kind of material that my constituents have received and to also submit an outstanding article on the subject of obscenity generally.

The article by Larry Ellison of the University of Montana Law School entitled "Obscenity: A Compromise Proposal," suggests that what needs to be done is to establish firmly the right of privacy by providing a tort right for citizens so that they can protect themselves against any pornographer, no matter how important in the publishing industry, through litigation.

I would like to request that your staff look into the matter of providing a means of court action in our Federal courts so that citizens do not have to rely entirely on the criminal law. Whether or not such a provision is added to legislation recommended by this Committee, the very fact that such a study is taking place should give smut mallers cause for concern. Thank you.

MACARTHUR'S RETURN TO THE PHILIPPINES—25 YEARS AGO

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, October 20 marked the 25th anniversary of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's return to Leyte in the Philippines, and this is a fitting time to take a moment for reflection on this great turning point in the war in the Pacific.

General MacArthur splashed ashore from a landing craft onto the shores of Leyte and issued his rallying cry to the people of the Philippine Islands. He said:

I have returned . . . Rally to me . . . Rise and strike!

The seizure of Leyte, in the center of the Philippine archipelago, meant the splitting of this island chain and with it the immobilization of the main Japanese forces on Mindanao and Luzon.

By day's end, Allied forces were ashore in force in spite of enemy resistance, difficult terrain and terrible heat. General MacArthur and the free world forces had returned. Before another year had passed, the entire Philippines would be liberated.

It was the promise of this return that kept up the resistance of the Philippine people for 2½ years, Mr. Speaker, and maintained the morale, spirit and loyalty of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee of the Post Office Department to begin work on a commemorative stamp in honor of the service given his country by General MacArthur and time the release of this stamp to coincide with the anniversary of the general's birth.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation this week is observing National Business Women's Week, October 19 through 25. Across the country more than 3,800 member clubs of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women will spotlight the role of women in today's world.

This is an annual observance that has special significance this year since the federation is marking its 50th anniversary. During the past half century, the federation has worked constantly, not only to achieve equal rights as citizens for women, but to elevate standards for them in business and professional life; to promote their interests and bring about a spirit of cooperation; to extend opportunities to them through education in industrial, scientific, and vocational activities.

The federation's success can be measured by its enormous growth since its founding July 16, 1919, in St. Louis, Mo., by 212 women representing 42 of the 45 States then in existence. Today the federation numbers 180,000 members from every State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. It has made its voice heard on legislation in the past and this year, during its annual convention, it outlined a five-point program for the future which includes the following items:

Support of legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide equality of rights under the law will not be denied or abridged because of sex.

To work actively for pending legislation to provide a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; to increase personal exemption and credit for dependents and to provide a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

To propose and support legislation providing uniform working hours, conditions, pay, and opportunities for men and women; equal treatment for them in survivor and retirement benefits and increased child care education.

To propose and support State legislation for uniform jury services and qualifications in the selection of men and women for jury duty.

To propose and support legislation for more effective crime control and law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note the Pennsylvania branch of the national federation met this past weekend in Harrisburg and honored three of my constituents in the 20th Congressional District for their services and efforts on behalf of the organization's ideals and objectives. Cited by the State group were O. Jean Hoffman of Dravosburg, a member of the McKeesport Area School Board; M. Rigby Hill, now retired as administrative secretary of the school board but still treasurer of the teachers' pension fund, and Irene M. Atwater, a past president of the McKeesport BPW

Club and the assistant to the solicitor of the city of McKeesport.

I salute these women, Mr. Speaker, and I extend my congratulations to the national federation on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

TRUTH MUST RISE ABOVE CLAMOR

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

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

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 9, 1969]

TRUTH MUST RISE ABOVE CLAMOR

Again there is a strong riptide of activity in the United States of America which seeks to induce President Nixon simply to abandon South Vietnam.

The riptide is visible in Congress where, individually and in small groups, legislators are urging a condemnation of the American commitment in Southeast Asia.

The riptide is also visible in the national agitation—professional or naive—for a demonstration Oct. 15 to force President Nixon to make a more firm but generally undefined commitment to retreat.

Amid the clamor of the clagues, there are some things that are evident and even more that are not—things that Americans would do well to keep in mind as they try to distill some truth from the confusion.

The first is that whatever the mistakes of the past, the United States cannot roll back the calendar in South Vietnam. We have to deal with the war on the basis of the present realities.

And we must, in seeking the truth, challenge the depth of thinking as well as the credentials of the experts, be they self-styled or real.

It is a truth and a reality that the United States is diminishing its Vietnam commitment at a rate deemed prudent by the person upon whose shoulders falls the responsibility for making the awesome judgment—the President of the United States.

What exactly do the critics of our current actions want? More rapid withdrawal? How rapid? Is open retreat their real object?

Do the critics of the war know whether it is possible to move our men home from Vietnam more rapidly simply from the standpoint of logistics?

Would those who favor pellmell withdrawal be willing to endorse the inevitable bloodbath in Southeast Asia that such a retreat would create?

Are those who urge our surrender in Vietnam prepared to accept the responsibility for its effect upon the hundreds of our young men being held prisoners by North Vietnam? Several already have been executed and Hanoi says it may "try" the remainder as war criminals.

Is the Greek chorus baying at the heels of the President prepared to face the worldwide implications of a United States' surrender?

The fact is they advocate nothing but the negative—get out. Has anybody heard acceptable positive programs from these self-styled experts to preserve the seedling of self determination in Vietnam and prevent the writing of an ignominious, bloody chapter in our history?

We have not heard them.

All that we have heard so far is that if we vaporize the American presence in Vietnam

immediately, somehow everything will turn out all right despite the obvious and imminent dangers. It will not.

Americans should view with suspicion the thought that there is an instant solution in instant surrender.

SOUTH AFRICA ADVERTISES LEGALIZED RACISM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leslie H. Whitten in "South Africa on Madison Avenue," which appears in the October 1969 issue of the Progressive, writes that the racist South African Government has allocated more than \$1.75 million in 3 years to the propagandizing of the American people. During a similar period, Mr. Whitten estimates that black South Africans spent about \$8,000.

This disparity in public relations investment, fortunately, is not reflected in the editorial treatment the South African Government usually receives in our mass media. The first requisite of a successful public relations campaign is a good product. And modern advertising techniques cannot hide the true face of the apartheid system.

I introduce the Whitten article into the RECORD because it illustrates the great effort the South Africans make to give a positive image to their social system. While they may score minor successes, the vast majority of the American people recognize apartheid for what it is—legalized racism.

The article follows:

SOUTH AFRICA ON MADISON AVENUE

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

(NOTE.—Leslie H. Whitten is assistant bureau chief of Hearst Newspapers in Washington. Previously he was on the staff of The Washington Post, United Press International, and Radio Free Europe. He has specialized in investigative reporting, and he is visiting associate professor at Lehigh University.)

In Washington's Montgomery county suburbs, "apartheid" is losing ground—one \$20,000 Negro breadwinner at a time. The laws of country and county, a generally liberal outlook, and the high cost of housing have combined to make integration possible, marginal, and middle-class.

But the schools, during the unpleasantness of the 1968 elections, sprouted a dragon's teeth minority of Wallaceites, animating a number of teachers to try to find the dragon—either by plain talk on American racism or, indirectly, by asking students to explore race in other parts of the world.

At Northwood High School, where my sixteen-year-old son goes, an imaginative history teacher proffered South African race policies as one subject for the final essay examination. My son, apple of an ACLU tree, had shown some soft spots toward Wallace, and my wife and I cooed approvingly when he opted for an essay on apartheid, the official policy of racial segregation in the Republic of South Africa to promote and maintain white domination. A newspaperman, I plied him with our office "morgue" files, made up mainly of critical articles from *The New York Times* and *The Washington*

Post. He also chewed through the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, which gave South Africa a slower but equally hot roasting on such things as the Sharpeville massacre.

The preliminary results—which he allowed us to read—were gratifying in a prima facie way. They reflected his sources. But, conscience-panged, I suggested he get the other side of the story from the South African embassy in Washington.

He made the arrangements. I drove to the chancery, a gracious mansion in the grand Washington diplomatic style across Massachusetts Avenue's "Embassy Row" from the larger British Embassy.

The blonde receptionist, pneumatically Dutch, dimnd pretty, seemed honestly touched that anyone would voluntarily seek out South Africa's official version of apartheid. She left me only a breath's span to thank her between her own "thank you's." I drove home with the apartheid packet, already impressed with its weight and variety, and turned the expensively-printed material over to my son. He balanced out his essay, managed to extract a "B" from it, and was subsequently able to debate us creditably on every one of our anti-apartheid points but this one:

"If you believe that one human being ought to have the same basic rights as another, then how come 3.6 million whites, minus a scattering of dissidents, are dictating much of the lives of more than fifteen million non-whites?"

When the dialogue was done, we wondered why he had not gotten an "A." Intrigued that anything could prevail with my independent-minded son where eleven years of educators had only endured, I browsed through the packet's thirteen separate articles, books, and pamphlets. Someone was spending a great deal of money to get the South African government's story told—and told expertly.

The 583 pages of material had something for us all.

The prestige-minded curious get a *Foreign Affairs* article (though surely there was something fresher than October, 1964 of the same distinguished kidney). The writer, Charles A. W. Manning, London School of Economics professor emeritus, born and educated in South Africa, describes his theory of the source of bad publicity about apartheid: "In few cases, if any, can a Communist-inspired, if not necessarily Communist-inspired, campaign of systematic movie-engineering have met with comparable success in the Western world . . ."

For the lumpen bourgeois, there is a *Reader's Digest* reprint, also vintage, Pleasantville 1963 in this case. In it, industrialist and former Presidential adviser, the late Clarence B. Randall, concluded that "the white people of South Africa are charged with a great responsibility toward the black people, and they know it. In the end, they will do right . . ."

The packet has a mixed bag for the businessman, including a leaflet of the conservative American Security Council which both soothes ("the flag of the United States is not subject to insult" in South Africa) and incites ("the Communists are trying to use the issue of apartheid in South Africa to accomplish their ever-present purpose of splitting the Free World's united front").

For the culture buff, there are 128 pages of "cultural and art" with striking native graphics and summaries of South African writing and poetry, both black and white. The poet D. J. Opperman, a white poet little known outside South Africa, is much praised. The internationally-respected novelists, Alan Paton and Doris Lessing, get also-ran notice. Both novelists deplore the plight of the blacks.

There is much more: a fact book telling that each white South African family pays

\$280 a year for Bantu education and development; a 114-page apartheid white paper called "Progress Through Separate Development," and, most beautiful, eighty-one pages on "Photogenic South Africa," with frameable pictures of elephants, klipspringers, impala, and Ndebele tribesmen.

The aggregate effect of all this is, at the least, to wonder whether one has been fair. True, there is a patronizing quality to the picture of the black doctor surprising white surgeons in a Bantu hospital with his agility. True, there is an uncharitable moment of confused recall over a fatherly white among the many smiling young of Transkei (a native reserve): Stalin, was it, with the Ukrainian kids? Hitler collecting a bouquet from a rosy Gretchen? But the total is enormously winning—until, and unless, one is burned by the saving fact that this stuff is prepared by white men for white men. The authentic voice of the fifteen million non-whites is nowhere heard. The thoughts of South Africa's Nobel Prize winning chief, the late A. J. Luthuli, are missing. So is the harsh yawn of Mangaliso Robert Sobukwe of the proscribed Pan Africanist Congress. So are the political ideals of countless others in that vast mute or gagged or exiled majority. They are being witnessed for by the 3.6 million whites.

Weeks later, as part of my regular newspaper checks, I went by the Foreign Agents registration section of the Justice Department where non-diplomats working for foreign governments must register and detail their activities. I leafed through the recent reports.

When I reached the items on South Africa, my sixteen-year-old's packet about apartheid surfaced on my mind. How much was South Africa's government spending to convince us that apartheid was the humanitarian final solution for the country's non-whites—Xhosas, Zulus, "Cape Coloreds," Bapedi, Indians, Tswanas, Shangaans, and so many others who, since they do not qualify as whites, do not qualify as full citizens?

The files, ably tended and far more complete than those for domestic lobbyists kept by the House Clerk in Congress, gave this answer:

Through the South African Information Service, the South African Tourist Corporation, and the South Africa Foundation, its three main organs in the United States, the Republic has allocated more than \$1.75 million, in less than three years, to publicize the country's natural, social, and political wonders.

The other side of this substantial coin, clearly, is how much the black South Africans are spending to tell their story. There are five of their organizations registered with the Justice Department. Assuming their filed reports are equally correct, they have spent less than \$8,000 during the same three years.

Eight thousand dollars against \$1.75 million! The David and Goliath character of this communications contest would be musical comedy material were it not that even this tiny pebble in David's slingshot, this \$8,000, has produced some pamphlets—included in the files—that raise nasty, welsh questions. Is it true, as one of the minuscule black African groups claims, that South African police and troops cold-bloodedly murdered people demonstrating peacefully against a relocation program in South West Africa? (This is a territory held by the Republic under a 1920 League of Nations mandate, now in dispute.) I found no record of this incident—in which it was reported that some blacks were killed—in the government's apartheid packet. There were no dead bodies among the klipspringers and impala.

My son's packet, I soon discovered from the Justice Department filings, is only a fragment of the South African government effort. The Tourist Corporation, with offices in Rocke-

efeller Center, describes some of its activities for just one six months period:

"Tourism promotional tours were undertaken by staff members to travel agents in the following cities: Boston, Hartford, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Columbus, Houston, Dallas, Miami, Palm Beach, Pensacola, Clermont, Gainesville, Fort Walton and Louisville.

"The South African Tourist Corporation in conjunction with South African Airways, South African Railways, and the South African Commercial Consul in New Orleans, had a joint exhibition at the Texas State Fair in Dallas . . .

"Film show presentations were held at the following cities: Boston, Hartford, New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Columbus, Houston, Dallas, Miami, Pensacola, and Palm Beach."

There were also 969 telecasts with an estimated combined audience of more than thirty million. One travel film, with unthinking irony, was named "Portrait in Color." There was a guest trip for a magazine writer; almost 100,000 pieces of travel literature for agencies, individuals, and newspapers were distributed, and 6,867 telephone and mail inquiries were handled.

While this flood of good news from the South African government was reaching a considerable percentage of the American people, the black African National Congress (whose president for many years was Chief Luthuli) was mailing out fifty copies of its monthly to libraries and to a newspaper or two. Its U.S. representative, Bethuel Pitlori Setal, a thirty-year-old student, was speaking to a small gathering of Presbyterian ministers on apartheid and to a group of Quakers on "non-violence in South Africa."

The contrasts go far deeper than the volume of word-flow.

Setal, whose headquarters in New York has no telephone, operates with no budget. His only big contributions totaled \$6,252, given more than two years ago so the office could be set up. South African born, Setal fled to Tanzania and entered the United States in 1962.

Poverty being relative, Setal's group is the plutocrat among the black South African organizations in the U.S. The four others, the Pan Africanist Congress, the South West Africa People's Organization, the South West Africa National Union, and the South West Africa National United Front, reported a total intake of \$1,350 in the last three years. The figure may be somewhat higher because of the irregularity of their reporting—much of it without benefit of typewriter.

For comparison with the five minigroups, the Information Service of South Africa, with offices on Madison Avenue, spent \$209,417 in one six month period last year, almost all of it for films, printing, and related costs.

The director, Lourens Erasmus Smit de Villiers, like his countrymen in the minigroups, is in his thirties—thirty-four to be exact—and born in South Africa. Unlike them, when he came to this country he stayed first at New York City's St. Moritz and then moved into the fashionable East Sixties. His salary (reported only as on the scale of South African diplomats), unlike the uncertain income of the black Africans, need not be plowed back into his cause. For the fiscal year ending March 31, the South African government has allocated \$381,318 to the Information Service.

De Villiers accurately points out that this total cannot be broken down to reveal expenses to defend apartheid. In a telephone interview, he said there is trade publicity and other information turned out by his office and staff which have nothing to do with apartheid. But the same is true on a pathetically smaller scale for the Pan Africanist Congress, for example. Its representative, Peter H. Molotsi, forty, laid out \$93 between

January and March, 1969, to help clothe and feed some of his colleagues.

The South Africa Foundation opened its government-sponsored office in New York late last year "to promote international understanding of South Africa, her achievements, her problems and her potential, and by so doing, to advance the welfare of all her peoples."

A Durban-born South African, John H. Chettle, thirty-one, was named head of the office at \$19,800 a year plus housing. Some \$18,000 was advanced by the government to set up shop, and Chettle reports he paid out \$2,400 in a six months period, ending this May, for "entertainment, travel, and hotel." This is twice what all five of the black South African groups say they received in the past two years.

The result of this chasm in funding is apparent. Few Americans remember reading of Sharpeville, where South African forces shot scores of natives. Few Americans see the Justice Department files, or receive one of those fifty African National Congress mailings, or are Presbyterian ministers who heard that lecture by Setal.

The atrocities of South Africa get small lineage even in newspapers otherwise serving their communities well. Who knows, for example, that the International Commission of Jurists has urged a United Nations investigation of jail "suicides" in South Africa that smell of torture and police murder? Who knows of the 119 executions by hanging that took place in South Africa last year (forty-seven per cent of all executions recorded in the "free world," according to a University of South Africa study)? In the Republic, capital punishment can be imposed under a number of laws including the Suppression of Communism Act and the Terrorism Act.

Midnight arrests, months of solitary detention without habeas corpus rights or any court intervention, and judicial ostracism of prominent anti-apartheid individuals have all been testified to by responsible South Africans. The limited coverage given to such horrors generally is accorded whites—such as the gallant newspaperman Laurence Gandar who exposed prison barbarism and was convicted. Deeds against the black man, in South Africa as in America, seldom emerge from the darkness in which they are committed.

Meanwhile, the American investments in South Africa bubble along merrily: up from \$450 million in 1965 to \$750 million in 1968, according to South African figures. General Motors, Ford, Goodyear, Coca-Cola, and the Chase Manhattan bank are among the 275 or more U.S. firms with interests in South Africa.

The investment by Americans in telling what the blacks, "coloreds," Indians, and other non-whites suffer from apartheid is, however, not in the hundred-millions, but in the tens of thousands. Not many know the literature of the American Committee on Africa, a private group backing black Africans and supported by Americans. Nor do most know of its opponent, the American-Southern Africa Council which promotes the white government and was built up by former Youth for Wallace chairman John Acord.

The Committee spent \$165,000 in fiscal 1968, concentrated on events in Rhodesia and Portuguese colonies in South Africa as well as the Republic of South Africa. The right-wing Council spent \$200,000 in 1967.

A fact sheet distributed by the South West Africa People's Organization, which describes apartheid as "sordid, inhuman, and undemocratic," did not achieve 969 television showings to thirty million people. It did not make it into my son's packet.

And yet, to believe in America is to believe that there are outrages which will be disclosed, even when the odds are \$1.75 million

to \$8,000. Setal, in conversation, tried to explain why.

"Well, we don't have a budget! We spend our own money. But I work at it because I can feel the struggle inside Africa. I'd feel guilty to get paid for it." In the 583 pages of the apartheid packet I found no topper for that.

JOSEPH W. BARR NAMED PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN SECURITY & TRUST CO.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post reported this morning that former Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph W. Barr, has been named as president of American Security & Trust Co.

I have known Mr. Barr for a number of years and have always been impressed by his great abilities and brilliant personality. I wish to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate him on his new position. American Security is indeed fortunate to have such an outstanding leader of the Nation's financial community at its helm.

I insert the Washington Post article in the RECORD, as follows:

A.S. & T. SELECTS BARR AS BANK PRESIDENT—ALMOST SURE TO SUCCEED BAKER

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Joseph W. Barr, former secretary and under secretary of the Treasury, was named yesterday president of the American Security and Trust Co., a position from which he should ultimately become the head of the city's second largest bank.

Barr, 51, now vice chairman of the bank's board of directors, will almost certainly be appointed to succeed Robert C. Baker, the bank's chairman and chief executive officer, when he retires. The mandatory retirement age is 68, and Baker is now 67.

As head of the bank, Barr would automatically become one of the most prominent and important men in Washington's financial elite.

Since he joined the bank earlier this year, Barr has helped guide Washington bankers' efforts to allow the city's 14 banks to move beyond the city limits and establish branches in the nearby suburbs.

He has consistently argued that Congress must allow the expansion of the District banks are to attract the necessary deposits to maintain a healthy rate of growth. A bill authorizing the change, which has been vehemently opposed by suburban banks, is currently pending before a Congressional committee.

In a short interview yesterday, Barr indicated that the additional deposits of the suburban areas could help Washington move more aggressively into financing international trade.

"It seems to me that this is a logical center for a lot of international business," he said.

Many of the world's major international financial institutions—the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank—are located here, Barr noted. Moreover, he said, "We're equidistant between the Baltimore and Norfolk ports, and we're near Dulles Airport, which should be one of the major centers for air freight in the next five years."

Most international business is now diverted to New York, according to Barr. Any increase

here, he said, would naturally result in additional deposits.

Barr actually served as secretary of the Treasury for less than a month before the Nixon administration took office in January. However, he held high government posts for eight years during both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

A former Indiana Congressman who was defeated in 1960, Barr first became the assistant to the secretary of the Treasury for congressional relations, then moved to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., where he was chairman, and finally received the No. 2 job at Treasury, under secretary, in 1965.

During these years, Barr earned a reputation for candor. In 1968, when Congress was debating whether the United States could afford both "guns and butter," Barr bluntly told a Congressional committee that the country could not—contradicting the administration's official policy.

"I'll either get fired or impeached before I get out—and either is not too bad," Barr said after that session.

Early this year, when he was secretary of the Treasury, Barr coined a phrase—"taxpayers revolt"—to explain the rising sentiment, both in and out of Congress, for tax reform. Barr's statement immediately attracted attention and was widely quoted in the press.

Before coming to Congress in 1958, Barr worked in a variety of businesses in Indiana.

In size, American Security and Trust is surpassed only by Riggs National Bank within the District. As the end of last year, American Security and Trust had \$624.9 million in deposits, and Riggs had \$830.9 million.

THE NAME McCORMACK DEFINES CREDIBILITY

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, current events have brought to our attention the difficult position in which our eminent Speaker JOHN McCORMACK finds himself as a result of an apparent error of judgment by one of his staff members. All of the facts in this case have yet to be revealed, but I am confident that nothing will be discovered which casts the slightest shadow on the Speaker himself.

In any congressional office there are dozens of decisions made each day, and since the decisions are made by fallible human beings, occasionally some of these are bad decisions. At one time or another, every Member of Congress has found himself in hostage to a decision made by a staff member. At that point a Congressman pays in embarrassment in proportion to his prominence, and for this reason Speaker McCORMACK has been required to stand public scrutiny far beyond any suggestion of actual implication in the events recently reported.

I would not dignify this whole affair by lengthy comment in support of the Speaker. I would simply say that during my years in the House I have learned from experience that the word of JOHN McCORMACK defines the word "credibility." Anything further that may be said from whatever source must be measured against the word of JOHN McCORMACK, and his word is more than enough for me.

FARM PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau is one of the most active, effective industry organizations in the State of New Mexico. Their membership is made up of a broad cross section of our citizens including farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, retailers, suppliers, and various others.

They are good, solid, honest, down-to-earth individuals who work for a living and they are not ashamed of it. They are willing to shoulder their share of responsibility and they expect others to do the same.

During a visit to New Mexico last week to meet with some of the county groups of the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, I was presented this list of suggestions and recommendations for consideration as we develop an agriculture program. I am pleased to present it for the review and comments of our colleagues:

Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm & Livestock Bureau go on record in favor of the following:

Farm Program—General: 1. If it is determined that land retirement should be part of any agricultural program, it is recommended that the producer be given a choice of:

a. no grazing with a higher payment rate.
b. limited grazing permitted with less payment rate, provided permanent cover is not damaged.

2. Any land retirement program should have provisions that would assure land renters a fair share of the retirement payments.

3. Establish and strengthen the advice and participation of the agricultural industry in the administrative decisions made with respect to the federal agricultural programs.

Farm Credit—Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau urge federal legislation to increase present limitations on farm operating loans (\$35,000) and ownership loans (\$60,000) for the purpose of encouraging individuals to become established in agricultural production on a scale large enough to be economically feasible.

Tax Laws—Whereas, it is almost impossible for a young person to buy a farm or ranch and recognizing that many older people that own land would prefer to sell if the tax was not so great; Therefore, Be it Resolved that it is recommended that the tax laws be changed to provide that older people could sell their farms and ranches and collect all the money if the money is invested in stocks, bonds, other securities, deposited or loaned out to draw interest and not be subjected to the present tax regulations. This would permit the transfer of agricultural property to individuals that desire to continue in agricultural production. This arrangement would allow older farm and ranch people to retire in dignity and have the satisfaction of living off the proceeds of their accumulated savings.

Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm & Livestock Bureau go on record in favor of the following:

1. *Cotton Research*—Promote legislation to increase funds for production, harvesting, and marketing research and education to lower the costs of production and improve the quality of cotton that is demanded by the industry.

2. *Cotton Program*—Until the cotton industry can recover from the present cost and price squeeze, it is necessary that some form of cost adjustment be provided, similar to the cost-of-living index reflecting wage adjustments, in order for producers to sell at competitive prices and receive a reasonable return for labor, management and investment; that such cost adjustment be made to the commodity rather than to the producer.

3. *Payment Limitations*—Oppose limitations on any farmer's benefits from a price support or payment program.

4. *Cotton transfer*—Recommend that no limit be placed on the acreage allotment which may be transferred from farm to farm; that transfers be permitted between any farms in a cotton-producing state, and that the transfer period be permitted as long as practical.

1. *Gun Laws*—Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm & Livestock Bureau is opposed to any new gun registration laws and go on record to repeal present gun registration laws.

2. *Federal Income Tax*—Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau support the present system of federal income tax reporting as regards the choice of a cash or an accrual basis and we oppose removal of the present exemptions on fertilizer, seed, feeds, insecticides, chemicals, and other materials that are used in production of agricultural products, and we also oppose the removal of any exemptions that promote industry.

3. *Fiscal Irresponsibility*—Whereas, we have expended countless billions in foreign aid with little benefits to the recipients and none to ourselves and have wasted many more billions in innumerable boondoggles at home and, Whereas our public debt has increased to such a staggering sum that the interest for the year starting July 1, 1968, is likely to be more than 16 billion; Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm & Livestock Bureau go on record as favoring a substantial reduction in domestic and defense spending and stopping foreign aid.

4. Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm & Livestock Bureau notify the American Farm Bureau that we oppose the Excess Deductions Account section of H.R. 13270 which the American Farm Bureau has endorsed and strongly urge their reconsideration of their endorsement of this section of the bill.

5. Be it Resolved that the New Mexico Farm & Livestock Bureau is opposed to the H.R. 13270 as passed by the House and urge its defeat by the Senate. We direct that copies of this resolution be sent to our four Congressmen.

HAZELWOOD MARINE IS DEAD IN VIETNAM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fighting men, Pfc. Patrick McClintic, of Hazelwood, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Private First Class McClintic for his heroic actions, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the Record the following article:

HAZELWOOD MARINE IS DEAD IN VIETNAM

Marine Pfc. Patrick McClintic, a son of Mr. and Mrs. Hunter McClintic of 215½ Glen Caladh St., Hazelwood, died of complications from malaria in Vietnam, the Defense Department told his parents yesterday.

Pfc. McClintic, 19, had enlisted in the Marines seven months ago, and was in Vietnam not quite two months.

A graduate of Boyle High School, Homestead, last June, he attended Hiram Scott College in Nebraska and worked at Kaufmann's store part-time during the holiday season last year before enlisting.

While at Boyle he was a fullback on the football squad. He also played Pony, Colt and Little League baseball.

Her son, who loved the Marines, enlisted because he felt it was his duty to be in service, his mother said.

In addition to his parents, Pfc. McClintic is survived by a brother, James, and his grandmother, Mrs. Helen Brenn, at home.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the Portland Evening Express, Portland, Maine, in the State of Maine. The editorial follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, July 24, 1969]

BIGGER TRUCKS TO THUNDER DOWN ROADS IF BILL PASSES

(By Richard L. Lyons)

WASHINGTON.—To the motorist who shudders when he sees a big tractor-trailer truck pounding down a hill from behind or approaching on a narrow road ahead, take heed.

The bill to permit even bigger trucks on the highways, which nearly slipped through Congress last year until public outcry killed it, is back again.

A House public works subcommittee headed by Rep. John C. Kluczynski (D-Ill.), a former truck driver and an enthusiastic sponsor, is conducting hearings on the measure to permit wider, longer and heavier trucks on the interstate highway system. The bill won committee approval last year, but some members now appear to be having second thoughts because of public criticism.

The bill was denounced as an "antisafety bill" by the American Automobile Association. It was defended by trucking interests as a means of enabling construction of safer trucks and as a long overdue unfreezing of truck size limits set by the 1956 Highway Act. For truckers, bigger vehicles mean bigger loads and more profits.

The measure is called a permissive bill, as it would merely permit the states to authorize larger truck sizes on interstate highways within their borders. But in the past states have been quick to go along with the trucking interests. And inasmuch as trucks have to get off the big interstate highways to make pickups and deliveries, they presumably would be permitted on smaller roads as well.

The bill would allow an increase in maximum width from 8 to 8½ feet (plus side mirrors and other outcroppings), and it contains a formula that would increase maximum loaded weight from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds.

For the first time the bill contains a length limit—of 70 feet. Only two of the 48 contiguous states now permit trucks that long in general use, though larger trucks operate under special use permit in several

states. Rep. Fred Schwengel (R-Iowa), who has led the fight against the bill, said expert testimony showed a "grandfather clause" in the bill makes the length limit meaningless and would permit use of triple-trailer trucks 105 feet long in some states.

Last year the Bureau of Public Roads predicted that the wear and tear of an estimated 300,000 bigger trucks would add \$8.5 billion in repair and construction costs to the interstate highway system during the first 10 years.

Rep. Richard D. McCarthy (D-N.Y.), another leading House opponent of the bill, said, "8.5 billion dollars to benefit one-third of one per cent of the nation's vehicles is a steal. I wouldn't believe it if I weren't here."

During the campaign last fall, President Nixon promised to "take a hard new look" at the trucking bill to "make certain that the interest of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected." The Administration will testify to conclude the hearings the first week in August. Both sides are waiting to hear what officials have decided.

The American Trucking Association said the bill would mean safer trucks—for instance, bigger tires gripping larger segments of pavement. William A. Bresnahan, ATA's managing director, said truck technology has been frozen since 1956 at levels of another era and added it would be "gross injustice" not to permit the larger dimensions.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, 1969, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch addressed the "Presidents to Presidents" conference of the Association of Student Governments.

Speaking on the topic "The Federal Government and Higher Education," the Secretary first outlined the traditional role of the Federal Government in the field of higher education—increasing knowledge and skills, assisting institutions in meeting growth problems, helping to make the option of higher education available to all Americans, and pervading all of these—striving for quality education.

But Mr. Finch pointed out:

What is not settled is the Federal role with respect to the new political life emerging on college and university campuses.

In rejecting the role of policeman as appropriate for the Federal Government, the Secretary challenges us to look for a positive response which will serve us not only now but in the future.

The Secretary's insight into this issue as well as his observations on how our decisions with regard to student involvement can and will affect the future will, I believe, be of interest and value to my colleagues, and I include the text of the Secretary's statement as part of my remarks at this point:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. FINCH, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Presidents, all, I am honored to be here tonight . . . and rather intimidated. It's

hard enough to collect my thoughts on a topic like "The Federal Government and Higher Education" and on the ongoing problems of education at every level when I report to just one President. Tonight, I have to report to a whole host of Presidents.

I'm sure you were struck today in your visit with President Nixon, even in the brief minutes you had together, by the deep concern he has in this area. This concern is profound and is a constant daily subject of our conversations. I know that your sessions today with him and with each other are going to be most helpful to the President and to members of Congress on the range of problems we must confront, generally, on the Federal level.

The lecture system, I gather, is subject increasingly to question. In that spirit I want to move rapidly to the dialogue . . . to questions and answers. My operating premise is simply this—that if the young ever decide the old are perfectly right . . . we all are lost—and so I hope we will have had as much discourse as possible before my portion of the evening is over.

Let me begin with a few brief observations—to help structure the dialogue. I want to give you some sense of how those of us with official responsibilities in the field of higher education see our job, and our roles.

We are launched, at least, into a series of programs designed to achieve three broad goals relating to higher education. The first is to assist in increasing the fund of knowledge and the reservoir of skills upon which our society depends, today more than ever. The second is to assist in the process of growth—growth in the numbers of students attending institutions of higher education, and parallel growth in the capacity of these institutions to receive them. And the third is to make the option of higher education available to all Americans—and to broaden the varieties of approaches, and curricula such as the community college and an improved elementary and secondary system within this option.

These, then, are settled policies—settled goals with respect to the Federal Government's commitments in higher education. What is not settled is the Federal role with respect to the new political life emerging on college and university campuses. And I have at least two strong misgivings about defining in a very precise way a Federal role or a Federal presence in the area of "student unrest" so-called.

First: from all the data we have available, from session after session this summer, from surveys, and from common-sense observation—the phenomenon of unrest . . . the syndrome of discontent obviously goes far beyond "students." It embraces all young people—and it also embraces much of the adult population at whatever socio-economic level. Indeed, for all the emphasis on "the generation gap," the differences within the youth community may be greater even than differences between parents and children. There is no single cleavage of opinion—neither is there a particular ideological polarity in the discontent that unquestionably pervades our national life.

My second misgiving follows from the fact that one of the most honored traditions of our free society is the autonomy . . . the pluralism . . . of its higher educational institutions. Campus governance must be the proper concern of each institution, and of every component—faculty, students, administration, alumni, and governing boards—within that community.

It is my strong conviction that the Federal intrusion onto the campus in the guise of policeman as has been suggested by so much in the way of legislative proposals is no more desirable than authoritarian intervention in any form. If some of the bills pending before Congress were enacted . . .

we would have, in effect, a national code of student conduct—and this I utterly reject . . . along with all the conformity and authoritarianism it implies.

One bill which has been proposed would, in effect, have the Secretary of HEW place a man on each campus. It proposes that if X percent of the students at the campus engage in disruptive activities, then the Secretary of HEW is to cut off all funds flowing to that institution. And so I get a picture of a man standing out there—my man on X campus—and he's counting, you know—"8, 9 . . ." and he can't tell whether that's a student or a teaching assistant or a graduate student or some guy wandering through the campus—but he hits a certain magic number and he calls me and says, "cut off the money" and there we are. Administratively, it just can't work. We cannot create that kind of apparatus—we cannot create that kind of Federal presence and still maintain the integrity of higher education in this country as we know it today.

Our response has to be tempered by our responsibilities—and our allegiance to academic freedom and the integrity of each institution must and will continue.

We are looking carefully, then, to the positive response—over the long range—which is appropriate for the Federal role. Particularly because of budgetary constraints, we are seeking responses which can be replicated as widely as possible.

The new orientation in HEW toward higher education will increasingly be on innovation . . . quality. And we seek also student involvement in higher education . . . involvement not only in the processes of higher education, but also in the areas of broader social concern to today's student. We want not merely to maximize the numbers of students who reach the college gates—we are particularly concerned about the quality of educational experience that awaits them once they have passed through the gates.

And this must be particularly so when the gates—the symbolic boundary between community and campus, town and gown, if you will—are less and less of a boundary at all. Like it or not, we do seem to inhabit Marshall McLuhan's "global village"—with instant communication . . . instant participation. Much indeed is falsified and distorted by this life process. But in such a context, we have to ask ourselves anew—what does the educational experience mean? How is it imparted? How do we make it more viable?

The opportunity to confront these questions is, it seems to me, the unique value of sessions such as this. Our dialogue has only begun. One of the exciting things about the campus visits undertaken in an unannounced way last spring by Congressman Brock, Congressman Steiger and their colleagues—and by the sessions we have had since—is the opportunity for dialogue and a learning experience that for all of us has not stopped. All of us recognize this commitment. We see, too, that the concerns extend beyond the campus to larger social issues in community and nation. And I was struck in my visit last night to Harvard that we must also mobilize this concern to go to some of the less visible, less glamorous issues affecting our national existence, such as the whole ecological-environmental spectrum. The extension of that same commitment and involvement must be engaged with a whole new range of qualitative problems.

We recognize and seek to tap the commitment of college youth. In the resolution of our social problems, I suspect the major contribution our universities can make is the time, intelligence, and dedication of their students. There is fruitful interaction here, too, because non-academic experience may well be a crucial component of quality education.

When I talk about involvement . . . and encourage young people in particular to join

the fray . . . I'm not talking about what a friend of mine calls "the Joshua effect"—certainly not only this. It is easy enough to grab a trumpet . . . stake out a position in the middle of the campus quad . . . and blast away and seek whatever constituency can be held together—but this doesn't really get us very far toward problem-solving. Politics is an infinitely slower, more subtle process than that, and those who want to make a real difference will have to do more than just blow trumpets.

I suppose I would put all I have said tonight about the University into perspective by pointing out a simple fact which is so obvious that we don't give it the thought it deserves. That fact is the level of expectations we impose on the university. America puts more burdens on the university—and charges its educational institutions generally with more fundamental tasks—than perhaps any other institution in our society. We ask that it serve many masters—government, business, the church, to name but a few—and consequently it probably serves none as it really should, while at the same time protecting its basic integrity.

In the context of all these burdens on our institutions, we see developing today another set of burdens—the burdens of an escalated political rhetoric.

The young charge that their elders are hypocrites. They confront the plethora of America's unsolved social problems—its unmet needs, against the context of incredible abundance—and the criteria of economic success seem to turn them off. Some observe those at the top of the material heap and seem to say, "I don't want to be that kind of person." "I want a different 'life style'."

On the other hand, their elders urge them to treat existing institutions with respect and with affection, and to initiate change with mature and reasoned judgment. And the young reply—"this is not maturity but senescence." The counsels of caution represent, to them, the atrophy of their elders' moral sense.

Their elders reply, in turn, that the young fail to apply the ethical standards they claim for themselves to their own modes of operation.

They observe the confrontation tactics of some—the violence calculated to "politicize" and "radicalize" their peers—and elders conclude that cynicism, hypocrisy, and manipulative politics are not the exclusive domain of those over thirty.

In a sense, I am not surprised that the campuses are the focal point for all of the rhetoric, deplorable as its excesses unquestionably are. I sometimes suspect that the late-night radio talk shows in all of our cities around the Nation have increased so dramatically in popularity because the talk show is about the only modern analogue to the town meeting of our early history. It attempts to do for us what the ubiquitous coffee houses did for 18th Century London . . . or the country-store crackerbarrel for 19th Century mid-America. It provides a place for the confrontation of ideas.

But what a faceless, impersonal, synthetic medium we have today . . . what a sad and bloodless substitute for face-to-face dialogue.

And this is one more reason, one more critical reason, to preserve our universities as open forums. That is why they must always remain open to all viewpoints, the arena for the confrontation of ideas.

We really have almost no alternatives. Otherwise, we might as well fold up shop as a free pluralistic society.

My predecessor, John Gardner, stated our problem eloquently in his recent Godkin Lectures:

"There are many ways in which a nation can die. It can die from internal strife, tearing itself apart. It can die of indifference, of an unwillingness to face its problems, an

incapacity to respond to the suffering of its people. Or a nation can die of old age, not chronological so much as psychological old age, a waning of energy and an incapacity to learn new ways."

It is the unending process of renewal, institutional and self-renewal, then, to which we must all be dedicated. Although the process of formal education sometimes creates a facade, an artificial feeling of removal from the world's concerns, I urge you, those who are still in school, not to be misled. You are not preparing for life; you are already living it. As Bob Dylan says, "If you're not busy being born, you're busy dying."

Life—renewal—challenge—opportunity—these are not things as persons, or as a society, that we can put off. You're a part of it all; it's happening here—and now—and we either make a difference—or we don't. But it's a matter of choosing.

As John Gardner put it:

"A nation is never finished. You can't build it and leave it standing as the Pharaohs did the pyramids. It has to be recreated in each generation by believing, caring men and women. It is now our turn. If we don't believe or don't care, nothing can save this nation. If we believe and care, nothing can stop us."

LEGAL SERVICES AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, Senator MURPHY's October 14, 1969, legal services amendment which grants to Governors absolute veto power over specific legal service programs and in effect permits one man in the State capitol to dictate the nature and extent of legal advice to be provided to thousands of individual clients, was intended to prohibit the continuation of a specific California legal service program, California Rural Legal Assistance.

The Senator's opposition to this program was predicated on what he contended were its law reform activities, such as its successful prohibition upon the importation of illegal foreign labor and its requirement that the U.S. Department of Agriculture provide food to hungry children in 19 California counties.

Mr. MURPHY's amendment is a classic example of overkill. In effect it is an anticivil rights amendment and constitutes an interference with the canons of ethics and a lawyer's relationships with his client. Whatever may be Congress position in regard to the role of legal service programs, two issues should be considered.

First, the effect, albeit unintentional, of Senator MURPHY's amendment, is to eliminate all southern legal service programs that vigorously represent Negroes. Virtually every southern legal service program that has vigorously represented Negroes in the area of civil rights has been under attack by both southern Governors and southern Senators.

At present the Mississippi legal service program is the object of just such anti-Negro attacks by local political figures. To give absolute veto power to a Governor will mean the termination of legal

service programs for Negroes in most Southern States. That this is the hoped-for effect of the Murphy amendment is best illustrated by the unanimous and vigorous support provided by southern Senators to Senator MURPHY. Not one southern Senator voted in opposition to the Murphy amendment. Florida's Senator HOLLAND, for example, who recently failed along with Florida Governor Kirk to block the refunding of south Florida's migrant legal service program, was the most vigorous supporter of the Murphy amendment. Thus, the present amendment is an anti-civil-rights amendment whose effect will be to discourage Negroes from using the courts and to inadvertently encourage the use of the streets.

Second, the amendment is intended to and has the clear effect of interfering with the historical independence of the lawyer and the relationship of trust that he has with his client. Canon 15 of the American Bar Association's canons of ethics which have been adopted in virtually every State and are presently embraced in revised canon 7:

The lawyer owes entire devotion to the interest of the client, warm zeal in the maintenance and defense of his rights and the exertion of his utmost learning and ability, to the end that nothing be taken or be withheld from him, save by the rules of the law, legally applied. No fear of judicial disfavor or public unpopularity should restrain him from the full discharge of his duty. In the judicial forum the client is entitled to the benefit of any and every remedy and defense that is authorized by the law of the land, and he may expect his lawyer to assert every such remedy or defense.

The American Bar Association on October 13, 1969, asserted this very position in a letter to the Honorable Senator YARBOROUGH, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD S12569.

In the judicial forum the client is entitled to the benefit of any and every remedy and defense that is authorized by the law. To encourage any less and in effect to prohibit the most effective remedies, could place each of the 2,000 OEO legal service lawyers in the dilemma of violating the canons of ethics they are pledged to uphold. Moreover, it could open a Pandora's box of malpractice and disbarment proceedings against such lawyers, should they, in seeking to preserve their legal service programs from political attack by Governors, fail to seek every remedy and defense authorized by the law.

I, therefore, call upon the Members of this body to show to the poor the same commitment to the law that we ask of them. If respect for the law is to have any meaning we must first see that the poor are permitted to effectively use the legal system. With this in mind, I believe that the Murphy anti-civil-rights amendment should be rejected and that the eventual decisionmaking power for legal service programs should rest with the President's appointee, the OEO Director. Only he can effectively judge the efficiency and the effectiveness of legal service programs.

As Chief Justice Burger stated to the Tenth Circuit Judicial Conference on

July 1 of this year, legal services for the poor can only be effective if wholly removed from political conflicts and from Executive control.

It seems especially ironic that we should permit a Governor to dictate the extent and nature of legal advice to a client while at the same time seeking to encourage the poor to use the courts rather than the streets.

DANGERS OF INVOLVEMENT IN ASIA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the majority leader, has warned us repeatedly of the dangers that could flow from our deepening involvement in Laos. Senator MANSFIELD is once again speaking out directly, telling it, as the young people say, like it is. I profoundly hope that our Government will take heed this time.

For years my distinguished colleague from Montana has warned while others have soothed. No alarmist, rather a realist and a man of peace, Senator MANSFIELD has tried to show us how badly our Vietnam policy has served our own interests, even if we could ignore its cost in men and resources.

In an article published recently in the Great Falls Tribune, William D. James, the executive editor, described Senator MANSFIELD's position and cited his many warnings about Vietnam. Mr. James has also drawn a parallel with our situation in Laos. In the hope that it will reinforce his warnings of additional tragedies there and so that all Senators may have the advantage of this recapitulation of MIKE MANSFIELD for the right statements, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Sept. 28, 1969]

MAJORITY LEADER MANSFIELD WARNS UNITED STATES ABOUT FURTHER INVOLVEMENT IN ASIA

(By William D. James)

A warning Sen. Mike Mansfield made last week that a deeper U.S. involvement in Laos could develop into a Vietnam-style military entanglement is drawing national and international attention because of the accuracy of his grim predictions about the course of the Vietnam war.

The Senate Majority Leader based his warning about Laos on a trip he made to Southeast Asia in August at the request of President Nixon.

The trip was his sixth fact-finding trip to Southeast Asia in the last 16 years. He made such trips in 1953, 1954, 1955, 1962, 1965 and 1969.

Mansfield, who has investigated conditions in Asia at the request of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, has been consistent in warnings that the U.S. should avoid getting lured into the quicksand of Asiatic wars.

The Montana senator has been lauded frequently by national co-respondents for analyzing Vietnam events accurately. Clayton Fritchey, nationally-syndicated columnist, complimented Mansfield last year for being "the one man, who from the beginning, has been uncannily right about U.S. involvement in Vietnam."

After investigating conditions in Indochina in 1953, when the French were still fighting, Mansfield recommended that the U.S. should improve its Vietnam programs. Noting that we then were spending about \$25 million a year there, he stressed that the aim of our programs should be to build up the self-reliance of the people.

Mansfield has maintained consistently since 1953 that it would be better to have the Southeast Asians solve their own problems than to have U.S. military forces involved.

"The situation in Vietnam and in a larger sense in Indochina, is grim and discouraging," he reported after his 1954 visit. (On that trip, he also attended the conference of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in the Philippines at the request of President Eisenhower.)

"It would be misleading and futile," he said in his 1954 report, to tell the Senate or the people of the U.S. that conditions were other than grim and discouraging.

The need, he explained, "is not to bury the realities of this situation but to face them, however grim and discouraging they may be. If we do so, it is possible that the reversal which has been sustained in Indochina may yield experience which has application elsewhere in Asia."

"This experience could be useful in avoiding still other setbacks and damaging waste of untold millions of dollars of the resources of the citizens of the U.S.," he said.

Mansfield pointed out in 1954, when discussing the French defeat in Vietnam, that there had been a general tendency to "make the wish father to the thought and consistently and seriously underestimate the strength" of the forces fighting the French.

"If there was one overriding cause of the failure, however," he said, "it is to be found in the distorted emphasis given to the capacity of military measures alone to bring about an end to the Communist advance in Indochina."

He said it would be difficult to see what more the U.S. could have done to avert a Communist victory over the French, "short of some foolhardy commitment of American troops on the Asian mainland."

After a visit to Vietnam in 1955, Mansfield again accentuated the need to encourage the Vietnamese to take care of their own affairs.

"What is at stake is the active loyalty of the preponderance of the population of South Vietnam. That can be won and held only by a Vietnamese government which alone can understand and respond to the needs of the people."

Mansfield urged the U.S. to concentrate on helping with economic recovery and development programs. He said that ought to be done with a view to creating over a set period of time a self-sustaining Vietnam free from further direct reliance on U.S. assistance.

After visiting Vietnam in 1962, Mansfield expressed serious doubts about U.S. policies there. He said there were about 12,000 Americans there and that U.S. spending totaled hundreds of millions annually there.

"It would be a disservice to my country not to voice a deep concern over the trend of events, since my last visit," he said in his 1962 report.

It was seven years and \$2 billion of U.S. aid later but yet, substantially, the same difficulties remained if, indeed, they have not been compounded, he reported.

He expressed fears about having the U.S. intensify support of the Vietnamese armed forces.

"This intensification, however, inevitably has carried us to the start of the road which leads to the point at which conflict in Vietnam could become of greater concern and greater responsibility to the U.S. than it is to the government and people of South Vietnam," he said.

"In present circumstances," he cautioned, "pursuit of that course could involve an expenditure of American lives and resources on a scale which would bear little relationship to the interests of the U.S., or, indeed, to the interests of the people of Vietnam."

To avoid that course, he asserted, it should be clear to ourselves as well as to the Vietnamese where the primary responsibility was in this situation:

"It must rest, as it has rested, with the Vietnamese government and people."

Concerned with the possibility that the war would be converted into an American one, fought primarily with American lives, he said:

"It should be noted in all frankness that our own bureaucratic tendencies to act in uniform and enlarging patterns have resulted in an expansion of the U.S. commitment in some places to an extent which would appear to bear only the remotest relationship to what is essential or even desirable in terms of U.S. interests."

Mansfield and congressional colleagues who accompanied him on the 1962 trip agreed that the U.S. should make a thorough reassessment of its security requirements.

Such security requirements could be met, they indicated, without any further extension of the U.S. commitment in Southeast Asia.

Pointing out the perils of having the U.S. assume too strong a role in Southeast Asian policies, Mansfield said in his 1962 report:

"It is doubtful that it is the best way in any Southeast Asian nation, if the responsibility for its independent survival were to come to rest more heavily with the U.S. than with indigenous leadership because of the failure or inadequacies of that leadership in meeting its own responsibilities to its people."

The Montana senator's warning of the "open-end danger of an expanding war" received worldwide attention following his 1965 trip to Southeast Asia.

Mansfield was pessimistic about chances for an early end of the war—in sharp contrast to optimistic views of top U.S. military and civilian officials.

"A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect," he cautioned.

Mansfield contended that despite the great increase in American military commitment, it was doubtful, in view of the acceleration of Viet Cong efforts, that the Saigon government's position could be held without more U.S. forces.

He said there was no assurance as to what ultimate increase in U.S. military forces would be required.

The question, he said, was not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation, but rather of "pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open-ended."

"How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force," he said.

The senator's "open-ended" warning was discussed frequently in the next three years as the U.S. saw its military forces in Vietnam grow to 560,000 and fatalities go over the 30,000 mark.

At the conclusion of his trip in August, Mansfield recommended to President Nixon that the U.S. place an immediate ban on increases in U.S. personnel in Southeast Asia.

In a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which he is one of the ranking members, Mansfield noted that our involvement in Laos already has cost hundreds

of millions of dollars and hundreds of lives. The involvement in Laos carries the threat of even a deeper commitment by the U.S., he said.

Congressional colleagues of Mansfield, who regard him as their leading authority on Southeast Asia, have been impressed by the accuracy of his scholarly reports after each of his fact-finding trips. Many of his Senate friends say it is tragic that his advice and warnings were ignored.

The record shows clearly that Mansfield was correct in his grim warnings about the dangers of a growing U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The senator now is warning the nation of what might develop if the U.S. makes the same mistakes in Laos it did in Vietnam.

OVERLY OPTIMISTIC VIETNAM QUOTATIONS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—There have been so many optimistic statements about the Vietnam war that Philip Geyelin, editorial page editor of the Washington Post, made a collection of them. Geyelin published his list in the summer after Defense Secretary Laird declared, "We have certainly turned the corner in the war."

(Since then, he probably has added a comment by President Nixon. The President described the war as possibly "one of America's finest hours, because we took a difficult task and we succeeded.")

(We are reprinting the article to show the difference in views between the men quoted by Geyelin and those of Sen. Mike Mansfield appearing on this page.)

"We have never been in a better relative position."—General Westmoreland, April 10, 1968.

"We have reached an important point when the end begins to come into view. . . . The enemy has many problems: He is losing control of the scattered population under his influence. . . . He sees the strength of his forces steadily declining. . . . His monsoon offensives have been failures. He was dealt a mortal blow by the installation of a freely elected representative government. . . . the enemy's hopes are bankrupt."—General Westmoreland, Nov. 21, 1967.

"We are generally pleased. . . . we are very sure we are on the right tack."—President Johnson, July 13, 1967.

"Progress has been made. . . . We have pushed the enemy farther and farther into the jungles. . . . We have succeeded in attaining our objectives."—General Westmoreland, July 13, 1967.

"I expect the. . . war to achieve very sensational results in 1967."—Ambassador Lodge, Jan. 9, 1967.

"We are beginning to see some signs of success. . . . There is an erosion of (enemy) morale."—Secretary of State Rusk, Aug. 25, 1966.

"We have stopped losing the war."—Secretary of Defense McNamara, October, 1965.

"We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."—President Johnson, Oct. 21, 1964.

"The war in Vietnam is on the right track."—Ambassador Lodge, June 30, 1964.

"I think the number (of U.S. personnel) in Vietnam is not likely to increase substantially."—Secretary of Defense McNamara, May 14, 1964.

"The Vietnamese. . . themselves can handle this problem with their own effort."—Secretary of State Rusk, Feb. 24, 1964.

"The United States still hopes to withdraw its troops from South Vietnam by the end of 1965."—Secretary of Defense McNamara, Feb. 19, 1964.

"I am hopeful we can bring back additional. . . men. . . because I personally believe this is a war the Vietnamese must fight. 'I don't believe we can take on that combat task for them.'"—Secretary of Defense McNamara, Feb. 3, 1964.

"Victory. . . is just months away, and the

reduction of American advisors can begin any time now . . . I can safely say the end of the war is in sight."—Gen. Paul D. Markins, commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon, Oct. 31, 1963.

"Secretary McNamara and Gen. (Maxwell) Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965 . . ."—White House statement, Oct. 2, 1963.

"I feel we shall achieve victory in 1964."—Tram Van Dong, South Vietnamese general, Oct. 1, 1963.

"South Vietnam is on its way to victory . . ."—Frederick E. Nolting, U.S. ambassador to South Vietnam, June 12, 1963.

"The South Vietnamese themselves are fighting their own battle, fighting well."—Secretary of State Rusk, April, 1963.

"(The struggle) is turning an important corner."—Secretary of State Rusk, March 8, 1963.

"The corner has definitely been turned toward victory in South Vietnam."—Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, March 8, 1963.

"There are definitely encouraging elements . . . the ratio of casualties . . . indicates some turning in the situation."—Secretary of State Rusk, Feb. 1, 1963.

"The war in Vietnam is going well and will succeed."—Secretary McNamara, Jan. 31, 1963.

"The South Vietnamese should achieve victory in three years . . . I am confident the Vietnamese are going to win the war. (The Viet Cong) face inevitable defeat."—Adm. Harry D. Felt, U.S. Commander-in-Chief of Pacific Forces, Jan. 12, 1963.

"Every quantitative measurement shows we're winning the war . . . U.S. aid to Vietnam has reached a peak and will start to level off."—Secretary of Defense McNamara, 1962.

"The Communists now realize they can never conquer free Vietnam."—Gen. J. W. Daniel, official military aide to Vietnam, Jan. 8, 1961.

"The American aid program in Vietnam has proved an enormous success, one of the major victories of American policy . . ."—Gen. J. W. Daniel, official military aide to Vietnam, Sept. 7, 1959.

CHILDREN'S PRAYERS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most incredible decisions ever rendered by the Supreme Court outlawed voluntary prayer in the public schools of America.

Defenders of this outrage like to split hairs and advance the argument that only "prescribed" prayers were outlawed.

This is fiction, of course, because, as all of our educators are well aware, the interpretation of the decision has had the devastating effect of banishing all word of God, prayer, and the Bible from our public schools.

Some people see great danger in allowing a group of schoolchildren to start their day with a simple, child's prayer.

But the same people applaud Supreme Court decisions which have given every pornographer in the Nation the green light to flood our mailboxes and magazine stands with filthy books and magazines.

For the past several weeks we have

been inserting five children's prayers weekly into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which may be used by our public schools if they so choose.

The Supreme Court would ban all religious aspects from American public life, but I do not believe the American people desire this, nor will they allow such action.

This week's children's prayers include the following:

I

We thank you, God,
For meat and drink;
We thank You for
Each happy day;
We thank You for
Long hours of play;
We thank You for
Bright butterflies;
We thank you for
Our own two eyes;
We thank You for
The birds that sing;
We thank You for
Just everything.

II

O send out Thy
Light and Thy truth:
Let them lead me
Let them bring me
Unto Thy holy hill.
(Forty-third Psalm.)

III

Jesus, from Thy throne on high,
Far above that bright blue sky,
Look on me with loving eye;
Hear me, Holy Jesus.

IV

Be Thou with me every day,
In my work and in my play,
When I learn and when I pray;
Hear me, Holy Jesus.

V

I will praise Thee, O Lord,
With my whole heart;
I will show forth all
Thy marvelous works.
I will be glad and rejoice
In Thee: I will sing
Praise to Thy name
O Thou most high.
(Ninth Psalm.)

FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL
DAY OPPOSES POSTAL CORPO-
RATION AND SHOWS THAT NO
CASE HAS BEEN PROVEN FOR
DESTRUCTION OF THE POST OF-
FICE DEPARTMENT

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Thursday morning, October 16, Mr. J. Edward Day appeared before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to give his views on the administration's Postal Corporation proposal, H.R. 11750.

Mr. Day is particularly well qualified to speak on this subject not only because he served as President John F. Kennedy's Postmaster General from January 21, 1961, until September 9, 1963, but also because it is widely agreed by former Post Office associates and Washingtonians generally that he was one of the

best administrators to ever serve in that vital Cabinet position.

Examples of his progressive and innovative services are legion. He conceived and inaugurated Zip Code service, he began A. B. C. D. business service—a service recently abandoned for so-called economy reasons—and he was the first Postmaster General to come before Congress himself and recommend a salary increase for the postal employees.

Aside from Mr. Day's direct experience as Postmaster General, his illustrious background in both business and public service lend even greater weight to his views regarding this corporation proposal. Admitted to the Illinois bar in 1938, he served as legislative assistant to Gov. Adlai Stevenson in 1949 and was Illinois Commissioner of Insurance from 1950 to 1953.

His business career with the Prudential Insurance Co. of America began when he was made associate general solicitor of that firm in 1953. He was later to serve as associate general counsel and then as vice president in charge of western operations—Los Angeles 1957–60—before President Kennedy virtually drafted this highly capable citizen for duty as our Nation's Postmaster General.

The administration's corporation proposal is quite complicated and Mr. Day's statement before the Post Office Committee was therefore of some length—but it was direct and to the point and it brought with it the depth of experience and good judgment that J. Edward Day has always been known for.

In his statement, he covered every facet of the corporate proposal. Highlighting his remarks, Day pointed out that H.R. 11750 recommends, among other things, that a postal corporation, entirely owned by the Federal Government, be chartered by the Congress to operate the postal service on a self-supporting basis. Yet there is no clear and convincing argument why reform cannot be accomplished within the framework of the present structure.

Day went on to conclude that a departure from congressional control of Federal activities should be made only where it is clearly demonstrated the activities can be more efficiently and economically operated through the corporate structure, and a net advance to the Government will result. There is no evidence to that effect in the case of the postal service.

The basic contention of critics is that the Post Office is "on the verge of collapse." Nothing could be further from the truth. The so-called deficit in "real" dollars is less per capita today than in 1950. We have fewer employees in proportion to mail volume than does Great Britain, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium, West Germany, Italy, and Japan. In truth, we operate the most efficient postal service in the world.

The unusual Chicago tie-up of October 1966 is also cited as a symptom of impending disaster—yet critics fail to mention there has been no recurrence in the 3 years since.

The postal service is compared unfavorably to TVA, yet such a comparison is really not valid. TVA is geographically

concentrated, capital intensive, and employs less than 20,000 people. The postal service is a sprawling, labor intensive giant employing three-quarters of a million people, and offering a variety of services to the public throughout the United States.

The Post Office has a history of working relationships and traditions that would be destroyed through a reorganization, whereas TVA began as a Government corporation. In fact, TVA, like the Rural Electrification Agency, was created in an area where private enterprise failed to do the job and it was necessary for the Federal Government to step in.

With the proposed corporation's break-even obsession, we would probably see skyrocketing postal rates as such costs as depreciation of facilities, debt retirement, and public service costs were incorporated in postal rates. Yet there is no objective reason why the postal service should retrieve all of its costs from charges. The post office serves all the people—and since these users are taxpayers, it is entirely appropriate that Federal tax revenues should provide a significant part of the postal budget. However, the proposed corporation concept would, with its system of incremental costing, in all probability put the vast burden of these additional expenses on the first-class mailer, the person least able to afford such an increase.

Under the administration's bill, the Post Office would not necessarily be responsive to the desires of the people and the Congress would be almost powerless to force it to comply with its wishes. Congress should not abdicate its role as overseer of this vast Department. There is too much at stake.

Day goes on to point out that while there is a need for meaningful postal reform, it can and should be carried out within the present structure of the Post Office Department whereby control of the Post Office would remain in the hands of the people through their elected representatives in the Congress.

Reorganization is, to a large extent, an avoidance of the real problems that plague the postal service. The postal service will always be a labor intensive organization, as are most service industries, and it is unrealistic to assume that all, or even a major part, of the mythical billion dollar savings projected under the administration's bill would ever materialize.

The real problem is not so much one of reorganization but one of bringing the postal service into the 20th century. In the past, funds have actually been turned back to the Treasury for lack of knowing what was needed. The problems that should be attacked are those of personnel, facilities, and mechanism—both large and small scale. When these questions are answered to the satisfaction of the Congress, moneys should be appropriated and corrective action taken.

Mr. President, the case against this proposal is a strong one and it was eloquently presented by former Postmaster Day. I therefore ask that this important message be printed in the Extensions of Remarks with the hope that it will re-

ceive the consideration it deserves from Congress and the American people.

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

PROPOSAL FOR POSTAL CORPORATION
(By J. Edward Day)

I had decidedly mixed feelings about the invitation from the Committee to appear today to give my views on the proposals for post office reorganization and for a postal corporation.

I certainly don't want to appear to be in some kind of a cat and dog fight with as fine a man as Mr. Blount. I don't want to be misunderstood as being infatuated with the *status quo*. I don't want to be misunderstood as seeming to favor politics in the Post Office, because I certainly don't. In a way I wish I could just ride along with all the slogans and over-simplifications and accept the corporation proposal as the cure for everything that isn't perfect about the Post Office.

But I think the best way for the Congress to make an objective analysis of this proposal is to hear both sides. I don't particularly relish the role in which this casts me because I much prefer to be a nice noncontroversial type. But I feel very strongly that this corporation bill for so-called total reform would in fact mean total disarray.

First, I want to bring the Committee up-to-date on some of my background, so far as it bears on this subject, and on some of my current activities.

When I resigned as Postmaster General in August, 1963, I became a partner in the law firm of Sidley & Austin. This is a large Chicago corporation law firm with which I began practice 30 years ago, and I am in charge of their Washington office. On July 1, 1968, our firm began representing as one of its clients the Associated Third Class Mail Users and I am the General Counsel of that organization. However, many of the points involved in the postal corporation proposal are of no direct concern to ATCMU as such. Since my opinions on each of the endless separate points involved in this far reaching proposal of course could not be passed upon by the ATCMU Board of Directors, the views I will give today should be treated as my personal opinions. Many of the members of the Associated Third Class Mail Users might be expected to agree, in general, with my views on the postal reorganization proposals. However, it is difficult for an organization with a diverse membership of people who cannot follow all the details of postal legislation to be expected to have an agreed position on each of the many separate features of a complicated proposal such as the postal reorganization and postal corporation plans.

In April 1967, when Larry O'Brien first announced his proposal for a postal corporation, I wrote a nationally syndicated article at the request of the North American Newspaper Alliance explaining the reasons why I opposed the idea. That was a year before I or our firm had any connection with ATCMU. That article started out as follows:

"With all due respect to my good friend Larry O'Brien, I feel that his much publicized speech about turning the Post Office over to a non-profit government corporation revives an old and unrealistic suggestion at a very bad time.

"The impending lengthy discussion and study of this plan will, in my opinion, only postpone facing up to some urgent but achievable needs of the Post Office. In addition the speech has provided ammunition from a surprising source for those who delude themselves by believing that business has a monopoly on brains and efficiency and that government employees and managers are lazy incompetents.

"The fouled-up Post Office Mr. O'Brien describes in his speech is a Department I never knew."

North American Newspaper Alliance republished the article in an up-dated form a year ago when the Kappel Commission Report was first issued.

I realize that your Committee is principally interested today in hearing about the bond financing provisions of the Administration's corporation proposal. I will try to concentrate on that aspect. But the bond provisions can't be isolated and dealt with in a vacuum. The bond financing provisions of the bill would necessarily and unavoidably require forcing our postal service into a break-even straitjacket. Supporting the bonds would be the first and foremost goal—the be-all and end-all of postal policy. Everything else would have to give way. Considerations of full service to the public, reasonable postal rates, public service allowance, and all the rest would have to come second. Supporting the bonds would become the new Postal Policy.

To me, it is quite remarkable that, in spite of the many objections which can be made to the corporation proposal, there has been very little published notice of these objections. On the contrary, there has been a barrage of one-sided propaganda and Chamber of Commerce slogans put forward in support of the Kappel proposal, much of it—I am afraid—by people who have limited qualifications as experts on the Post Office or even as experts on operation of large organizations generally.

To qualify myself a bit, I might mention that prior to my 929 days as Postmaster General, I was for eight years one of the top senior officers of the Prudential Insurance Company of America, which, in terms of assets, is the largest private corporation in the world. In a remarkable number of respects, Prudential is similar to the Post Office. Both have offices and personnel in every part of the country; both have a need for giving good service and establishing favorable relations with the public; both have regional offices, with continuing problems of the degree of autonomy to give to regions and to local offices; both have major real estate responsibilities in building or leasing buildings large and small; both handle large amounts of money; both have employees who are organized in highly aggressive unions; both are basically paperwork operations; both have an inspection service; both have complex problems of levels of management, chains of command, and internal communications; both are highly regulated as to their policies and operations by detailed legislation; both are faced with problems of turnover and the necessity of competing in the labor market for rank and file personnel (in contrast with earlier years when there was a situation of highly stable and dedicated employment of people for whom employment security was the major incentive). In addition, both organizations have for years experienced the headaches associated with attempting to automate and mechanize operations. Both have even had several changes in the top chief executive just in the past 8½ years.

I may seem to be overdoing the close comparison between these two giant organizations, one public and one private, but it is a fact that when I came from Prudential to the Post Office in 1961 I often felt that I had merely moved to a different desk in the same organization.

As a matter of fact, and only partly in jest, I have frequently pointed out that a very large private bureaucracy even has another feature which is often thought of as associated only with government. This is illustrated by an apocryphal story about a top officer of a large life insurance company who was asked to run for United States Senator. After thinking it over, he declined, saying, "I don't want to leave the Metropolitan Life. I like politics too much." It is definitely a fact that there is a certain

amount of politics in all large organizations, public or private.

I mention all this background because of the fact that I did have an unusual experience in acquiring a top level inside familiarity with one of the largest public organizations in the world and one of the largest private organizations. This is important because too many of the editorials and columns commenting on the postal corporation idea have indicated that—

(a) anyone who understands business management will necessarily be an all-out advocate of the postal corporation idea, and

(b) that business management is *a fortiori* better than government management.

There are thousands of pages in the Kappel Commission Report and its supporting volumes and thousands more pages have been written about the Report and about related or alternative proposals. Therefore, in a statement of this kind, one can only touch on some of the highlights.

THE KAPPEL COMMISSION

I agree with most of what appears in the statement made before the House Committee by former Deputy Postmaster General Fred Belen on this subject on May 20. I am convinced that even if the post office—corporation or not—could pay six figure salaries, they could not get a better executive than Fred. It is regrettable that he was not even consulted before the postal corporation proposal was launched by Mr. O'Brien in April, 1967. It is equally regrettable that someone with his long and deep knowledge of postal problems was not a member of the Kappel Commission. The members of the Commission were, of course, all important men. However, I think it a remarkable fact that not one of them had any background in postal matters. I doubt if the President of Campbell Soup Company—who was a member of the Commission—would have been impressed by the results of a critical survey of his company by a group that did not include even one person with the slightest experience in the food business.

The same can be said about the President of General Electric, of the Bank of America, and of Cummins Engine Company—all members of the Commission. The same is even true of AT&T—a company for which I have the most intense personal and professional respect. Some might think that there are many parallels to the Post Office in a telephone system because both involve communications. However, electronic communications are, by their nature, readily susceptible to a most far-reaching degree of standardization and automation. Electronic switching makes it possible to have the customer get his individual call through to its destination without any direct participation by a telephone company employee. On the other hand, regardless of all the superficial ideas that some may have, any postal system will necessarily remain to a large degree a manual operation. As one example, 42% of Post Office cost is for delivery service and it is certainly never going to be possible to have mail delivered door-to-door by clanking robots.

Similarly, there are over 30,000 post offices and only two or three hundred of them at the very most are large enough to justify a high degree of mechanization.

Although no person having any post office background was included on the Commission, one of the 10 commissioners was a former Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I have no hesitancy in saying that I think the Bureau of the Budget is the No. 1 enemy of the Post Office and accountable more than any other one reason for Post Office difficulties.

Federal money generally is handed out to the glamorous or politically potent agencies, such as Defense and Space. Nearly all of the old-line, non-glamorous agencies such as the Post Office, Customs Bureau and the regulatory agencies are strangled to

death for funds to try to do a decent job. The Post Office problem is lack of money and that problem can't be solved by re-shuffling the organization chart or giving new titles to the people in charge.

ASSUMPTIONS BEHIND THE PROPOSAL

My objections to the Kappel approach largely relate to the premises and assumptions on which the proposal is based. I disagree with nearly all of them. Some of these premises and assumptions, which are either explicit in the Report or implicit in its tone and recommendations, are as follows:

- (1) The Post Office is generally a mess.
- (2) The difficulties in the Chicago Post Office in October 1966 were a symptom of an approaching catastrophe in the Post Office generally.
- (3) Participation by Congress in postal policy, postal rates and postal pay represents intolerable interference and has fouled up the Department's operations.
- (4) Huge savings on the order of \$1 billion a year can be achieved by adopting the Kappel recommendations.
- (5) There is some magic of efficiency, economy and error-free management in a corporate form of organization. (I might mention here that it was not a federal department that brought out the Edsel automobile, or the Conair 880 airplane, or that hired the private detectives to tail Ralph Nader.)
- (6) An organization is political only when Congress has a major say in its affairs and is pure and pristinely non-political when presidential appointees run things.

(7) The first and foremost goal of the Post Office should be a break-even operation.

(8) There is a better chance of continuing the Post Office's long history of strike free labor management relations by halting the program of having postal pay set by Congress and to, instead, have it determined by collective bargaining. In my opinion, this collective bargaining would, at best end up almost every time with arbitration and a decision by one or two men on the pay level of over 700,000 employees.

(9) Postal employees can and should be separated from and treated differently from other federal employees on job status, fringe benefits and other features of employment.

THE BREAK-EVEN OBSESSION

To go back to number 7 on this list of premises, I feel that the greatest flaw in the Kappel approach is the adoption of what I call the break-even obsession about the Post Office.

If a state university were run on the philosophy that its educational program was limited to what it could pay for out of tuition it collected, it wouldn't be expected to be much of a university. The goal of a great public university is to provide an educational program of top quality. Consideration of the relationship of financial outgo to amounts collected from the students is purely secondary.

The same should be true of the Post Office—and will be if historical policy is followed in setting Post Office goals and priorities. The Post Office receives part—at the moment a very large part—of the amount it needs to pay its costs from charges by users. But since it serves all the people—and since those users are taxpayers—there is no objective reason why it should retrieve all of its costs from postal charges.

Charges for postage are really just another tax. Taxpayers are already paying for government services. The Post Office provides one of the most vital and widely needed and used of government services. It is entirely appropriate, therefore, that federal tax revenues should provide a significant part of the postal budget.

Chamber of Commerce groups, conservative newspaper editorial writers and others, have talked for years about the need for a break-even operation in the Post Office. Their speeches and articles assume that the

desirability—even the necessity—for a break-even operation needs no proof, in fact does not even leave room for argument. They talk as though the proposition were carved in stone on Sinai. A remarkable job has been done of turning slogans for a particular point of view into something approaching gospel.

All of this talk, usually unanswered talk—has tended to balloon the break-even philosophy into a break-even obsession. From time to time certain postal officials, nearly all Budget Bureau officials and many so-called analysts of the Post Office, fall victim to this break-even obsession and come to regard it as the be-all and end-all of postal goals and thinking.

From a financial standpoint the Post Office is much like a metropolitan public transit system. Since nearly everybody uses it, it makes little difference whether it is paid for by user charges or, to a substantial degree, by general tax revenue. The fact that the Post Office has a so-called deficit is no more relevant to judging its effectiveness and goals than the "deficit" of the Department of Commerce, the Veterans' Administration, or the Department of the Interior.

Yet the reason the Post Office has this so-called deficit is purely and simply because its costs continue to go up with all other costs and Congress has used common sense and regard for the public interest in avoiding overly frequent and overly precipitous rate increases.

ATTACKS ON THE POST OFFICE

Nonetheless, the existence of the so-called deficit is used in the Kappel Report and by others as supposed proof that the Post Office is archaic, inefficient, poorly managed and all the rest. This is perhaps understandable in view of the fact that we live in an age where scoffing, criticism, carping and cynicism are the order of the day. It is not fashionable to see the good side of much of anything or to be understanding about work situations where occasional human errors make it difficult to achieve 100% perfection. In our frenzied, impersonal society it is popular to find fault, and the Post Office and its employees are natural targets. Add to this the human quality of nearly all of us to think of his own problem as the really big problem, so that every mistake or delay as to his own mail by the Post Office, no matter how isolated or infrequent, is magnified into a sweeping generalization that the Post Office is poorly organized and poorly run. It is hard for any individual to think of the occasional delay in one of his own letters in the context of delivering 80 billion pieces of mail a year—which number is considerably more than the number of seconds which have ticked by since the death of Julius Caesar.

My principal argument, therefore, with the Kappel proposal is its top priority emphasis on the break-even goal, rather than on service as the top consideration.

If the corporation were established, as proposed, with the rigid break-even requirement, with participation by Congress in the rate-making process diluted almost to the vanishing point, and with the proposed bond issue authority, the result would be that rates for all classes of mail would have to go up as much as 100%. We have seen what has happened to the parcel post system as the result of giving rate-making power to the Executive Branch, rather than to Congress. The rates have been raised so frequently and so precipitately that the whole system is on the verge of being wrecked and parcel service at moderate rates is no longer available to the general public from the Post Office.

UNREALISTIC PREDICTIONS OF SAVINGS

I feel that the Kappel predictions of savings which can be achieved by adopting its recommendations are so unrealistic as to be strictly of an ivory tower nature. The biggest single saving is to come from mechanization

for superseding certain activities of city letter carriers. The Report says that 15% of the cost of delivery operations can be saved by this means. This figures out to about \$450 million in view of the fact that the delivery operation accounts for 42% of Post Office costs. This idea of trying to mechanize the change of address and casing work which the letter carrier performs when he first comes on duty is an old idea. It has been thoroughly tested in the past and found to be completely unworkable. If it would work, it could be instituted immediately and certainly would not have to wait for reorganization of the Department. This, and other suggestions relating to increased mechanization, cannot fairly be described as savings related to having a corporation take over.

Unrealistic statements by study committees that the Post Office could save hundreds of millions of dollars a year are nothing new. Back in 1954 a 10 member Advisory Council claimed that "economies totaling hundreds of millions of dollars are possible" in the Post Office. Mr. Summerfield had a detailed analysis of this Council's recommendations made by the Department and by outside experts including Mr. Maurice Stans, and issued a 350 page report which, among other things, demonstrated in detail that any claim of great potential short term savings was totally unrealistic.

RATES WOULD SKYROCKET

Since I am convinced that no one billion dollars of real, near term savings, or anything close to it is possible, it seems clear to me that the break-even policy prescribed by the Administration Bill could be carried out only by financial shock treatment in the form of drastic rate increases and continuing cutbacks in service.

As a lawyer I believe that radical general rate increases could, under this Bill, be made entirely by administrative action by the Corporation and could then remain in effect for two years or more, without any power in either the Congress or the courts to veto or even modify the increases during those two or more years. This is possible under the temporary rate authority in Sec. 1253(d) and Sec. 1257(e) of H.R. 11750 and is something new that the Kappel Report did not recommend. I think the Post Office Department is realistic in recognizing that if break-even is to be achieved in order to support the bonds, then the Corporation must have this unprecedented, unrestricted "temporary rate" power. This one feature of H.R. 11750 alone dramatizes how the whole concept of postal policy would be dislocated by this proposal.

My prediction is that adoption in toto of H.R. 11750 would bring us a 12 cent first class rate in just a few years and enormous rate increases for each of the other classes, too.

Here are just some of my reasons for this prediction:

First, despite all the glowing statements about the saleability of the proposed non-government-guaranteed bonds, I am convinced they would be saleable only at sky high interest rates—10 or 12 percent—and even then only with extremely generous sinking fund and mortgage lien provisions. Even now the commercial mortgage rate for fully secured loans to profitable corporations is 9.5 percent. Sound business concerns are paying an effective rate of 10.4 percent for bank loans. I would expect the servicing—combined interest and principal amortization—of the projected \$10 billion of postal bonds to cost the Corporation as much as \$2 billion a year. This would be an entirely new direct cost to the postal service to be paid for from postal rate increases.

(It must be borne in mind that a general rate increase affecting first, second and third class, such as is now being proposed by the Post Office Department, brings in about \$660 million a year, assuming no loss in volume.)

Second, the backers of the corporation

proposal say much about the lack of opportunities for promotion for rank and file postal employees. I would assume that these backers therefore contemplate tens of thousands of new higher level jobs. This could cost hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Third, the Department has committed itself to an improved cost ascertainment system. This is bound to show that too much postal cost is now being assigned to some of the non-priority classes of mail. This would mean a further increase for first class. I am not so naive as to think that a corporation or Congress or anyone else is going to institute these staggering increases for first class mail without increases at the same time for other classes, regardless of what proper cost ascertainment shows. When I predict 12 cents for first class, I am assuming huge increases for other classes too.

Fourth, Mr. Blount has pointed out quite realistically in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Postal Rates, that the Post Office "faces the loss of some of its more lucrative third class mail business" to private carriers. He then stated: "Loss of third class mail [volume] ultimately works to increase the postage required of first class mail." This is just what I contemplate would happen as a result of the drastic rate increases for all classes which I foresee resulting from the bond financing proposal.

Fifth, the existing level of the public service allowance would, under the Administration Bill, be sharply reduced. This means rates would have to go higher.

Sixth, the special carrying charge and imputed charge features for parcel post rate-making included in Section 1203 of H.R. 11750 is bound to mean even further acceleration of rate increases for that class, further cream skimming by competitors and more huge losses of the profitable portion of parcel post volume. Parcel post makes a big contribution to post office institutional cost. When parcel post volume plummets, this institutional cost has to be picked up by the other classes.

Seventh, the Kappel Commission (Report, p. 82) recommended that "the Corporation fix its rates to earn its projected costs, including interest and appreciation, plus about 3 to 5 percent to cover unanticipated costs." This is a recommendation that would in all likelihood be followed by a postal corporation determined to meet a break-even goal, and, particularly, to try to provide adequate support for servicing its bonds. Sec. 1201 of H.R. 11750 says that "costs", which, with limited exceptions, are to be covered by postal revenue, shall include "a reasonable provision for contingencies." Five percent of postal costs would come to several hundred million dollars.

Eighth, Section 1201 of H.R. 11750 also says that "costs" to be covered shall include "depreciation on capital facilities and equipment." The Kappel Report Annex material indicates depreciation should be \$35 million per \$1 billion of capital investment. (Annex I, Sec. II, p. 30.)

Ninth, it is unrealistic to assume that all or even the major part of projected capital improvements to be acquired with the bond proceeds are going to save dollars, particularly on a near term basis. If a postal building is antiquated and poorly ventilated and crowded it should be replaced regardless of whether a dollar saving can be claimed. If the capital improvement program is well balanced and service oriented, it should include many facilities directed toward faster delivery which facilities could not be expected to result in significant savings in operating costs. Hamburg, Germany, has a three foot diameter large capacity pneumatic tube system for carrying mail under its streets. London has a special subway system just for carrying mail. New York City, Chicago, Boston and eventually Washington should have hundreds of millions in federal

money spent on adaptation of the subway systems for carrying mail. As an aside, let me say that I think any federal financial support for an urban rapid transit system should be conditioned upon that system being adapted to carrying mail. A mail truck can't move any faster in Manhattan cross-town traffic snarls than your taxi can.

Tenth, one of the earliest and most prestigious backers of the postal corporation plan, Mr. Gronouski, told the House Committee: "I support the postal corporation idea, also, because * * * I would look for a substantial improvement in postal worker wages and fringe benefits" under that system. I doubt if that prediction was foremost in the minds of those who gave overwhelming support to the corporation proposal in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce poll among its members. But because of Mr. Gronouski's experience and good judgment, we must accept this prediction as at least a possibility and it certainly would not result in dollar savings for the corporation.

These are just some highlights of why first class rates would, in my judgment, skyrocket under the corporation proposal. First class is where the money is—particularly in view of the very real competitive situation which must be faced in pricing other classes of mail.

I have attached to this statement as Exhibit A an itemized schedule of estimated increases in postal costs under this corporation proposal. The total is \$2,419,000,000 which I believe is a most conservative figure.

SERVICES WOULD BE CURTAILED

In my opinion the break-even policy and the break-even obsession would also result in service curtailment by the corporation. Just in the past nine months we have seen repeated announcements of reduced service by a highly capable but definitely break-even oriented postal administration. For example, in these nine months there has been announcement (a) of abandonment of the ABCD program for same day delivery in business areas, (b) of reduction of weekday business area deliveries from three to two, (c) of reduction of Saturday business area deliveries from two to one, (d) of curtailment of special delivery service and (e) of proposals to require detached address cards for merchandise samples.

It also seems a near certainty that under the pressure of the break-even obsession the corporation would drastically curtail rural routes and rural post offices. Under H.R. 11750 Congress would have no veto power over this. The story of what happens to service to less densely populated areas when an intense cost squeeze is on can be seen in the recent history of REA.

Now, in view of the special focus the Committee wishes to achieve at today's hearing, I will turn to an analysis of the bond financing provisions of the bill.

ANALYSIS OF THE FINANCE PROVISIONS OF H.R. 11750

The provisions of H.R. 11750 relating to finance are found in Sections 1001-1008 of the proposed Bill. The Bill, in Section 1005, authorizes the Postal Service to issue up to \$10 billion in obligations. In any one fiscal year, the net increase in the amount of obligations outstanding issued for the purpose of capital improvements may not exceed \$1.5 billion. Under Section 1006 of the Bill, the Postal Service may require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase up to \$2 billion of Postal Service obligations. There is no provision for the Postal Service bonds to be guaranteed by the United States Government. The General Accounting Office, in its testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, criticized many of the main features of the finance provisions of H.R. 11750. (See House Hearings, pp. 1115-1116, 1134-1139.) The following is a detailed

analysis of the essential parts of the finance provisions of H.R. 11750. It covers these basic points:

(1) The finance provisions of H.R. 11750 do not contain adequate controls over the borrowing power of the Postal Service.

(2) The finance provisions of H.R. 11750 do not explain what would happen to the Postal Service in the event of default on the bonds.

(3) Since the Postal Service bonds would not be guaranteed by the United States Government, acceptable interest rates could not be obtained.

(4) Since there is only limited authority requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to buy the bonds, large amounts of the bonds could be sold only at very high interest rates.

At the outset, it should be noted that the Kappel Commission Report did not make a detailed study of the feasibility of finance provisions similar to those contained in H.R. 11750. One of the staff studies of the Kappel Commission prepared by Price, Waterhouse & Co. makes the naive and unrealistic statement that "variations in interest rates would have a relatively minor effect on overall operating costs . . ." (Vol. I, Section II, p. 29.) The question of whether or not a U.S. Government guarantee would be necessary was discussed but not resolved. (Vol. I, Section II, p. 38.) The Report of the Commission did recommend that the Postal Corporation be authorized to float up to \$2 billion in revenue bonds and possibly a larger authorization for secured bonds (Report, p. 81).

H.R. 11750 does not contain adequate controls over the borrowing power of the postal service

H.R. 11750 does not contain any limitations as to what the proceeds from Postal Service bonds could be used for. While most of the discussion of the legislation has been related to the use of the borrowing power to build new post offices and modernize facilities and equipment, there is no requirement in the Bill that the bonds be used for any such purpose. Mr. Blount, in his testimony before the House Committee, conceded that the bond proceeds can be used for operating expenses (Hearings, p. 339). It also can be noted that Section 1005(a) of H.R. 11750 provides that the net increase in bonds in any one fiscal year "for the purpose of capital improvements" may not exceed \$1.5 billion. There is absolutely no limitation on the net increase of bonds used for purposes other than capital improvements.

Even if the proceeds of the bonds were used only for capital improvements, the Postal Service could have a net increase of \$1.5 billion in bonds each year. At that rate, the entire authority for new borrowing for the Postal Service could be exhausted in 7 years. The experience with other government corporations has been that the borrowing authority has been, at later dates, increased tremendously over the original authorization. For example, TVA obtained increases of their borrowing authority in 1959 and 1966. The Commodity Credit Corporation started with a borrowing authority of \$500 million in 1938. Since then there have been 10 increases in its borrowing authority and the Commodity Credit Corporation is now authorized to borrow \$14,500,000,000—twenty-nine times its original authorization.

H.R. 11750 also contains a provision—Section 1006(b)—which would enable the Postal Service to require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase up to \$2 billion of the obligations of the Postal Service. Since the Postal Service could not be expected to achieve a self-sustaining operation for a number of years, it is likely that the \$2 billion borrowing authority from the Treasury would be used up in the first few years of the Postal Corporation. See testimony of Postmaster General Blount, House Committee, pp. 177-78.

If the Postal Service did attempt to offer its bonds to the public, there are no controls that the Secretary of the Treasury could exert over the issuance of the bonds. Section 1006(a) of H.R. 11750 states in pertinent part:

"If the Secretary does not purchase such obligations, the Postal Service may proceed to issue and sell them to a party or parties other than the Secretary upon notice to the Secretary and upon consultation as to the date of issuance, maximum rates of interest, and other terms and conditions" (emphasis supplied).

The above provision requires only that the Postal Service give "notice" to the Secretary of the Treasury and engage in "consultation" with him. The section does not require the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in order to sell bonds to the public. It should be noted that the issuance of TVA bonds is subject to control by the Secretary of the Treasury (Section 16 U.S.C. § 831n-4(c)).

Section 209(3) of H.R. 11750 states that "Chapter 14 of title 31, the Government Corporation Control Act" shall apply to the Postal Service "except as otherwise expressly provided in this title."

Section 868(a) of the Government Corporation Control Act, 31 U.S.C. § 868(a) provides that all bonds and other obligations issued by the government corporations and offered to the public "shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, shall bear such rates of interest, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, shall be issued in such manner and at such times and sold at such prices as have been or as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury" (emphasis added). However, the language already quoted from Section 1006(a) of H.R. 11750 providing for "notice" and "consultation" is the only provision which would give any control over the public issuance of postal corporation bonds to the Secretary of the Treasury. Section 1005(b) of H.R. 11750 states:

"The issue of obligations by the Postal Service shall be subject to the requirements of Section 847-849 of title 31 and of no other law" (emphasis supplied).

Since Section 1005(b) of H.R. 11750 only refers to Sections 847-849 of the Government Corporation Control Act, it is evident that Section 868(a) of the Government Corporation Control Act, which requires that the Secretary of the Treasury approve the terms and conditions relating to the issuance of bonds to the public, would not apply to the Postal Service. Robert F. Keller, Acting Comptroller of the United States, pointed out in his testimony before the House Committee that "The Corporation . . . would be subject to less congressional control than most other wholly owned Government Corporations subject to the Government Corporation Control Act." (House Hearings, p. 1115.)

It should be noted that Section 1005(b) gives the Postal Service wide discretion to make "binding covenants" with the bondholders. Such covenants could cover such matters as "application and use of revenues and receipts of the Postal Service" and "such other matters as the Postal Service may deem necessary or desirable to enhance the marketability of said obligations." Under this authority, the Postal Service might even try to make "binding covenants" with respect to postal rates and other important matters of postal policy. There is no provision for an independent review and approval of the covenants contained in the bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury or by anyone else.

If bonds of the Postal Service can be offered to the public without approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, it would enable the Postal Service to make bond offerings in such a way as to impair the saleability of Treasury bonds. It also gives the Postal Service a right that no other wholly owned

government corporation would have—the right to sell bonds to the public without any control by the Secretary of the Treasury. Consequently, on the basis of a careful analysis of the finance provisions of H.R. 11750, it is evident that the Postal Service could issue large amounts of bonds without effective or adequate controls.

The finance provisions of H.R. 11750 do not explain what would happen to the Postal Service in the event of default on the bonds of breach of the covenants contained in the bonds

Section 1005 (b) of H.R. 11750 provides that the Postal Service may "pledge its assets and use its revenues and receipts" for the payment of the principal or interest on Postal Service bonds. The Postal Service is authorized to enter into "binding covenants with the holders of said obligations . . . as the Postal Service may deem necessary or desirable to enhance the marketability of said obligations." Section 1005(c) (7) states that the obligations "may be entitled to such relative priorities of claim on the assets of the Postal Service without respect to principal and interest payments . . . as the Postal Service determines."

H.R. 11750 and the Kappel Commission Report (Vol. I, Part 3, p. 37) both contemplate that obligations secured by assets of the Postal Service may be issued and that "binding covenants" imposing various conditions on the Postal Service could be used to enhance the marketability of the securities. Postmaster General Blount, in his testimony before the House Committee (p. 335), stated that "the Act gives the Board of Directors broad authority in his area. They could encumber specific properties . . . or they might furnish more general security." However, the mere existence of such security provisions and covenants in the Postal Service obligations is meaningless unless there is some mechanism to enforce the covenants if they are not kept. Investors are not likely to buy these unguaranteed bonds if they do not have complete assurance that the "binding covenants" would be enforced.

Nevertheless, the Bill does not specify what would happen if the postal corporation were unable to meet the interest on the debt. Would major postal buildings actually be foreclosed and turned over to the creditors? The Post Office Department has now conceded that a debtor could foreclose on a postal facility. (See House Hearings, p. 1271.) Could the Postal Service Fund be attached? If it were attached, would the secured creditors have priority over salary payments to postal employees? It can be noted that Section 1005(b) of H.R. 11750 states that the issuance of obligations by the Postal Service shall be "subject to the requirements of Sections 847-849 of title 31 and of no other law."

Thus, there is no legal provision which would prevent the attachment of the Postal Service Fund, and if the Postal Service Fund were depleted as a result of the attachment, the Postal Service might be unable to pay its employees and meet its current bills. Under what law would there be a bankruptcy proceeding or a reorganization plan? Could the postal corporation, and the government, lose control of Post Office finances and facilities? What would be the remedies available to bondholders in case of default? What would be the remedies of the bondholders if one of the "binding covenants" were breached? These and other questions are not answered by the finance provisions of H.R. 11750.

Since H.R. 11750 does contain provisions providing for liens on Postal Service assets and for covenants with the bondholders, these are logical and reasonable questions to ask. When you have a Post Office with a long history of losses amounting to billions of dollars, the possibility of action by the bondholders is not remote. In these circumstances, if the bondholders are to rely on covenants

and representations that they have a prior claim to the assets, there must be a means for assuring that the Postal Service would keep its commitments. If there were no means for enforcing the covenants and the obligation to repay the bonds, there is no reason why anyone would want to take the risk of purchasing these unguaranteed bonds.

Acceptable interest rates could not be obtained unless the bonds were guaranteed by the United States Government

In discussing the potential marketability of the Postal Service bonds, it is revealing to examine the actual facts as to the experience of TVA. The Tennessee Valley Authority was established in 1933. Much of the initial financing consisted of substantial appropriations from Congress. The original Act authorized the sale of up to \$50 million in bonds and in 1935 and in 1939 the statute was amended to authorize additional borrowing. All of these bond issues were fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States. See 16 U.S.C. § 831n-1 and § 831n-3. Moreover, all of these bond issues were sold either to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the U.S. Treasury. It was not until November, 1960—twenty-seven years after TVA was first established—that TVA first obtained financing from private investors. At this point, the bonds were no longer guaranteed by the U.S. Government. TVA still issues short-term notes to the U.S. Treasury and currently there are about \$100 million of such notes outstanding.

It was only when TVA had been operating for many years on a successful basis that its bonds were issued to private investors for the first time. TVA bonds have the highest rating by the investment services, and the principal purchasers of TVA bonds are pension and retirement funds of state and local governments. Not long ago, \$100 million of TVA bonds, noncallable and due in 1994, were sold at an interest rate of 8.25 percent. A rate covenant in the TVA bond resolution provides in part that TVA shall charge rates sufficient to cover all operating costs (excluding depreciation), debt service on the bonds, payments to the Treasury for repayment of the appropriation investment and such additional margin for other purposes as the Board may determine. The resolution further provides that rates shall be sufficient to cover such requirements if there were substituted for "debt service" for any fiscal year an amount which, if applied annually for 35 years, would retire, with interest, originally issued amounts of all bonds outstanding on July 1 of that year. TVA has escalator provisions in its rate schedules which provide for rate increases in proportion to the interest that TVA has to pay. It was recently announced that TVA was utilizing these escalator provisions for the third time in two years. Thus, TVA has used the automatic escalator provisions in its rate schedules to increase rates 27% in two years.

If TVA bonds are currently offered at an interest rate of 8.5%, one can well speculate as to what rate of interest the Postal Service would have to pay. The Post Office has a long history of large gaps between postal income and outgo. Its rate schedules could not contain any automatic escalator provisions such as TVA has. In addition, it is highly doubtful that the Postal Service could properly make any covenant in its bonds covering postal rates, because its rates are subject to approval by the Rate Commissioners and the Board of Directors as well as the theoretical possibility of a veto by Congress. There is also the strong possibility that the postal rates would be subject to judicial review. In contrast, TVA rates are not subject to review by any other government agency and rate increases can be promptly implemented by the use of an automatic escalator provision in the rate schedules. In

light of all the difficulties which confront the Post Office, it undoubtedly would take a number of years to determine if the Postal Corporation experiment were going to succeed. Prudent investors would probably select bonds of proven soundness unless the interest paid by the Postal Service bonds were sky high.

It is significant that Paul A. Volcker, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, conceded in his testimony before the House Committee that unguaranteed Postal Service bonds would not sell as readily in the open market and at the same interest rate as guaranteed bonds. See House Hearings, p. 1168. I have a letter from a top partner in one of the largest and most prestigious investment banking firms in New York and here is what he says:

"I have talked over the Post Office bond situation with several of my Partners and we are rather amazed that anyone contemplated selling such bonds to the public unless they were guaranteed as to principal and interest by the government. As we understood the situation, the government itself was going to buy the entire issue and then possibly at some later date have a public issue. We see no good reason for an institution or an individual buying the bonds without, as mentioned, some form of guarantee."

While the Postmaster General did submit to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee a number of letters from investment firms, it is clear that these letters discussed primarily the relative merits of H.R. 4 (the Dulski Bill) and H.R. 11750 and concluded that H.R. 11750 provides a more acceptable basis for financing than H.R. 4. See House Hearings, pp. 1204-1206. These letters do not contain any comments on the desirability of a government guarantee of the bonds or a requirement that the Treasury Department purchase all of the bonds, as the General Accounting Office recommended in its testimony before the House Committee. See House Hearings, pp. 1115-1116. Moreover, these investment firms indicate that the Postal Service would be subject to the same disciplines and credit restraints as other securities and would have to demonstrate during a suitable seasoning period that it could operate on a basis that at least covers its cost.

There is another factor that would make it difficult for the Postal Service to obtain reasonable interest rates: overloading of the market. H.R. 11750 contemplates that the Postal Service would borrow \$10 billion. In comparison, TVA is authorized to borrow up to \$1.750 billion and only about \$845 million of this authorization is outstanding at the present time.

TVA has never issued more than \$100 million in bonds at any one time. There has never been an offering of bonds by any private company that exceeded \$300 million at one time. Therefore, if the Postal Service tried to sell a large amount of bonds at any one time, it would undoubtedly have difficulty in unloading the bonds because of the size of the offering. If the Postal Service had a poor rating by the investment services—and it would seem a poor rating would be inevitable—these difficulties would be compounded.

A recent example should illustrate the problem. Wisconsin Gas Company not long ago offered \$16 million of 25-year 8½% first mortgage bonds. The bonds had five years of refunding protection. However, the bonds had mediocre credit ratings, Baa-1 from Moody's and triple B from Standard & Poor's, and as a result, only 50% of the issue was sold on the first day, which is typically a sign of poor public acceptance of a bond offering.

Wisconsin Gas Company was only offering \$16 million in bonds. If the Postal Service were trying to make an offering of \$100

million or more, or if it repeatedly entered the bond market (as it would have to do to use a \$10 billion authorization) its chances of success would be even more limited—unless the interest rate were so high that investors were willing to take the risks involved. When Mr. Kappel was asked by Congressman Corbett whether he would buy these Postal Service bonds which were not guaranteed by the government, Mr. Kappel responded (p. 261):

"Without the guarantee of the Government? I doubt if you could, until their house was in order. . . . It is a good question to ask—would you buy any of these bonds—and I would say it depended on whether it was a good buy."

It can be noted that the Commodity Credit Corporation, a government corporation which borrows money on the scale contemplated by the Postal Corporation, does have its obligations fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States. See 15 U.S.C. § 713a-4. The Commodity Credit Corporation presently has over \$12 billion in outstanding obligations.

It may be that the advocates of H.R. 11750 feel that the inclusion of sinking fund provisions in the public bond offering would eliminate the necessity for a U.S. Government guarantee of the bonds. However, the use of a sinking fund, as contemplated by Section 1005(b), would require regular deposits for paying off the principal. Section 1201(b), which sets forth the basic policy for rate-making, states that costs shall include "provision for sinking funds or other retirements of obligations to the extent that such provision exceeds applicable depreciation charges." Thus, it would be necessary to have the rates high enough to cover any sinking fund costs, which could be substantial. It is interesting to point out that TVA bonds contain no provision for sinking funds.

For all these reasons, it is clear that the marketability of the bonds would be significantly impaired and the interest rates on the bonds would have to be unreasonably high if the Postal Service bonds are not fully guaranteed by the U.S. Government.

Large amounts of postal service bonds could be sold at acceptable interest rates only if the Secretary of the Treasury purchased them

Section 1006(b) of H.R. 11750 enables the Postal Service to require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase Postal Service obligations up to \$2 billion. Section 1006(a) provides that the Secretary of the Treasury has the first opportunity to purchase any Postal Service obligations. The fact that the Secretary of the Treasury is given the first opportunity to purchase all Postal Service bonds is a recognition of the fact that such obligations may be difficult to sell to the public. It can be noted that TVA sold its bonds only to government agencies in the first 27 years of its existence. The bulk of the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has shown consistent losses in its operations, were purchased by the United States Treasury, even though the bonds are fully guaranteed by the United States. The bonds of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation were never offered to private investors, but were issued solely to the Secretary of the Treasury. See 33 U.S.C. § 985. The Export-Import Bank of the United States is authorized to issue up to \$6 billion in obligations, and the Secretary of the Treasury is "authorized and directed" to purchase any obligations of the Bank. See 12 U.S.C. § 635d. It is interesting to note that the obligations of the Bank must be purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury even though it has been in successful operation for over 34 years, its earnings have been running in excess of \$100 million annually, and it pays

yearly dividends of \$50 million to the U.S. Treasury.

The testimony of the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, Robert F. Keller, before the House Committee fully confirms the conclusion that large amounts of Postal Service bonds could be sold at acceptable interest rates only if the Secretary of the Treasury purchased them. Mr. Keller stated as follows:

"We are concerned that the sale of bonds to the public by the corporation would result in higher financing costs than would be incurred if the corporation used the financing facilities of the Treasury Department. Studies made by our office have disclosed that interest costs are generally higher when agencies obtain financing directly from the public rather than through the facilities of the Treasury Department."

"If borrowing authority is to be granted, we recommend that the corporation borrow all of its funds from the Treasury rather than borrow directly from the public." (House Hearings, pp. 1115-1116)

In addition to the more acceptable interest rates which could be obtained by selling the obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury, there are other advantages to borrowing from the Treasury. In order to keep interest costs reduced to a minimum, the Commodity Credit Corporation borrows each day the amount required to finance the net of the prior day's activity. Based upon daily wires from all Federal Reserve banks and branches, plus Washington activity, the Commodity Credit Corporation computes the net amount required to cover the excess of disbursements over deposits for the prior day. This amount is borrowed from the Treasury. When deposits exceed disbursements, CCC makes a payment to the Treasury against its notes. This method not only reduces interest costs, but keeps cash on hand at a minimum level. Also, when bonds are purchased by the Treasury, there is no conflict with the marketing of other government securities. On the other hand, if Postal Service bonds were offered directly to the public in large amounts, the regular offerings of Treasury securities for other purposes could be adversely affected.

Thus, it should be evident that large amounts of Postal Service bonds could be purchased at acceptable interest rates only if the Secretary of the Treasury purchased them.

If the Treasury purchases them, what is the point of having the elaborate bond issuing authority. All this complicated machinery would merely be an indirect way of getting money needed for postal purposes out of the Treasury. It is far more realistic and sensible to get it out direct—by appropriations.

I mentioned in my list of premises behind the Kappel Report the great emphasis in that report on the problems in the Chicago Post Office in October 1966, which have been picked up and magnified by many of the columnists and editorial writers as though that one situation showed that the entire Post Office was on the verge of collapse. The fact is that there was just one big problem there which resulted from a well-meaning but disastrous error in management decision making. A new postmaster had taken over at a time when an unusually heavy volume of mail hit the office. He needed overtime to cope with the work load. It was denied him. That was the whole trouble.

It is a really remarkable fact to me, and an indication of a pre-judgment of the Post Office problem by the Kappel Commission staff, that even though this 1966 Chicago problem was used as the lead off horror story in the Kappel Report, no one on the Kappel Commission or staff ever sat down with that new Postmaster of Chicago and got his explanation of what the problem really was. To me, that is just as unfair as it would be to take the isolated case of the Consolidated

Edison power blackout in New York a few years ago and to conclude from that that the entire privately operated electric utility system in the country was poorly managed and on the verge of catastrophe.

During the hearing on June 5, 1969, before the House Committee on the postal corporation plan recommended by the Kappel Commission, Mr. Kappel insisted that because the Post Office Department does not operate in the black, business is being "subsidized."

But would he feel that the businessman who goes to the Department of Commerce for advice or information is being subsidized because the Department does not make him pay a fee? Of course not. Mr. Kappel would readily recognize that service from the Department of Commerce is something he pays for with his tax money and is entitled to get as a taxpayer.

A man who takes his family to Yellowstone National Park is certainly not being "subsidized" merely because the entrance fee he pays is small in relation to what it costs the government to make the facilities available.

The simplistic talk about subsidies to users of the mail is based entirely upon the unproven and unprovable assumption that the taxpayer is entitled to nothing whatever for his tax money where the Post Office is concerned, but is entitled to all kinds of free services—very often much less essential—from other federal agencies.

The Post Office furnishes a service which practically everyone wants and uses and is glad to have. Because of this, taxpayers today should, more clearly than ever before, be entitled to have their taxes pay for some of the service they get from the Post Office. With taxes at sky high levels many taxpayers are getting less and less that they really want for their tax dollars. They are getting Viet Nam. They may, according to a high administration source, be paying for a trip to Mars. Many of the things the rank and file taxpayers pay for never come to them at all: farm price support payments, foreign aid grants, rent supplements, and much, much more.

Let us first ask ourselves what per cent of the total federal spending is for things the average taxpayer really wants and would ask for if the government weren't already providing them. It could be a rather modest per cent. The service provided by the Post Office would, however, certainly be included in this per cent, even if it were small. And yet there are those who say this average taxpayer is not entitled to have his tax dollars pay for any part of his postal service.

It is a strange thing how, in the eyes of many, delivery of a letter is a "business" type activity for which a taxpayer should pay in full through user charges, while other types of government activity, even when performed by the Post Office, is a service which a taxpayer is entitled to get for this tax dollar. For example, if a householder complains to the Post Office about receiving an advertisement for obscene material he is not expected to pay the Post Office for its efforts—often extensive—in investigating the case.

If a businessman asks the Post Office to check into and prosecute a scheme to use the mails to defraud, no one thinks he is being subsidized because he does not reimburse the Post Office for the expense it incurs.

So what is it about the government delivering a piece of mail which is so different? Nothing but custom. It has been traditional to make a charge. But there is nothing in logic that decrees that that charge must pay the full cost. There is certainly nothing in common sense or orderly thinking that compels the conclusion that, if that charge does not pay the full cost, the agency handling the transaction is archaic, inept, inefficient, unmanaged, or unmanageable.

There are other things done by government for which it is easy to make a charge, but which by equally accidental custom, no charge is made. Public libraries could easily charge everyone a rental fee. But they don't. They operate as a service to taxpayers. True, they may charge a daily fee for certain much-in-demand recent books. But the fact they obtain some of their revenue from user charges certainly isn't used by the editorial writers to "prove" that public libraries are unbusinesslike and poorly managed because they do not set their charges so they will operate in the black.

It is easy to assign a user charge for sewer service or trash collection service. But most cities don't.

It is easy to charge for use of highways. We have some roads for which a toll is charged, even though the motorists using them have already paid gasoline taxes for road building. But toll roads are the exception.

There is a simple explanation for all these examples. All levels of government are hard up for money. They have tapped nearly every source of tax revenue. They like to call taxes by euphemistic labels. But nonetheless user charges, such as tolls for using highways, or monthly fees for sewer service or trash collection service, or tuition for attending state colleges, are merely different forms of taxes. It is really immaterial—from the standpoint of showing whether or not the activity is "efficient"—that a user charge pays all, or only a part, or none at all of the cost to provide the service to taxpayers.

Some of the statements which are made about how much prouder the postal employees will feel, and how much higher their morale will be, if user charges pay the full costs of the Post Office, are of doubtful validity. Does anyone really think crews who work on repairing toll roads are happier and prouder than crews that work on roads that have no user charges?

A positive thing that could be done for the morale of postal employees is to stop the endless sloganeering about how the Department is supposedly a mess because it doesn't operate in the black. Once it is frankly and clearly recognized that the Post Office provides a service to taxpayers the cost of which should be paid in part by tax dollars, the so-called "deficit" of the Post Office will be as irrelevant as the deficit of the Department of Interior or of the Veterans Administration.

There are many things which should be and are being done to improve the Post Office. But "total" reform—if it means embracing the break-even obsession—will mean regression rather than improvement. "Piecemeal" is not a popular word. People want instant solutions to every problem. But piecemeal progress is what reasonable men learn to hope for. This Committee has certainly shown a willingness over the years to try to help the Post Office do its job better.

I favor many parts of the postal reform proposals. I favor greater continuity in the top positions at the Department—I was myself part of the problem on that score. But continuity like everything else can be overdone. I don't favor having a General Hershey at the head of the Post Office. I favor taking postmaster appointments out of politics. I favor generally the provisions on postal transportation in both the Administration Bill and H.R. 4.

I personally favor most of the employee relations provisions of H.R. 4. I favor strong provisions for control of pornography. I favor more opportunities for advancement of postal personnel—such as having most of the regional directors and the chief postal inspector come from the career postal service. I favor sensible, proven mechanization. I favor better, larger, cleaner, more modern postal facilities.

But I don't think any of this should come through the stranglehold of a rigid break-

even policy. I don't think it should come about with post office assets turned over at an artificially low original cost figure to a new corporation while onerous postal liabilities would be left behind for the general government to bear. I feel the Post Office needs a 15% annual increase in its budget to be earmarked for acquiring modern buildings and mechanization. The money should best come from a reassessment of our national priorities. But until that happens, any indebtedness resulting should be part of the overall federal debt.

In an effort to be helpful to this Committee I want to make a suggestion as to a major step you should consider taking before making a decision on any of the variations of the major postal reform bills. This suggestion applies not only to the bills, such as the Administration Bill, which would turn the Post Office over to a corporation, but it also applies to any of the bills which provide for the setting of rates by an agency other than the Congress or which provide for the issuance of a large amount of bonds, the interest and principal of which would be payable out of postal revenues.

It is impossible for me to convey to you adequately what complex problems are involved in consideration of these rate-making and bond issue provisions. You have an unusually capable staff working for this Committee. However, even in a large law firm such as ours where we have specialized familiarity with problems of public utility rate-making and corporate bond financing, we have found the attempt to adequately analyze these provisions of the pending bills so overwhelming that we feel we have only been able to scratch the surface. I feel that you need the services of both a qualified and well staffed law firm and a qualified and well staffed investment banking firm to assist in analyzing these provisions. I hasten to take our law firm out of the running so that no one might think I am trying to propose that we get in on something. We already have enough to do and because of our representation of a major segment of business mailers and our work on parcel post rates and various postal problems for some of our other clients, someone might claim we could not be completely objective—although in this statement I certainly have tried to be.

This isn't a proposal for a two or three weeks job from each of these specialized firms resulting in a brief opinion of law or financial analysis. This will require the same type of extensive and in-depth study by specialists which the Kappel Commission obtained on a great variety of points from other types of specialists: principally accountants and management consultants. The Congress of the United States not long ago undertook to pay to a large New York City law firm hundreds of thousands of dollars as a fee for representing Congress in connection with an unusual and complex case. Similar use of outside firms—legal and financial—is needed here in order to see where these unprecedented proposals for non-Congressional postal rate setting and for issuance of huge amounts of non-guaranteed postal bonds would lead us.

No one can now do any more than speculate as to what would happen if the postal corporation or the postal authority were unable to meet the interest on the bonds. Would major postal buildings actually be foreclosed and taken over by the creditors to be used as bowling alleys and warehouses? If that happened, where would the mail be handled? If there would not be actual foreclosures, under what law would there be a bankruptcy proceeding or a reorganization plan? Could the postal corporation, and the government, lose control of Post Office finances and facilities?

To make the bond saleable, what would the provisions of the proposed bonds have to be as to interest rate, redemption penalties,

sinking fund, liens on specific properties and other features? What would be the remedies available to bondholders in case of default?

In my opinion, government guarantee of the bonds would not help because that would mean, under other laws, the Secretary of the Treasury would have control over whether the bonds could be issued and I am convinced he would conclude he could not give his consent. However, in the meantime, in the hope of making the bonds acceptable, postal rates would have been raised to sky high levels.

It simply isn't sound business judgment to move ahead with something this monumental on the basis of statements that if it doesn't work, we won't be any worse off than we are now. My conviction is we would be many, many times worse off and that no one would know how to untangle the mess.

The expense to the government of hiring experts at such a time of possible financial disaster would, in my opinion, be many, many times what the expense would be now to get an objective, deliberate, expert look at the legal and financial aspects of just these two particular aspects of the proposal: rate-making and bond financing.

Various ones of you gentlemen may or may not be enthusiastic about the efforts and methods of large law firms and investment banking firms. However, the fact is that there are certain types of situations, much less complex than proposed here, where it takes literally years to work out all of the legal and financial ramifications. A merger of two major railroads takes six or eight years of legal proceedings before it can be consummated. A bankruptcy reorganization of a major corporation often takes years of the work of lawyers and experts.

Government agencies and departments cannot be expected to do the technical analysis job required here. The President has endorsed this proposal. How could his subordinates presume to pick it apart?

The mammoth size and variety of the legal and financial problems involved in these proposals cannot be exaggerated. I have tried to make a start on at least sorting out the questions, but it has not been possible to get to the bottom of these thorny issues.

There have been dozens of references in testimony on the corporation proposal to the TVA, for example. Yet as I have pointed out, the differences are far greater than the similarities. Neither the TVA nor any of the other government type corporations were set up to take over an existing government agency. They have all been set up from scratch to start something new. TVA is basically just another electric utility and electric utilities have been operated both by private corporations and by government agencies—such as the consumer power districts in Nebraska—for decades. There is no great problem in an electric utility producing revenue to fully cover cost. Electric utilities are not labor intensive and cost of electricity is one of the few items in our list of goods and services that have actually been holding still or going down during these years of inflation. TVA has rate escalation covenants in its bonds and automatic rate increase provisions in its contracts with its power customers.

CONCLUSION

In summary, it is clear that the finance provisions of H.R. 11750 do not contain adequate controls over the borrowing power of the Postal Service. The bonds could be used to pay operating expenses without any limitation as to the amount that could be issued in one year. The Secretary of the Treasury would not be required to approve any of the terms relating to the sale of bonds to the public. Moreover, the lack of a guarantee by the U.S. Government and the limited authority of the Postal Service to require the Secretary of the Treasury to buy the bonds would make it very difficult to sell the bonds at favorable interest rates. The end result of

these problems would be to saddle the mail users with the high costs of debt service and it would necessitate substantial rate increases to achieve the breakeven requirements of H.R. 11750.

I hope the material in this statement on the bond issuing authority provisions will be of assistance to the Committee. But I think my comments only make a start on analyzing the innumerable tricky problems involved. Therefore I urge the Committee to retain the two types of top experts I have referred to and to have them make full-scale, in-depth studies before any action is taken on these "total reform" proposals.

I am honored by the opportunity to testify today.

How POSTAL COSTS WOULD INCREASE UNDER H.R. 11750

Inclusion of interest as required by § 1201; assuming \$10 billion outstanding debt, with average interest rate of 8½ %	\$850,000,000
Inclusion of depreciation on capital facilities and equipment as required by § 1201 (b); assuming \$10 billion in assets with depreciation computed in accordance with Vol. I, Sect. II, p. 30, Exhibit A of Price, Waterhouse & Co. Study for Kappel Commission	359,000,000
Inclusion of public service costs as required by section 1202, including 10% of costs of operation of third class post offices and star route system and 20% of gross cost of operation of fourth class post offices and rural routes using figures from Postmaster General Blount's Testimony, June 24, 1969	122,800,000
Inclusion of Public Service Costs as required by section 1202 for special services and non-postal services	162,000,000
Inclusion of provision for amortization of debt and provision for sinking funds or other retirements of obligations minus computed depreciation charges as required by § 1201(b); assumed retirement of \$500 million in bonds per year	141,000,000
Inclusion of reasonable provision for contingencies as required by § 1201(b); contingency allowance is computed at three percent as recommended by Kappel Commission Report, p. 82, and based on adjusted costs of Post Office according to Postmaster General Blount's Testimony, June 24, 1969	221,295,000
Recovery of deficit as indicated by Postmaster General Blount, June 24, 1969	563,400,000
Grand total	2,419,495,000

PRIORITIES NEEDED TO HALT INFLATION, SAYS FRANCIS E. FERGUSON

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Francis E. Ferguson, president of the Northwestern

Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Milwaukee, recently addressed Northwestern Mutual's 22d all-Western meeting at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco. Portions of Mr. Ferguson's timely remarks follow:

Hedging against inflation through investment in the stock market provides no basic, permanent answer for anybody. The only real answer to inflation is control.

We're going to have to establish national priorities, and let those objectives with low priorities wait. We know we can't have guns and butter, and we know we can't do everything we want to do at once.

Uncontrolled inflation will swamp the short-term advantages gained by hedging, if large pools of capital turned away from fixed dollar investments in favor of equities.

The first effect would be to bid up prices, as a great many more dollars began chasing a limited number of equities.

The next effect would be to push interest rates on money still available for borrowing to such heights that the orderly capital markets presently existing would be destroyed.

Once the shortage of money and prohibitive interest rates foreclosed corporations from borrowing capital, they would have to raise it through common stock issues. That would dilute the equity values and drive share prices down. Even the common stock of blue-chip corporations has significant value mainly because of the leverage provided by large proportions of borrowed money in the corporations' capital structures.

UTILITY RATE INCREASES

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the oft-repeated slogan of the electric utility industry; while the price of everything else is going up, the price of electricity is going down.

Both parts of the slogan are untrue. The price of some other principal items is going down. For example, I know of no one whose livelihood depends on the price of wheat—as do many families in Montana and a number of other States—who has detected a rising trend in wheat prices over the past 20 years.

The other part of the slogan is equally fallacious. The price of electricity is not going down. It is going up. This is a national trend. It applies to telephone and gas utilities as well as electric utilities. The major utility corporations are enjoying substantial profits, as they always do, despite recessions which affect agriculture and other risk enterprises that do not enjoy the protection of commission regulation.

The Federal Communications Commission has been conducting closed meetings with the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. which could result in additional costs, running into hundreds of millions of dollars, for telephone subscribers. These costs would be borne principally by residential customers, who are regularly overcharged by A.T. & T. in order to permit the company to offer lower rates to industrial customers who might otherwise obtain communications service from A.T. & T. competitors.

As of June 1, approximately \$1 billion

in proposed rate increased by investor-owned utilities were pending before State utility commissions. A survey of the State commissions, conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, presided over by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), showed that as of June 1, rate increases pending before them amounted to \$961,160,505, not including a number of pending cases where a specific dollar amount was not stated. Of the \$961,160,530 total, \$317,411,571 was requested by electric utilities, \$175,742,171 by gas utilities and \$468,006,763 by telephone utilities.

Since June 1, the investor-owned utilities have asked another half a billion dollars annually of the State commissions. In settlements announced during the past 4 months the utilities have received more than 75 percent of what they asked. Sixteen requests totaling \$312 million a year, were settled for \$239 million. At least 182 rate increase requests are pending, and in 60 of those cases the utilities are asking from \$1 million to \$175 million more annually.

The rate increases, if granted will be equivalent in a number of States to substantial tax increases. For example, as of June 1, according to the State commission's report to the subcommittee, rate increases pending before the New York Public Service included \$175,000,000 by a telephone utility, New York Bell, \$1,300,000 by two gas companies and \$21,800,000 by an electric utility, Niagara Mohawk. Subsequently, as reported by Electrical World, Consolidated Edison filed a request for a \$117,500,000 rate increase. The New York Commission said it would not give Niagara Mohawk \$21.8 million, but would give it \$18 million more a year. Thus in New York State, pending rate increases amount to about \$300,000,000 a year. The stakes are especially high in Michigan and California, as will be seen from tables I shall subsequently insert in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this huge and unprecedented wave of rate increase requests comes at a time when inflation is seriously eroding the paycheck of the ordinary residential consumers who would bear the increased cost. And they come at a time when the utilities are doing well financially.

I do not wish to minimize increased costs, for utilities, as for other businesses, in certain areas, such as interest. The utilities themselves do an excellent job of emphasizing these cost increases. What they tend to minimize is the fact that their average interest costs on long-term debt are low, averaging—in the case of electric utilities—4.3 percent in 1968. That is not much more than it was 30 years ago, when it was 4.1 percent. At that time, the electric utilities averaged 6.9 percent return on their common stock equity. By 1948 return on common stock had risen to 9.7 percent, by 1958—a wonderful year for electric utilities—it had risen to 10.7 percent. But 1968 was beautiful. They averaged 12.3 percent on their common stock last year. I find it difficult to justify the highly inflationary escalation of utility rates in the light of high profits by the IOU's.

Unfortunately, significant data on the natural gas industry is even more difficult to obtain than electric utility data. However, the return on common stock equity of gas utilities appears to be increasing at approximately the same rate as for electric utilities. The industry-wide average return on common stock equity of gas distribution systems—not including transmission companies—according to computations by the American Gas Association, has been as follows, during recent years selected by AGA:

	Percent
1955	9.63
1960	10.08
1965	12.18
1967	12.63

The trade literature of the telephone industry alternates between dark observations on the deadly menace of consumerism and reports of record gains. Allied Telephone of Little Rock, Ark., reported record operating revenues for the first half of 1969. Its operating revenue almost doubled and its net income more than doubled over the first half of 1968. During the same period Central Telephone & Utilities' revenues rose a record \$20 million, with net income rising from \$1.21 per share to \$1.29 per share. Net income of Rochester Telephone rose from \$0.99 to \$1.09 per share. For Continental Telephone—which this summer picked up six more independent companies, four community antenna television systems and a cable products distributor—net income increase from \$0.50 to \$0.57 per share. United Utilities reported a 10-percent increase in earnings, amounting to \$0.59 per share as compared with \$0.53 per share during the first half of 1968.

Mr. President, it is possible that some of the requests by utilities for rate increases can be justified. However, because of the generally excellent financial condition of utilities, substantial doubt exists whether many of the proposed increases are merited. The rate increases need to be challenged, on behalf of the public. For it is the public that pays, not only the increased rates, but also the cost of the utilities' expensive presentations for rate increases and the utilities' misleading advertisements.

But nowhere, through either the rate or tax structure, does the public provide for adequate presentation of its own case in utility matters. Nor is the public provided with much of the basic information needed, on the performance of each utility, to permit reasoned judgments on the validity of rate increase requests.

The small staffs of the State utility commissions and the commissioners themselves, encumbered by the constant and tender loving care of utility officials, are in no position to be tough advocates for the consumer in the crucial issues of rates, reliable service, and environmental protection. These most serious gaps in regulatory procedure could be rectified through passage of S. 607, the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act, on which hearings have been completed by the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. S. 607 would provide the public and regulators with the facts they need

to know about utility performance, and provide meaningful adversary proceedings in utility hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the tables prepared by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations from infor-

mation supplied by the State utility commissions, showing rate increase requests pending as of June 1, 1969, a table showing requests filed since that date, as reported by Electrical World, Public Utilities Fortnightly, and the weekly NARUC bulletin, and a table, based on the same

three sources, which shows actions taken during the past 3 months on rate increase requests pending before State utility commissions.

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

TABLE 1.—UTILITY RATE INCREASES PENDING, BY STATE COMMISSION, JUNE 1, 1969, AND RELATED DATA

Commission	Increases pending	Name of company	Category	Amount	Date requested	Status of request
Alabama Public Service Commission.....	None					
Alaska Public Service Commission.....	3	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	Electric.....	\$82,000 (estimated) (2 percent of current annual revenue).	Apr. 23, 1969.....	On basis of staff protest, commission suspended proposed tariff for 60 days.
		Alaska Electric Light & Power Co.	do.....	\$130,000 (estimated) (8 percent of current annual revenue).	May 8, 1969.....	Will become effective June 8, 1969, unless protest is filed.
		Glacier Highway Electric Association, Inc.	do.....	\$7,000 per year (4 percent of current annual revenue).	June 2, 1969.....	Pending—no action on filing taken as yet.
Arizona Corporation Commission.....	1	Citizens Utility Rural Co.	Telephone.....	To 8 percent rate of return on fair value.		Under advisement—hearings on the matter have been held.
Arkansas Public Service Commission.....	2	Western Arkansas Telephone Co.	do.....	\$493,600, or approximately 32.35 percent increase.	Oct. 31, 1968.....	Formal order issued Apr. 11, 1969. Granted increases totaling \$83,000 subject to filing of new tariffs by the company and acceptance of same by the commission, contingent upon the company meeting certain requirements of the commission.
		Arkansas Western Gas Co.	Natural gas.....	\$1,062,877, or approximately 13.78 percent increase.	May 29, 1969.....	Investigation in process as to propriety.
California Public Utilities Commission.....	11	Southern California Edison Co.	Electric.....	\$60,137,000.	July 1, 1968.....	Submitted. Reply briefs due June 23, 1969.
		Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Gas.....	\$33,050,000.	Dec. 27, 1968.....	Hearings in progress.
		Pacific Lighting Service Co.	do.....	\$5,705,000.	May 5, 1969.....	Hearings scheduled.
		Southern California Gas Co.	do.....	\$5,939,000.	do.....	Do.
		Southern Counties Gas Co.	do.....	\$4,310,000.	do.....	Do.
		Southwest Gas Corp.	do.....			
		Placer County	do.....	\$90,000.	Oct. 2, 1967.....	Hearings in progress.
		San Bernardino County:				
		Phase I.....	do.....	\$33,000.		
		Phase II.....	do.....	\$26,000.	Feb. 6, 1969.....	Submitted.
		California-Pacific Utilities Co.	Telephone.....	\$98,000.	Jan. 2, 1969.....	Hearings to be scheduled.
		General Telephone Co.	do.....	\$46,300,000.	Dec. 1, 1967.....	Hearings scheduled.
		California-Oregon Telephone Co.	do.....	\$26,000.	Apr. 7, 1969.....	Submitted.
Colorado Public Utilities Commission.....	1	Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co.	do.....	Not specifically stated, but between \$30,000,000 and \$33,000,000 annually.	Apr. 1968.....	Hearings scheduled.
						Commission order issued granting increase \$5,878,000. Hearing held on spread of the rates but turned down by the commission. 2d hearing held on spread of the rates week of June 16, but to date no order issued.
Connecticut Public Utilities Commission.....	2	Pequot Gas Co.	Gas.....	\$50,600 per year.	Mar. 28, 1969.....	Hearings being held.
Delaware Public Service Commission.....	None	Greenwich Gas Co.	do.....	\$290,000 per year.	Apr. 1, 1969.....	Do.
District of Columbia Public Service Commission.	2	The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Washington, D.C.	Telephone.....	\$13,282,000.	Dec. 8, 1968.....	Hearings begin June 9, 1969.
		Potomac Electric Power Co.	Electric.....	\$24,900,000.	Feb. 27, 1969.....	As of June 3, 1969, no date set for hearings.
Florida Public Service Commission.....	7	General Telephone Co. of Florida.	Telephone.....	\$7,751,000.	Mar. 4, 1968.....	Temporary increases in the amount of \$4,269,854 were granted under bond, on Nov. 26, 1968. A further hearing has been set for July 29, 1969, for a final determination in this matter.
		Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.	do.....	\$5,775,625.	Aug. 15, 1968.....	Pending hearing now set for June 24, 1969 to determine final disposition. Requested increases were granted under bond on Nov. 26, 1968, subject to refund if not made permanent. The increases granted were based on the 10 percent Federal income tax surcharge imposed by Congress in 1968 and was calculated to restore the previously allowed return.
		United Telephone Co. of Florida.	do.....	\$2,800,000.	Oct. 15, 1968.....	During the past 10 years the commission reduced the rates of this utility approximately \$20,000,000 on an annual basis. Its last increase was in 1961 and was for only \$1,600,000. The bulk of its rate reductions were subsequent to 1961.
						Temporary increases in the amount of \$1,872,359 were granted under bond on Nov. 1, 1968. The matter is now pending further hearings to determine what final disposition shall be made of the requested increases. At the time the temporary increases were granted the company's rate of return had dropped to 3.15 percent.
						Further hearings are awaiting completion of separation studies so that a proper apportionment can be made of investment, revenues, and expenses to interstate and intrastate operations.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—UTILITY RATE INCREASES PENDING, BY STATE COMMISSION, JUNE 1, 1969, AND RELATED DATA—Continued

Commission	Increases pending	Name of company	Category	Amount	Date requested	Status of request
Florida Public Service Commission—Con.						
		Florida Public Utilities Co.: Deland Division	Gas	\$20,692	Dec. 19, 1968	Docket is presently pending further hearing for the purpose of allowing the company's attorneys to cross-examine commission staff witnesses. The further hearing has not been set as of this date.
		Sanford Division	do	\$14,128	do	Same as above.
		Winter Park Telephone Co.	Telephone	\$600,000	Feb. 17, 1969	Hearings have been completed and the matter is now ready for decision by the commission.
		Florida State Telephone Co.	do	\$143,923	Mar. 4, 1969	Pending further hearing to receive further testimony from the utility.
Georgia Public Service Commission						
	5	General Telephone Co. of the Southeast (Georgia operations).	do	\$1,548,632 (7.18 percent—resulting rate of return on net investment.)	Mar. 26, 1969	In process of being heard.
		General Telephone Co. of Georgia.	do	\$1,326,491 (8.12 percent—resulting rate of return on net investment.)	do	Do.
		Mutual Telephone Co.	do	\$65,675 (6.77 percent—resulting rate of return on net investment.)	do	Do.
		General Telephone Co. of Georgia (for EAS).	do	\$42,291 (Resulting rate of return on net investment—not available.)	Apr. 16, 1969	Assigned to be heard June 25, 1969.
Hawaii Public Utilities Commission						
	3	Pembroke Telephone Co., Inc.	do	Not available at this time	May 19, 1969	Do.
		Kauai Electric Co., Ltd.	Electric	\$691,000	Sept. 19, 1968, amended Nov. 1, 1968.	Application pending before commission. Hearings have not been held on said application because of other legal problems, involving this company. As soon as these problems, which are now in process of being disposed of, are acted upon the rate application will then be heard.
		Maui Electric Co., Ltd. (Lanai division).	do	\$60,400	Apr. 8, 1965, amended Apr. 16, 1969.	Application was not acted upon because information regarding the cost of power was not submitted to the commission. The Lanai Division of Maui Electric Co. is a distributing company and has no generating capability of its own. The Lanai Division purchases all its power from Dole Corp. and pays said corporation for the power.
		Hilo Electric Light Co., Ltd.	do	\$870,000	Nov. 21, 1968	This application is now in the process of being disposed of. Public hearings on this application have already been held.
Idaho Public Utilities Commission						
	3	Albion Telephone Co.	Telephone	\$7,864	Mar. 17, 1969	Order pending.
		Cambridge Telephone Co.	do	\$6,576	Oct. 2, 1968	Pending hearing.
		General Telephone Co. of the Northwest, Inc.	do	Filed complaint requesting commission find reasonable rate of return, and therefore no set amount was requested.	Jan. 7, 1969	Hearings scheduled June 25-30, 1969.
Illinois Commerce Commission						
	5	Union Electric Co. (St. Louis, Mo.).	Electric	\$2,150,000 (6.55 percent per year).	Nov. 6, 1968	Currently under hearing.
		Central Illinois Light Co. (Peoria, Ill.).	Gas	\$1,472,000 (5 percent per year).	Apr. 1, 1969	Do.
		Lakeside Telephone Co. (Champaign, Ill.).	Telephone	\$12,000 (17 percent per year)	May 8, 1969	Currently waiting for hearing.
		Prairie Telephone Co.	do	\$18,000 (21.3 percent per year)	do	Do.
		Rossville Telephone Co.	do	\$20,000	Aug. 1, 1968	Currently pending decision by Commission.
Indiana Public Service Commission						
	12	Boonville Natural Gas Co.	Gas	\$64,000	Feb. 3, 1969	Awaiting order.
		Clay County Rural Telephone Co.	Telephone	\$90,000	Feb. 21, 1969	Do.
		Hendricks Telephone Co.	do	\$161,000	Mar. 7, 1969	Do.
		Uniondale Telephone Co., Inc.	do	\$55,000	Mar. 11, 1969	Do.
		Hoosier Telephone Co.	do	\$60,000	Mar. 27, 1969	Hearing Sept. 3, 1969.
		Thontown Telephone Co.	do	Undetermined	Apr. 1, 1969	Hearing July 30, 1969.
		Ohio Valley Gas Corp.	Gas	do	Apr. 10, 1969	Hearing Sept. 15, 1969.
		Ohio Valley Gas, Inc.	do	do	do	Hearing Sept. 16, 1969.
		Dome Gas, Inc.	do	do	do	Hearing Sept. 17, 1969.
		Richmond Gas Corp.	do	\$644,000	Apr. 24, 1969	Hearing Aug. 4, 1969.
		Northern Public Service Co.	do	Undetermined	Apr. 30, 1969	Hearing Oct. 20, 1969.
		Indiana Telephone Co.	Telephone	do	do	Hearing not set.
Iowa State Commerce Commission						
	3	Iowa Telephone Co.	Telephone	\$135,346	Apr. 20, 1967	Audit staff examining books and records of company and conferences between staff and company representatives have been held in an attempt to limit areas covered at hearing.
		Hawkeye State Telephone Co.	do	\$210,004	Dec. 16, 1968	Audit staff examining books and records of company prior to settling hearing date.
		Union Electric Co.	Electric	\$450,000	Feb. 21, 1969	Application was rejected by order of the commission dated Mar. 17, 1969, for noncompliance with rules of the commission.
Kansas State Corporation Commission						
	2	Cuba Telephone Co.	Telephone	\$4,053	Nov. 8, 1968	Matter was partially heard on Feb. 25, 1969, and at said hearing applicant requested a continuance to a date to be determined. The status as of June 1, 1969, is that said matter was scheduled for further hearing for June 4, 1969.
		Salemsborg Farmers Telephone Co.	do	\$2,061	May 12, 1969	This matter is scheduled for formal hearing on July 1, 1969.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—UTILITY RATE INCREASES PENDING, BY STATE COMMISSION, JUNE 1, 1969, AND RELATED DATA—Continued

Commission	Increases pending	Name of company	Category	Amount	Date requested	Status of request
Kentucky Public Service Commission.....	1	South Central Bell Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$920,052.....	Feb. 11, 1969.....	Commission granted increase totaling \$839,662. Scheduled for hearing.
Louisiana Public Service Commission.....	1	do.....	do.....	\$17,000,000.....
Maine Public Utilities Commission.....	None
Maryland Public Service Commission.....	3	The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Maryland.	do.....	\$34,000,000 (involves 3 jurisdictions).	Oct. 18, 1968.....	Company completed its direct case, reserving the right to introduce new separations testimony. All company witnesses were cross examined. People's counsel will present its direct case beginning June 12, 1969. Not assigned for hearing as of this date.
.....	Potomac Electric Power Co.	Electric.....	\$24,900,000 (involves 3 jurisdictions).	Feb. 27, 1969, amended May 15, 1969.
.....	Columbia Gas of Maryland.....	Gas.....	Undeterminable at this time.....	Apr. 1, 1969.....	Company will present its direct case on June 11, 1969.
Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities.....	9	Boston Gas Co.....	do.....	\$3,500,000 (estimated).....	Feb. 12, 1969.....	Suspended.
.....	Lawrence Gas Co.....	do.....	\$184,500 (estimated).....	Dec. 26, 1968.....	Do.
.....	North Shore Gas Co.....	do.....	\$322,400 (estimated).....	do.....	Do.
.....	Northampton Gas Light Co.....	do.....	\$98,700 (estimated).....	do.....	Do.
.....	Wachusett Gas Co.....	do.....	\$53,100 (estimated).....	do.....	Do.
.....	Central Massachusetts Gas Co.....	do.....	\$115,500 (estimated).....	do.....	Do.
.....	Mystic Valley Gas Co.....	do.....	\$994,900 (estimated).....	Dec. 19, 1968.....	Do.
.....	Lynn Gas Co.....	do.....	\$252,800 (estimated).....	Dec. 26, 1968.....	Do.
.....	New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.	Telephone.....	\$3,120,000 (estimated) increase in message toll.	Dec. 17, 1968.....	Do.
.....	\$2,000,000 (estimated) increase in service toll.	Dec. 23, 1968.....	Do.
Michigan Public Service Commission.....	12	Climax Telephone Co.....	Telephone.....	\$16,520 (approximate).....	May 15, 1969.....	Hearing scheduled June 10, 1969.
.....	Consumers Power Co.....	(Gas.....)	\$37,972,900.....	Apr. 19, 1968.....	Hearing combined. Some hearings completed and further hearings scheduled for late June 1969.
.....	Detroit Edison Co.....	(Electric.....)	\$70,934,000.....	July 15, 1968.....	Some hearings completed and further hearings scheduled.
.....	do.....	\$48,000,000.....	July 22, 1968.....
.....	Michigan Bell Telephone Co.....	Telephone.....	Not specified.....	Aug. 1, 1968.....	Hearings scheduled for mid-June 1969.
.....	Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.....	Gas.....	\$26,986,000.....	Apr. 11, 1968.....	Hearings completed and decision pending.
.....	Michigan Gas Utilities Co.....	do.....	\$2,150,000.....	Sept. 18, 1968.....	Some hearings completed with further hearings scheduled. Interim relief of \$642,547 granted Apr. 16, 1969.
.....	Tri-County Electric Co-op.....	Electric.....	\$100,725 (approximate).....	Apr. 30, 1969.....	Hearings to be scheduled.
.....	Upper Peninsula Power Co.....	do.....	Not specified.....	Nov. 15, 1968.....	Do.
.....	Whiteford Telephone Co.....	Telephone.....	\$122,935 (approximate).....	Dec. 14, 1967.....	Hearing held, but case rescheduled nearer June 1969.
.....	Wisconsin Public Service Corp.....	Gas and electric.....	Not specified.....	Aug. 7, 1968.....	Hearing to be scheduled.
.....	Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.....	Electric.....	Full amount not specified, but requests emergency rate relief of \$1,600,000 immediately.	Sept. 5, 1968.....	Do.
Minnesota Public Service Commission (does not regulate electric or gas utilities).....	2	Gopher State Telephone Co.....	Telephone.....	Not available.....	Mar. 21, 1969.....	Hearings completed—order not yet issued.
Mississippi Public Service Commission.....	None	Pioneer-United Telephone Co.....	do.....	do.....	June 4, 1969.....	Hearing scheduled July 1, 1969.
Missouri Public Service Commission.....	7	Missouri Public Service Co.....	Electric.....	\$5,300,000.....	Apr. 3, 1969.....	Submitted on record for final determination.
.....	The Gas Service Co.....	Gas.....	\$4,020,000.....	Oct. 30, 1968.....	Case to be heard.
.....	Union Electric Co.....	Electric.....	\$12,200,000.....	Nov. 6, 1968.....	Do.
.....	Missouri Telephone Co.....	Telephone.....	\$521,500.....	Nov. 12, 1968.....	Submitted on record for final determination.
.....	Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.....	do.....	\$44,500,000.....	Nov. 15, 1968.....	Case to be heard.
.....	Laclede Gas Co.....	Gas.....	\$6,870,000.....	Jan. 10, 1969.....	Do.
.....	Missouri Utilities Co.....	do.....	\$135,000.....	Jan. 15, 1969.....	Do.
Montana Public Service Commission.....	None
Nebraska State Railway Commission (does not regulate electric and gas utilities).....	None
Nevada Public Service Commission.....	None
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.....	None
New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners.....	None
New Mexico Public Service Commission.....	4	Southwestern Public Service Co.	Electric.....	\$711,662.....	Oct. 10, 1968.....	Granted.
.....	Public Service Co. of New Mexico.....	do.....	\$2,700,000.....	Oct. 24, 1968.....	Denied. ¹
.....	Southern Union Gas Co.....	Gas.....	\$4,309,772.....	Jan. 28, 1969.....	Hearing held.
.....	Rio Grande Gas Co.....	do.....	\$67,929.....	Apr. 1, 1969.....	Granted.
New York State Public Service Commission.....	5	Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.....	Electric.....	\$22,000,000 (approximately).....	Oct. 7, 1968.....	Suspended to and including Oct. 2, 1969, unless otherwise ordered by the commission. Hearings are closed.
.....	Corning Natural Gas Corp.....	Gas.....	\$100,000 (approximately).....	May 12, 1969.....	Proposed effective date July 1, 1969. Under investigation.
.....	Columbia Gas of New York, Inc.....	do.....	\$1,200,000 (approximately).....	May 1, 1969.....	Suspended to and including Oct. 1, 1969, unless otherwise ordered by the commission. First hearing scheduled for June 19, 1969.
.....	General Telephone Co. of Upstate New York, Inc.	Telephone.....	\$81,000.....	May 29, 1969.....	The proposed effective date is July 1, 1969. The matter is under investigation.
.....	New York Telephone Co.....	do.....	\$175,000,000.....	Mar. 20, 1969.....	Schedules suspended and hearings are in progress.
North Carolina Utilities Commission.....	4	Lee Telephone Co.....	do.....	\$239,013.....	Oct. 2, 1968.....	Hearings completed. Briefs filed. Ready for decision and order.
.....	Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.....	do.....	\$3,135,100.....	Nov. 29, 1968.....	Hearing completed. Order being filed.
.....	Denton Telephone Co.....	do.....	\$29,571.....	Jan. 6, 1969.....	Hearing completed. Order being written.
.....	Eastern Rowan Telephone Co.....	do.....	\$45,986.....	do.....	Hearing completed. Order being filed.
North Dakota Public Service Commission.....	2	Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.....	do.....	\$3,000,000 (approximately).....	Mar. 27, 1969.....	Application was filed and hearings were completed on May 13, 1969. No order as yet issued.
.....	Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.....	Gas.....	\$1,208,783.....	May 19, 1969.....	Application is filed and hearing has been scheduled.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—UTILITY RATE INCREASES PENDING, BY STATE COMMISSION, JUNE 1, 1969, AND RELATED DATA—Continued

Commission	Increases pending	Name of company	Category	Amount	Date requested	Status of request
Ohio Public Utilities Commission.....	5	Farmers Mutual Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$3,168.....	Dec. 17, 1968.....	Staff report issued May 15, 1969.
		North Creek Mutual Telephone Co.	do.....	\$1,278.....	Jan. 27, 1969.....	Staff report issued May 1, 1969.
		The Champaign Telephone Co.	do.....	\$123,293.....	Mar. 13, 1969.....	(The above companies are small and were in violation of the commission's rules and regulations which had to be corrected before a staff report could be issued.) Staff report issued May 22, 1969.
		The Ohio Valley Gas Co.	Gas.....	(Cannot be determined until staff report is completed.)	Mar. 17, 1969.....	Staff report in process.
		The Ohio Valley Gas Co., East Liverpool, Ohio.	do.....	\$238,088.....	Dec. 13, 1968.....	Staff report issued.
Oklahoma Corporation Commission.....	1	Southwestern Public Service Co., Amarillo, Tex.	Electric.....	\$360,000.....	1969.....	Pending audit examination.
Oregon Public Utility Commission.....	1	Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$11,804,400.....	Feb. 21, 1969.....	Continued hearings to be held August 1969.
Pennsylvania Public Service Commission.....	3	Philadelphia Electric Co.	Electric.....	\$29,707,184.....	Dec. 5, 1968.....	Suspended Feb. 3, 1969, for 6 months to Aug. 3, 1969. Pre-hearing conference Mar. 14, 1969, in Philadelphia. Hearings in progress.
		Equitable Gas Co.	Gas.....	\$762,500.....	May 16, 1969.....	Permitted to become effective July 15, 1969. This increase only offsets the increase in rates that Equitable must pay one of its wholesale suppliers. The latter's rates were increased by FPC.
		Mercer Gas Co., The	do.....	\$17,261.....	Dec. 3, 1968.....	Permitted to become effective Mar. 1, 1969. Noncommission case pending before commission.
Puerto Rico Public Service Commission.....	None					Prehearing conference continued.
Rhode Island Department of Business Regulation.	3	New England Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$9,200,000.....	Apr. 1, 1969.....	Suspended pending investigation.
		Newport Gas Light Co.	Gas.....	\$239,000.....	July 15, 1969.....	Suspended.
		Bristol & Warren Gas Co.	do.....	\$140,000.....	Apr. 28, 1969.....	Do.
South Carolina Public Service Commission.....	3	Greenwood United Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$803,998.....	Dec. 9, 1968.....	Hearings completed. Matter will be taken under consideration as soon as briefs are filed in July by the parties involved.
		The Bowman Telephone Co.	do.....	\$31,008.....	May 14, 1969.....	In process of audit.
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission (does not regulate electric and gas utilities).	2	The Ellorree Telephone Co.	do.....	\$59,485.....	do.....	Do.
		Sioux Valley Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$21,269 (13.9 percent) increase in local service revenue.	May 21, 1969.....	Request filed. Conference held. Public notice being given.
		Armour Independent Telephone Co., Inc.	do.....	\$8,148 (26.8 percent) increase in local service revenue—includes conversion to dial operation.	do.....	Do.
Tennessee Public Service Commission.....	1	United Inter-Mountain Telephone Co.	do.....	\$2,052,212.....	Dec. 31, 1968.....	Heard May 6, 1969, order pending.
Texas Railroad Commission (does not regulate electric and gas utilities).	3	Lone Star Gas Co.	Gas.....	\$10,848,253.....	May 2, 1969.....	Pending.
		High Plains Natural Gas Co.	do.....	\$48,849.....	Dec. 3, 1968.....	Do.
		Houston Pipe Line Co.	do.....	\$5,236,539.....	Apr. 25, 1969.....	Do.
Utah Public Service Commission.....	1	Utah Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	Unknown—claim insufficient revenue. Ask increase without specifying amount.	Apr. 14, 1969.....	Hearing set for June 10 and 11, 1969.
Vermont Public Service Board.....	1	Citizens Utilities Co.	Electric.....	\$2,364,000.....	March 1969.....	Due for hearing on remand from Vermont Supreme Court.
Virginia State Corporation Commission.....	1	United Inter-Mountain Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$822,526.....	Dec. 10, 1968.....	Hearings concluded; decision pending.
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.	1	Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Co.	do.....	\$26,700,000.....	Dec. 12, 1968.....	Concluding hearings are set to begin June 9, 1969.
West Virginia Public Service Commission.....	9	Consolidated Gas Supply Corp. (Hope Natural).	Gas.....	\$2,000,000.....	Oct. 30, 1967.....	Completion of audit and set for hearing.
		Cabot Corp.	do.....	\$791,000.....	May 1, 1968.....	Do.
		Wayne Gas Co.	do.....	\$25,000.....	July 30, 1968.....	Awaiting commission decision.
		Holden Gas Co.	do.....	\$15,000.....	Sept. 10, 1968.....	Do.
		Logan Gas Co.	do.....	\$9,000.....	do.....	Do.
		Independent Gas Co.	do.....	\$17,000.....	Oct. 6, 1968.....	Do.
		Spencer Gas Co.	do.....	\$20,000.....	Nov. 20, 1968.....	Completion of audit and set for hearing.
		Telephone Utilities of West Virginia.	Telephone.....	\$61,600.....	Oct. 29, 1968.....	Awaiting commission decision.
		Preston County Light & Power Co.	Electric.....	\$36,600.....	May 28, 1969.....	Completion of audit and set for hearing.
Wisconsin Public Service Commission.....	26	Wisconsin Gas Co.	Gas.....	\$6,447,000.....	July 25, 1968.....	Hearings held; briefs being filed.
		Wisconsin Public Service Corp.	Electric and gas.....	\$5,167,000.....	Aug. 8, 1968.....	Hearings held.
		Natural Gas, Inc.	Gas.....	(?).....	Aug. 12, 1968.....	Do.
		Northern States Power Co.	Electric.....	\$1,427,000.....	Oct. 14, 1968.....	Hearings held; adjourned hearings scheduled.
		Universal Telephone Co. of Northern Wisconsin.	Telephone.....	\$27,000.....	Nov. 15, 1968.....	Hearing held.
		Wisconsin Natural Gas Co.	Gas.....	\$4,660,000.....	Dec. 4, 1968.....	Hearing held. Adjourned hearings are scheduled.
		Central State Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$63,100.....	do.....	Hearing held. Staff investigation in progress.
		Mount Vernon Telephone Co.	do.....	\$37,500.....	do.....	Do.
		Wisconsin Telephone Co.	do.....	\$21,600,000.....	Dec. 30, 1968.....	Hearing held. Staff examination of Company's exhibits, working papers, and underlying records to commence shortly.
		American Gas Co. of Wisconsin, Inc.	Gas.....	(?).....	Jan. 7, 1969.....	Held in abeyance at request of company.
		Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.	do.....	\$269,000.....	Jan. 14, 1969.....	Hearings held. Adjourned hearings scheduled.
		Wisconsin Fuel and Light Co.	do.....	(?).....	Jan. 15, 1969.....	Hearing held.
		Headwaters Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$11,800.....	Feb. 14, 1969.....	Do.
		Kaukauna, Wis.	Electric.....	\$232,000.....	Mar. 6, 1969.....	Do.
		United Telephone Co.	Telephone.....	\$212,000.....	Mar. 14, 1969.....	Interim order issued May 22, 1969. Staff investigation in progress.
		Casco Telephone Co.	do.....	\$11,500.....	Mar. 20, 1969.....	Hearing Apr. 30, 1969. Staff investigation in progress.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—UTILITY RATE INCREASES PENDING, BY STATE COMMISSION, JUNE 1, 1969, AND RELATED DATA—Continued

Commission	Increases pending	Name of company	Category	Amount	Date requested	Status of request
Wisconsin Public Service Commission—Con.						
		Wisconsin Telephone Co.	Telephone	\$1,000	Mar. 24, 1969	Hearing held.
		General Telephone Co. of Wisconsin	do.	\$2,800	Apr. 7, 1969	Do.
		Dodge County Telephone Co.	do.	(?)	Apr. 8, 1969	Hearing pending.
		Valders Telephone Co.	do.	(?)	Apr. 14, 1969	Do.
		Munich Natural Gas Utility	Gas	\$4,700	Apr. 16, 1969	Do.
		Chippewa County Telephone Co., Inc.	Telephone	\$44,100	Apr. 25, 1969	Do.
		Waukegan Telephone Co.	do.	(?)	May 19, 1969	Do.
		Black Earth Telephone Co.	do.	(?)	do.	Do.
		Shawano, Wis.	Electric	(?)	May 23, 1969	Do.
		Madison Gas & Electric Co.	Gas	\$500,000	May 29, 1969	Do.
Wyoming Public Service Commission	2	Cheyenne Light, Fuel & Power Co.	Electric	\$168,000	Nov. 7, 1968	Commission's order entered June 13, 1969, rejecting company's proposal and requiring refunding tariffs permitting a total increase as follows: Electric, \$48,419; gas, \$50,852.
			Gas	\$142,000		

¹ See footnote 2, table 2, below.² Cases for which no amount of revenue requirement is indicated represent either small com-

panies or instances where actual additional revenue requirements have not been indicated at the present stage of the proceeding.

TABLE 2.—TABULATION OF UTILITY RATE INCREASES PENDING AS OF JUNE 1, 1969, BY STATE AND CATEGORY

State	Electric	Gas	Telephone	State	Electric	Gas	Telephone
Alabama	None	None	None	Nevada	None	None	None
Alaska	\$219,000	None	None	New Hampshire	None	None	None
Arizona	None	None	(1)	New Jersey	None	None	None
Arkansas	None	\$1,062,877	\$493,600	New Mexico ¹	\$3,411,662	\$4,377,701	None
California	60,137,000	49,153,000	46,424,000	New York	22,000,000	1,300,000	\$175,081,000
Colorado	None	None	31,500,000	North Carolina	None	None	3,449,810
Connecticut	None	340,600	None	North Dakota	None	1,208,783	3,000,000
Delaware	None	None	None	Ohio	None	1,238,088	127,739
District of Columbia	24,900,000	None	13,282,000	Oklahoma	360,000	None	None
Florida	None	34,820	17,070,548	Oregon	None	None	11,804,400
Georgia	None	None	2,983,089	Pennsylvania	29,707,184	779,761	None
Hawaii	1,621,400	None	None	Puerto Rico	None	None	None
Idaho	None	None	14,440	Rhode Island	None	379,000	9,200,000
Illinois	2,150,000	1,472,000	50,000	South Carolina	None	None	894,491
Indiana	None	708,000	366,000	South Dakota	(?)	(?)	29,417
Iowa	450,000	None	345,350	Tennessee	None	None	2,052,212
Kansas	None	None	6,114	Texas	(?)	16,133,641	(?)
Kentucky	None	None	920,052	Utah	None	None	(?)
Louisiana	None	None	17,000,000	Vermont	2,364,000	None	None
Maine	None	None	None	Virginia	None	None	822,526
Maryland	24,900,000	(1)	34,000,000	Washington	None	None	26,700,000
Massachusetts	None	5,521,900	3,120,000	West Virginia	36,600	2,877,000	98,200
Michigan	120,634,725	167,108,000	139,435	Wisconsin	16,852,000	11,880,000	22,010,800
Minnesota	(?)	(?)	(1)	Wyoming	168,000	142,000	None
Mississippi	None	None	None				
Missouri	17,500,000	11,025,000	45,021,500	Subtotal	317,411,571	175,742,171	468,006,763
Montana	None	None	None	Grand total		961,160,505	
Nebraska	(?)	(?)	None				

¹ Other increase(s) pending with no set dollar amount requested or established. See table 1 above.² No regulation.³ On July 30, 1969, Public Service Co. of New Mexico filed for an electric rate increase of \$4,219,547.⁴ Does not reflect 25 applications for which no dollar amount was available.UTILITY RATE INCREASE REQUESTS FILED WITH STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 1, 1969
(In millions of dollars)

Company	Category	Amount
COLORADO		
Public Service Co. of Colorado	Electric-gas	\$1.9
CONNECTICUT		
Connecticut Natural Gas	Gas	4.4
FLORIDA		
Southern Bell Telephone	Telephone	32.0
GEORGIA		
Southern Bell Telephone	do.	29.7
IDAHO		
Idaho Power	Electric	8.4
ILLINOIS		
Commonwealth Edison	do.	45.0
MASSACHUSETTS		
New England Telephone & Telegraph	Telephone	52.0
MINNESOTA		
Northern States Power	Electric	2.7
MISSOURI		
Kansas City Power & Light	do.	7.3
NEW JERSEY		
Jersey Central Power & Light	Electric	12.7
New Jersey Power & Light	do.	5.8

UTILITY RATE INCREASE REQUESTS FILED WITH STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 1, 1969—Continued
(In millions of dollars)

Company	Category	Amount
NEW MEXICO		
Community Public Service	Electric	\$0.3
Public Service of New Mexico	do.	4.2
Southwestern Public Service	do.	1.9
NEW YORK		
Consolidated Edison	do.	117.5
Iroquois Gas Corp.	Gas	8.8
OHIO		
Ohio Bell Telephone	Telephone	80.0
United Telephone of Ohio	do.	14.0
Cleveland Electric	Electric	17.5
PENNSYLVANIA		
Duquesne Light	do.	19.0
Metropolitan Edison	do.	20.7
TENNESSEE		
South Central Bell Telephone	Telephone	4.6
TEXAS		
Lone Star Gas	Gas	3.1
WISCONSIN		
Wisconsin Public Service	Electric	5.1
Total		498.6

ACTION ON RATE REQUESTS BY STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS JUNE-SEPTEMBER 1969

Company	Amount requested	Amount approved
CALIFORNIA		
General Telephone of California	\$46,300,000	\$46,300,000
Southern California Edison	60,137,000	46,668,000
Southern California Gas	5,939,000	(?)
Southern Counties Gas	4,310,000	(?)
CONNECTICUT		
Southern New England Telephone	23,900,000	23,900,000
FLORIDA		
Southern Bell	5,775,625	3,701,500
MICHIGAN		
Consumers Power	57,700,000	37,822,000
Michigan Consolidated Gas	27,000,000	4,200,000
		2,800,000
MISSOURI		
Missouri Public Service	5,300,000	5,100,000
NEW YORK		
Niagara Mohawk	21,800,000	(?)
NORTH CAROLINA		
Lee Telephone Co.	239,000	100,000

Footnotes at end of tables.

ACTION ON RATE REQUESTS BY STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS, JUNE-SEPTEMBER 1969—Continued

Company	Amount requested	Amount approved
PENNSYLVANIA		
Pennsylvania Gas & Water.....	\$2,200,000	\$1,800,000
Philadelphia Electric.....	29,707,184	29,707,184
TEXAS		
Lone Star Gas.....	10,848,253	6,961,445
WISCONSIN		
Wisconsin Public Service.....	5,167,000	2,000,000
Wisconsin Gas Co.....	6,447,000	4,021,000
Total.....	312,770,062	239,581,129

¹ Jointly received rate increases totaling \$6,500,000 plus opportunity to obtain additional \$7,700,000.

² Note: \$13,157 granted in April by State commission, full \$23,900,000 granted in July by Supreme Court.

³ Note: 3 weeks after Florida Commission approved \$3,700,000 increase, Southern Bell filed request for \$32,000,000 rate increase.

⁴ Note: Consumers Power reported request totalled \$57,000,000. Michigan Public Service Commission reported to subcommittee request had totalled \$108,900,000.

⁵ In June.

⁶ In July.

⁷ New York Public Service Commission has advised company it will accept revised request for \$18,000,000.

**MRS. LOUISE BOWKER, PRESIDENT,
NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION MAN-
AGERS, INC.**

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was pleased to learn that Mrs. Louise Bowker, of my State, recently has added to her many accomplishments her election as president of the Newspaper Association Managers, Inc. The NAM is fortunate to have the talents and industry of this Arkansas leading this organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article published in the Missouri Press News outlining some of Mrs. Bowker's civic and professional contributions.

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

[From the Missouri Press News, October 1969]
ASSOCIATION MANAGERS ELECT ARKANSAS
WOMAN PRESIDENT

Mrs. Louise Bowker, secretary-manager of the Arkansas Press Association, was elected president of Newspaper Association Managers, Inc. at the group's 46th annual meeting August 22, in Williamsburg, Virginia. NAM is an association composed of managers of state, regional and national newspaper organizations. She is the first woman ever elected to the NAM board, having been chosen secretary-treasurer in 1967 and moving to the vice presidency in 1968.

She joined the Arkansas Press Association as office manager in April 1956, was promoted to assistant manager in 1961 and became the first woman to head the 97 year old association in 1962.

In 1962 she was chosen APA's "Man of the Year" an award bestowed on the person considered to have made the greatest contribution to the programs and progress of the Arkansas Press Association. She was elected Woman of Achievement in 1963 by Arkansas Press Women, Inc.

She is currently serving as secretary of the Arkansas Highway Users Conference; vice president of the Arkansas Council on Children & Youth; and vice president of the

Mid-America Newspaper Mechanical Conference, the first woman in the country to be elected to such a board. She is a member of the Little Rock Advertising Club and is active on its legislative committee; the Salvation Army Auxiliary; North Little Rock Boys Club, and other civic organizations.

She is a native of Jonesboro, where she was graduated from the public schools and Jonesboro Baptist College, majoring in business administration. Mr. Bowker is married to S. W. Bowker, an insurance executive of North Little Rock, Arkansas.

Other officers and board members elected were: Vice President, Robert M. Shaw, Minnesota Press Association; Secretary-Treasurer, Richard W. Cardwell, Hoosier State Press Association; and Director, Ray Hamley, Maryland-Delaware-D.C. Press Association.

GREEK REGIME TOKENISM**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a recent dispatch in the New York Times reports that the military government of Greece is undertaking a liberalization program. The press is now free—except there is a two-page list of banned topics. Summary arrests and imprisonment are barred—except in cases involving "the public order and security." Military courts will no longer have jurisdiction over civilians—except in cases of treason, espionage, sedition, disturbing the peace, spreading false information, and arousing discord. In short, the people of Greece are now free—as long as they do not do or say anything the colonels do not want them to.

Verily, the junta is preserving Greece as a bastion of freedom.

I include the article entitled "Greek Regime Eases Martial-Law Curbs, but With Exceptions" from the New York Times of October 4, 1968, in the RECORD at this point:

**GREEK REGIME EASES MARTIAL-LAW CURBS,
BUT WITH EXCEPTIONS**

ATHENS, October 3.—Greece's Army-backed regime today modified three martial-law rules—on press censorship, arbitrary arrest and trial by military courts—but the new measures contained a number of qualifications, assuring that controls would continue.

Greek newspaper editors were told today that the press was now free. But they were handed a two-page list of banned topics and were told that although they no longer needed to submit galley proofs to the censors, a copy of each paper must still be submitted for approval before it goes to the newsstands.

At the same time, summary arrests and imprisonment were barred "except in cases involving crimes against public order and security" and the jurisdiction of special military courts was narrowed.

ANNOUNCED AT NEWS TALK

The new measures were announced by Premier George Papadopoulos at a news conference in the marble-walled Senate chamber in downtown Athens.

The timing of the measures puzzled foreign diplomats in Athens.

Some noted that that they came 24 hours after George Tsistopoulos, an Under Secretary in the foreign office, returned from the United States, where he had talks with Secretary of State William P. Rogers, and passed on to the Greek leaders the strength of feel-

ing in Washington in favor of substantial liberalization in Greece.

It is also possible that the announcement was intended to counteract a statement in Paris Tuesday by former Premier Constantine Caramanlis, who said that the regime was making no progress toward democracy and intended to perpetuate its oppressive rule.

It came a day too late to prevent the approval of a resolution by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg condemning the regime.

The list of taboo newspaper topics included these:

All news and comments "directed against public order, security and national integrity," such as "slogans or statements of outlawed parties or organizations aiming at the violent overthrow of the prevailing lawful order."

Topics of a subversive nature, including incitement to citizens or the armed forces to violate orders and laws, or instigating demonstrations, mass meetings or strikes.

Publications directed against the national economy, including rumors likely to provoke anxiety on the progress of the economy or the stability of the currency, or divulging state economic secrets.

Reports likely to revive political passions and feuds.

The 50-year-old Premier said the new measures were justified by a substantial improvement of the domestic situation since the coup of 29 months ago and by the support his regime enjoyed from the Greek people.

"The patient is no longer in the plaster cast," he said, using his favorite analogy in which Greece is the patient and he the surgeon. "The patient is now in small splints. Let's hope he won't break his limbs again."

Mr. Papadopoulos told reporters he had issued orders, effective at once, abolishing press controls as well as banning arbitrary arrests and trials of civilians by special military courts. These controls had been authorized under the martial law in force since the coup.

"FREEDOM IS INVIOABLE"

"Personal freedom is inviolable," the Premier declared. All arrests and imprisonments from now on will be carried out in accordance with the Constitution—"except in cases involving crimes against public order and security," he said.

EXPLAINS EXCEPTIONS

The jurisdiction of special military courts, set up by the regime to punish security offenses, will now try only cases of treason, espionage and sedition, including charges of disturbing the peace, spreading false information and arousing discord, he said.

Most of the cases tried by special military tribunals since the coup have involved charges of sedition.

Mr. Papadopoulos said the regime was negotiating with the International Red Cross for investigating allegations of torture of Greek political prisoners. He said, "This should put an end to the infuriating campaign of lies about tortures in Greece."

Mr. Papadopoulos, asked to comment on the statement by Mr. Caramanlis, said he was not prepared to discuss the future of Greece with "anyone except the Greek people."

Mr. Caramanlis, a rightist whose attack on the regime drew wide support from most Greek political groups warned the Athens rulers to make way for democracy or face violent overthrow.

Mr. Papadopoulos said that he, as a citizen who had voted in the past so that Mr. Caramanlis could become Premier, could only say: "Pity, I regret."

Commenting on elections, he said: "We, and only we, shall decide when they will be held in Greece."

Asked if, in view of the fact that he had announced the freedom of the press, he

would now allow the Greek papers to publish Mr. Caramanlis' statement, Mr. Papadopoulos replied: "I will not."

BRIG. GEN. FRED W. VETTER, JR.

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it has often been said that "little things mean so much." And I am certain that the commander of the Dover, Del., Air Force Base believes it, for his example at the base illustrates that phrase accurately.

In January of this year, Brig. Gen. Fred W. Vetter, Jr., assumed the top post at one of the Military Airlift Command's largest installations.

Initially, the general expressed a desire to improve and maintain the physical appearance of the property and to strengthen the ties to surrounding communities. This ambitious officer set a personal example for all to follow.

In the quest of better community relations, the air base recently hosted a "Salute to Delaware," a daylong program of aircraft displays, parades, demonstrations, and a performance by the precision flying team, the Thunderbirds. Attendance was in the thousands despite the fact that it was a weekday.

Delawareans are proud of this military base. I am confident that all Delawareans join me in commending and thanking General Vetter for the fine job he is doing.

An Associated Press article written concerning General Vetter, by Edgar Miller, was published recently in the Delaware State News. I feel it is an excellent character sketch and illustrates quite well why those under his command and the citizens of the first State appreciate this fine officer and the job he is doing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Delaware State News of October 17 be printed in the RECORD.

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

GENERAL PUTS SELF ON SPOT AT AIR BASE

(By Edgar Miller)

DOVER.—Brig. Gen. Fred W. Vetter Jr. left himself wide open shortly after taking command of the 436th Military Airlift Wing at Dover Air Force Base last January.

"Put me on the spot," he challenged the base's 25,000 officers, enlisted men and dependents in an unusual—for a general—column in the base's weekly newspaper, The Airlifter.

One of his first takers did just that.

The writer was a sergeant with two children who said that with a third straight hardship assignment staring him in the face—this time in Greenland after previous tours in Korea and Vietnam—his wife was threatening to divorce him if he didn't give up his Air Force career.

Vetter investigated, found the man's complaint was indeed legitimate and replied:

"The assignment of this man was carefully investigated and discussed with higher headquarters. He has been released from the assignment..."

Such swift, decisive action made the column an immediate hit and Vetter now is

deluged with mail, so much that he can only publish a representative selection. But he gives personal attention to all letters and each writer gets a personal reply.

The letters have had results in several areas, from film processing at the post exchange to spraying for Japanese beetles in flower gardens.

While there are a few which are "petty and self-serving," most letters serve a useful purpose, Vetter says.

"It's amazing the number of good and practical suggestions we are picking up," the general says.

Some of the letters really do put him on the spot and "can be utter dynamite" if not handled right, Vetter says.

Of course, Vetter's reaction to a given letter might not always be what the writer had in mind.

Take the case of the three lieutenants who complained that officer of the day duty offered "very little in the way of a sense of job accomplishment" and suggested it be discontinued.

Vetter agreed that junior officers weren't getting enough out of the long, tedious hours of OD duty at night and on weekends so he expanded their chores to include "educational as well as meaningful responsibilities" so they wouldn't be bored any more.

The column has done much to give Vetter a reputation on the base as a man who gets things done—in a hurry.

He has particularly emphasized spit and polish—often to the anguished groans of many airmen—at all levels of base life, from his own office down the base housing area.

As a result, the base has taken on a neat and trim appearance. Housing area roads have been resurfaced and buildings are being painted throughout the base. "The men look smart and one senses a new feeling of urgency and pride," one staff officer, Lt. Col. Maurice G. Steele, said.

Vetter begins his day with a brisk mile run at 6:30 a.m. through the housing area. During the run he takes note of any unkempt lawns or houses. If he spots one he jots down the address and the occupant gets a call from him later. He also calls those who have done a particularly good job of keeping up their quarters.

Vetter's hobby is big game hunting and his office walls are covered with trophies from hunts on several continents. His latest trophy is still being mounted—the 61-inch antlers of a moose shot in Alaska.

A native of Snohomish, Wash., who now calls Houston, Tex., home, Vetter began his career as an aviation cadet in 1942. He was promoted to general in April 1968.

Vetter's lean, 5-foot-11 frame, his dashing salt and pepper mustache and graying temples and his straight military bearing led one newsman to write in a biographical sketch:

"If Hollywood were type-casting for an Air Force wing commander, Fred Vetter Jr. would get the role."

JIM COMSTOCK, WEST VIRGINIA'S AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY, PORTRAYS STATE WITH IMAGINATION IN UNIQUE NEWSPAPER

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia is fortunate to have within its borders a journalist of the talent and capacity of Jim Comstock, whose base of operations is Richwood in the forest lands of my State.

His keen powers of observation and his ability to find new insights in nearly every situation make the West Virginia Hillbilly a most popular and eagerly awaited weekly newspaper. Under the guidance of Comstock, his partner, Bronson McClung, and their erudite master of the print shop, C. Donnee Cook, the Hillbilly has become an institution known across the United States and overseas.

It is more than just a weekly newspaper. It devotes itself primarily to the discussion of life in West Virginia, its strengths, its weaknesses, its heritage, and its future. Hillbilly likewise is ever alert to ways in which West Virginia can be improved.

But it is also a light-hearted publication, filled with humor and Comstock's own, often-irreverent comments on events of the day.

In the course of bringing Hillbilly to its present state of journalistic eminence, Jim Comstock himself has become a sought-after personality who frequently graces speakers' platforms in West Virginia and other States. He reports on his travels and observations weekly in a lengthy column called the Comstock Load.

Elsewhere in the publication there may be discussions of many subjects under intriguing headlines such as these from recent editions of Hillbilly: "West Virginia Cole Slaw Signs As American As Apple Pie," "Memories of a B. & O. Dispatching Man," "A Mighty Mingo Chieftan," "How the Teacher Nipped a Riot," "All You Need Is a Peach Tree Limb To Find Water," "By Rail Up Shaver's Fork River," "Look What a Big Dog Dragged In," "In the Land of Buckwheat Cakes," "Hillbilly Ramblings," "The Man in the Henhouse," "Have Sleeping Bag, Will Travel," and "Old Likker in a New Jug," a regular compilation of quotations and poetry. Hillbilly also features a regular heritage page, a lively exchange of letters from readers and periodic reviews of various industries that contribute to the West Virginia economy. A picture of a pretty West Virginia girl always brightens Hillbilly's pages.

Mr. President, Jim Comstock recently spoke at Salem College, my beloved alma mater, telling of the trials and tribulations of an editor. His appearance was reported in the September issue of the Salem College Bulletin, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR JIM COMSTOCK GIVES ADDRESS AT SALEM COLLEGE

"I founded The West Virginia Hillbilly because I wanted to tell the world that West Virginia is a notch above the other states," Editor Jim Comstock told the Salem College students.

Comstock, West Virginia "ambassador extraordinary," spoke at Salem College and was received by the students with enthusiasm.

He told of his special "ramp edition which caused quite a stink with the subscribers and especially with the Post Office Department." He explained that the stunt drew national attention on the wire services and resulted in The National Geographic doing an article about the paper, ramps and Rich-

wood—the home of the Comstock and McClung publications.

"Every Monday morning I have 16 blank pages in front of me to fill," Comstock said. "To a literate person that paper, when published, has meaning. I ask myself, 'Is there some little thing in it that will lift the world?'"

READERS HAVE POWER

The West Virginia Hillbilly really belongs to the readers, and the readers have the power, he declared. Among the many things which Hillbilly readers have done are—founding a "Past 80 Club," building a hospital in Richwood, sending a boy to Williamsburg, Pa., for rehabilitation, saving the scenic Cass steam railroad—the last of its kind in the country—for a tourist attraction, starting the drive to buy Pearl Buck's birthplace home in Hillsboro for West Virginia.

MELVIN MILLER

Comstock told the story of Hillbilly's collapse a couple of years after its birth and of Melvin Miller who came to Richwood to encourage the two publishers to start again. Miller, who had just graduated from Bethany College, was on his way back when his small sports car failed to make a curve and he was killed.

Inspired by Melvin Miller's faith, Comstock and McClung started the publication again. The first issue of the reborn paper was dedicated to Miller in Comstock's story, "Here, Melvin Miller, Is Your Paper."

"Each week I ask myself, 'Have I done something good? Have I been true to the dreams of a boy who wanted to start a paper?'"

PRESS AGENT FOR STATE

Comstock is one of the state's best press agents. He has publicized its writers, sculptors, painters and musicians; worked to bring in new industries; and plugged its tourist attractions.

In Hillbilly he has satirized West Virginia's politics, described its beauties in glowing words, and kept alive its rich folk heritage.

AUTHORITY ON APPALACHIA

Otto Whittaker, who compiled and edited the recent book, *Best of "Hillbilly,"* says that Comstock probably knows more than any man alive about the yesterdays and todays of Appalachia and how it got that way, and for the past year he has been enlarging this knowledge with a fellowship from the Ford Foundation.

In addition to editing the Newsleader and Hillbilly, Comstock is compiling and editing a 25-volume encyclopedia on West Virginia. "In this encyclopedia we hope to preserve West Virginia's heritage which is rapidly being lost," he said.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNION OF POLES IN AMERICA

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, October 26, 1969, marks the 75th anniversary of the Union of Poles in America. A fraternal service organization, the Union of Poles in America was founded in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1894 and has since provided innumerable benefits to the Polish-Americans of Ohio. But more noteworthy is the great service this organization has provided to our community through its many juvenile and adult social programs. The Union of Poles is headquartered in Cleveland and its national president, Mr. Richard E. Jablonski, also resides in that

city. As a Representative for the city of Cleveland, I commend the Union of Poles for their 75 years of unselfish service and I wish them continuing success for the future.

In saluting this organization, I would like to provide my colleagues with the following historical review of the Union of Poles in America prepared by Mr. Richard E. Jablonski:

The Union of Poles in America, under the protection of our Blessed Mother, came into being as a result of the merging of two Unions, The Polish Roman Catholic Union under the protection of the Immaculate Heart of Mary and The Polish Roman Catholic Union, under the protection of Our Lady of Czestochowa. This merger occurred at the joint convention in Cleveland, Ohio on May 30, 1939.

The Polish Roman Catholic Union, under the protection of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, was organized on July 1, 1894, in Cleveland, Ohio. Its first president was A. Skarupski.

The Polish Roman Catholic Union, under the protection of Our Lady of Czestochowa, was organized on March 11, 1898, in Cleveland, Ohio. Its first president was Francis Szemplachowski.

Both of the unions, after many preliminary discussions, held special conventions during the month of May 1938. Finally it was decided to hold a common convention on May 30, 1939 in Cleveland, for the purpose of finalizing the merger. Its first president was Joseph Missal.

During the 30 years of existence, the Union of Poles has considerably increased its membership and financial resources. The financial resources are now approaching the \$4,000,000 mark. The entire organization stands on a firm financial basis and is one of the leading fraternal organizations in America. From an earned surplus, dividends have been paid to its members every year for the past 25 years.

During World War II, the Korean War and the present War in Vietnam, the Union of Poles has guaranteed the entire payment of life insurance in case of death of an insured member serving in the Armed Forces—not excepting the policy with war reservations.

The Union of Poles is a participating member in the Polish American Congress and for many years has taken an active part in the social, cultural, and economic affairs of the "Polonia."

The Union of Poles in America, a fraternal organization, strongly believes in serving its country; and taking an active part in helping the free world emerge a very great power in the service of mankind, for a better, stronger, and happier society of Free and Independent Nations.

Today, we observe, together with the "Polonia," the Diamond Jubilee, the 75th year of the founding of the Union.

STUDENTS FOR WHAT?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called the attention of the Members to the rampage perpetrated in Chicago on October 9, 10, and 11 by militant members of the SDS.

It is important that people around the country understand the developments in Chicago and therefore I insert into the RECORD a very effective commentary

carried in the Sunday, October 19, Chicago Heights Star, a publication whose staff kept very close to the situation:

STUDENTS FOR WHAT?

By all accounts, militants of the self-styled Students for a Democratic Society alienated or at least embarrassed all but the most knuckle-headed of their admirers during the group's most recent descent upon Chicago. They came to tear the city apart, and they remained to demonstrate how badly decent people would fare if they indeed achieved whatever brand of society they really want.

Emerging as heroes, ironically, were the very Chicago policemen whom the anarchists proposed to discredit. Much has been said and written about the professionalism and restraint which characterized the police work. The praise was deserved. It is reasonable, meanwhile, to pay some attention to the cost of the soft approach in dealing with mad-dog tactics, exemplary and well-reasoned as that course proved to be.

Reports indicate that virtually all injuries of consequence were suffered by policemen—although some members of the liberal establishment might have risked mishap in the rush to back away from identification with the SDS. In any case, it can be assumed that the policemen not only acted in a most temperate manner, but did so at their own considerable peril.

A less serious but nevertheless significant aspect of these confrontations is the question of whether citizens are to be denied the use of their streets and sidewalks if they don't choose to be trapped on the rim or in the midst of a revolution.

But at least when the scum surfaced in Chicago this time, there were no non-militant idealists on the scene to blue the image; the true nature of the demonstrators was laid bare. The next time revolutionaries boast of their intent to bring a major city to its knees, the authorities should again be ready for them. And with real luck, the television cameras will grind as feverishly as they did when it was considered stylish to represent that only policemen break the law.

MORATORIUM DAY

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following statement by a former distinguished Member of the House, Hon. Hamilton Fish, Sr., with reference to the recent moratorium day.

Mr. Fish has been opposing communism for more than 40 years and is a strong supporter of our divine heritage of constitutional and free government. He always has an interesting point of view.

The statement follows:

For a quarter of a century in Congress, I supported every move to promote and maintain peace. I join with all Americans who want an honorable peace and favor an immediate Cease Fire to be followed by peace negotiations.

The police and firemen are the guardians of order and security in New York City. The best way to fight crime would be to take the handcuffs off the police.

God bless the police and firemen for refusing to lower the American Flag in support of the proposed cowardly, dishonorable, and

treasonable total withdrawal from Vietnam; thereby aiding and abetting our Communist enemies. This would make the United States a constant target for ridicule and abuse in both the Communist and the Free Nations, and be a mockery of the heroic sacrifices by our Armed Forces in Vietnam.

SUEZ CANAL CLOSING: EFFECTS ON SHIPPING

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the consequences of major geopolitical significance resulting from the closure of the Suez Canal in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war was the diversion of interoceanic commerce around Southern Africa. Another was the stimulation of the construction of super tankers that can transport oil more economically by this route than by the Suez Canal. This means that this canal has permanently lost a large part of its traffic even if the Suez Canal should be opened.

An informative article on the effect of the closure of the Suez Canal on South Africa follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Oct. 19, 1969]

SUEZ CLOSING IS A BOON FOR SOUTH AFRICA

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—October 18.—Closing of the Suez canal following the six day Israeli-Arab war in 1967 has been a boon to South Africa's harbors.

Since 1967 ships have sailed around the Cape of Good Hope into South African ports at a rate that has reached about 1,000 a month, with resulting far-reaching economic and strategic implications for this country.

The number of ships rounding the cape and calling at one of the country's major ports—Durban, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and East London—has nearly doubled since June, 1967.

SOUTH AFRICA CONFIDENT

And while some ship owners may still be looking toward the Suez canal and wondering about the possibility of it reopening, shipping authorities in South Africa are confident the Suez will never again become one of the world's major waterways.

Many shipping people agree that Suez has seen its best days. For as ships grow in size, they say, the canal will become too small. It also is a fact that altho the canal has been closed for more than two years, there has been remarkably little disruption of world trade.

Figures for immediately before and after the closing of the Suez canal show a phenomenal jump in the number of ships rounding the cape and the amount of tonnage handled. In the year June, 1966, to June, 1967, 7,370 ships rounded the cape, and the gross tonnage handled at Cape Town harbor was 46,487,000. Then from June 1967, to June, 1968, the number of ships rose to 12,268, and cargo handled at Cape Town harbor was 95,337,000 tons.

SEE NO SLACK

The latest figures available for the year 1968-69 indicate there will be no slack in the activity that has gripped South African ports—especially Durban and Cape Town, the two biggest. At the end of April this year 13,890 ships already had used the cape sea route.

According to one shipping source, the revenue to South Africa from ships entering its harbors can be calculated on an average of

between \$560 to \$700 per ship. Since June, 1967, 3,000 diverted ships called at Cape Town and 4,000 at Durban Harbor. This gives an estimated extra revenue of 4.5 million dollars in berthing fees alone to which must be added income from food and provisions and other trade.

STOP OUTSIDE HARBOR

According to a spokesman for Cape Town's office of the port captain, several thousand other ships stopped outside harbor limits for stores and mail to be taken to them by launch and helicopter, thus escaping harbor charges.

The decision taken in March, 1968, by the major oil companies never again to rely heavily on the Suez canal for transporting oil has had a major impact on South Africa. Since they were forced to use the cape route, oil companies have found that oil can be transported via the cape in super tankers at a saving of up to 20 cents a barrel.

Shipyards already have orders for about 200 new tankers of which more than half are more than 200,000 tons and the rest more than 100,000 tons. None of these tankers will be able to get thru the Suez canal.

TOURIST BOOM

Apart from these considerations the closing of Suez also has resulted in a South African tourist boom. It is estimated that about 170,000 tourists have passed thru either Durban or Cape Town from rerouted liners on their way to the far east or Australia. It is estimated further that they have spent in the vicinity of 1 million dollars on sightseeing and shopping excursions.

Lord Chalfont, Britain's minister of state, reported that the number of British registered ships passing around the Cape of Good Hope had more than tripled since the closing of the Suez canal.

Russia's use of the route also has risen dramatically. According to the Cape Town port captain more than one-third of the 13,980 vessels that passed during the year ending April, 1969, were from communist countries, and of the 5,500 communist ships, nearly 3,900 were Russian.

"TURNING THE CORNER"—THE WRONG CORNER

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, an optimistic administration spokesman has cited as "encouraging" the most recently reported rise in the Consumer Price Index the Washington Post reported this morning. Another Presidential spokesman was quoted as saying September's rise means we are "turning the corner."

Is it possible that there is some statistic these fellows are looking at that the rest of us have not been made privy to? I am under the distinct impression that this morning's paper reported a 0.5-percent increase in the Consumer Price Index. If this half percent rise is "encouraging" and "turning the corner" then I suggest we have turned the wrong corner, and are encouraging the wrong policy.

It seems to me one can seriously question the credibility of a "spokesman" who is "encouraged" by a half percent rise in the Consumer Price Index. According to the Washington Post:

The bellwether industrial commodities component, considered by some analysts as the best measure of inflation, jumped 0.4 percent. It matched the August increase, which had been the largest since March.

The September rate gives no indication that there is any slowdown in the record 4.5 percent rate of increase in the Consumer Price Index for 1969. The rate for this year is up 1.1 percent from 1968, and the "encouraging" September figure suggests no decrease in this record annual rate.

I have no doubt that few if any Americans will feel "encouraged" when they read the Associated Press report that—

Clothing prices rose at about double the usual increase for September . . . Food prices failed to show their usual decline for the month, (and) housing costs continued to rise and there were increases for all kinds of consumer services.

Who is being kidded? Certainly not the public, and hopefully not the Congress. Is it not time the administration dealt candidly with this issue, instead of feeding us this meaningless pabulum? We do not need self-serving statements so obviously out of kilter with the real circumstances. What we do need is some honest analysis and some responsible discussion about solutions.

GREAT HARDSHIP TO OUR FARMERS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen whose districts include large rural areas as mine does are greatly concerned about the affects inflationary trends are having on farmers. I believe all the Members will share our concern as they read the following speech being delivered today by Hon. W. R. POAGE which clearly points out the problems causing great hardship to our farmers:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN W. R. POAGE AT FARMERS UNION APPRECIATION DINNER, GATESVILLE, TEX., OCT. 23, 1969

Mr. Chairman: It is always a pleasure to meet with my friends. It is especially a pleasure to meet with them when they have gathered to do me honor. I recognize that I am not worthy of the kind of exaggerations which have been indulged but I do appreciate the spirit of friendship which has prompted my friends of Coryell County to arrange this dinner, and I especially appreciate the fact that my friends in the Farmers Union have made this dinner possible.

I feel a special responsibility for the welfare of agriculture, just as does the Farmers Union, and I realize that the problems of agriculture are probably the most serious and the least understood of the problems of any substantial segment of our economy.

Like all other Americans, farmers are vitally affected by the inroads of inflation. The first evidences of inflation are always welcomed by the overwhelming majority of our people because cheaper money makes it possible for them to pay their debts more easily, and higher wages put more money in circulation and for a time provide a higher standard of living. People begin to feel a sense of prosperity, but as inflation progresses costs soon catch up with increased income and there

are demands for a new round of wage increases. Then there is a new round of higher prices, a substantial reduction in the buying power of our money, and shortly a lowering of our living standards.

Our economy in general is, I believe, just now entering this stage of the inflationary spiral. The farmers entered it some time ago. Your costs have gone up far faster than your income, and this is really the thing which hurts in connection with inflation. Most everyone knows that the cost of things farmers buy, like the cost of things city people buy, has increased rapidly. A tractor which cost \$2000 twenty years ago costs about \$8000 today. Barbed wire which sold for eight dollars a roll twenty years ago now costs around twelve dollars a roll.

The public generally concedes that the cost of farming has increased but they say, "So have our costs." The thing the public does not generally recognize is that the price of the farmers' products have not increased. Wages have gone up and again the public says, "The farmer is a wage earner as well as an investor so he has benefited." They do not realize that the farmer receives practically nothing in payment as wages from his farming operations. True, farmers devote their time, but their time must be paid for out of the proceeds of what they produce and what they produce is today very often bringing less per unit than it brought twenty years ago.

For instance, corn sells for a little more than a dollar a bushel. A little over twenty years ago it sold for \$2.00 a bushel. Wheat, which with the government payments, averages out at about \$1.50 a bushel was bringing over \$2.00 a bushel twenty years ago. Middling inch cotton, which very few of us were able to raise this year is worth, with all the government payments, around 29 cents. Twenty years ago, it brought nearly 33 cents in the open market, without payments.

There has been an especially loud complaint about the price of beef. It is true that round steak went up to \$1.60 a pound in Washington a short time ago, but on the same day choice steers were bringing just over 30 cents a pound in Omaha. That was approximately 15% less than they brought twenty years before.

Certainly it was not the price cattlemen were receiving which forced the price of beef to its present levels, but even with all of the costs which have been added after the food leaves the farm, the American housewife is still buying the greatest bargain available in any country at any time in history. In the Far East many people spend two-thirds to three-fourths of all they earn throughout their lives just to secure a very meager diet. The people of the Soviet Union today spend nearly one-half of their disposable income on food. In Western Europe the figures are from 25 to 30%. In the United States we enjoy a far more varied diet and actually buy a tremendous amount of "Built-in maid service" at the grocery store but last year our people spent only 17.2% of their disposable income in the grocery store, and a substantial portion of these expenditures were for non-food items, and of the food the farmer was paid only about one-third of the retail price. By any standard, food in America is one of the world's greatest bargains.

Let us keep this one point in mind—the American people are not being overcharged for food and fiber. On the contrary, they are receiving more for their dollar—that is, in buying food and fiber they are getting more of somebody else's labor and investment—for fewer dollars than they are in almost any other segment of our economy.

Just who in America, other than the farmer, is today taking less for what he produces than he got twenty years ago? Oh, I know that there are those who would immediately point out that the efficiency of production has increased on our farms, and this is cer-

tainly true, but the efficiency of production has increased in the General Motors plant, the Bell Telephone Company, United Airlines, and all of the rest of our great corporations, but their unit prices are all up. The farmer's is down.

This is the great difference which I think cries out for rectification, but I don't want to take your time simply to discuss the inequities of our agricultural price system. You are familiar with them just as well as I am. We need not tell ourselves of our troubles, although we do need to tell this story to city people. I think the American people are basically fair when they understand the facts, and I have been trying to give them the facts, but it is extremely difficult to get a city audience to listen to the facts.

What you want to know and what I need to know is how can we change this situation. How can we improve farm income? When we ask these questions we involve ourselves in far more complications than most of us realize. It is not enough to know the simple laws of economics. Most of us know that if we reduce the supply of goods, other things remaining equal, prices will tend to go up. It is, of course, on this fundamental truth that most of our farm programs are based, whether they be land retirement programs, grain storage programs, cotton allotment programs, or any other variation of supply control.

But we are faced with all kinds of related influences and activities. A massive land retirement program certainly involves the destruction of community life across broad areas, and the bankruptcy of many small-town businesses. An arbitrary, mandatory reduction of any kind involves the use of governmental controls which most of us resent. The use of the present "carrot" type program of inducements, as contrasted with the "stick" of compulsory controls, requires the cooperation of large land holders to be effective, and this in turn opens the door for what seems to me to be some of the most effective demagoguery, such as we have seen in connection with the advocacy of limitation of agricultural payments. Demagogues or not, these advocates of limitations have enough votes that we must devise a program which will not involve such large payments—and most important of all, no farm program deserves to succeed which denies the American people of all of the food and fiber they need at reasonable prices. Now, I said "reasonable" prices, and that is what I mean. I mean prices which will enable the producer to enjoy the same kind of living standards in return for the same contributions of labor and capital which are enjoyed by other segments of our economy.

Parity is not an exact measure of such standards, but it is probably the best we have. I would therefore suggest that while we should seek to bring the price of farm products up to parity, we should also seek just as diligently to prevent the development of a price level in excess of parity. That is actually what our farm programs throughout the years have sought to achieve. They have not always achieved their objectives, but they have done much toward maintaining a higher standard of living on our farms and ranches.

I know that it is considered "smart" in some circles to say that if we had no farm programs we would all be better off. Well, it isn't but 250 miles from here to the Mexican Border. I suggest that any farmer in Coryell County who feels that he can do better without any farm programs ought to move across the river. He won't have any farm programs there, but he won't get as much for his cotton, his cattle, or his wool.

Then there is another group who like to say, "Just Look—cotton, wheat and feed grains are the major crops with farm programs and they are in far worse shape than

some of the commodities without any programs; therefore, farm programs must destroy the value of our commodities." My wife was recently in Scott & White Hospital at Temple. There were hundreds of other people there. Most of them were in real bad shape but they were not in bad shape because they had gone to the hospital. They had gone to the hospital because they were sick. So it is with our crops. The crops which are in trouble are the ones which need and are getting the programs. Those of us who are well do not need hospitalization and those farm products which are in sound balance do not need farm programs.

For this reason, farm programs do not mean nearly as much in Coryell County as they do in some other parts of the country, but farm programs put enough money into this county during the past bad years to not only help a great many of our farmers but also to mean the difference between profit and loss to a great many merchants, businessmen, bankers and doctors. You would find it much harder to keep the City of Gatesville solvent if we had no farm program.

The existing farm program has many faults and shortcomings but on the whole it is probably the best we have yet devised. Anyway, I think it would be foolish to give it up until we get something better. I had hoped that we could maintain this program, and of course it was my bill of last year which gives us the program for next year, but with the end of the next crop year we will have practically no farm program unless we are able to pass a new bill. Our Committee has been trying for many months to reach some consensus on legislation which can be passed, because it is not sufficient to know what we should have. It is just as important to know what we can have—and I recognize that we cannot pass a bill through the Congress which does not have considerable support from both Republican and Democratic members. We can't pass a bill which is simply a Committee bill. We can't pass, simply a Farm Bureau bill, or even a coalition bill. We can't pass a bill which is simply a Departmental bill. But our Committee must work with all the farm organizations and with Secretary Hardin and the Department of Agriculture.

I have felt that the Secretary was a reasonable man, but he doesn't feel the urgency for new legislation which I think exists. I know that unless we have made considerable progress before the end of this year that our farm program will probably still be before the Congress as the end of the next session draws to a close. This is not the way to get good legislation, and it is no way to give farmers the opportunity to use good farming practices. I had hoped, and I still hope, that we will be able to get a bill through the Committee and to the Floor of the House before adjournment of Congress this fall—but time is running out and it was just last Monday night that the Secretary came up with the first specific language he has indicated he would accept, and this related only to feed grain. It was a start and I am glad we have made this start.

Our Committee has been meeting with the Secretary and his staff every Monday night in informal discussions which I think have been most helpful but we have a long way to go. The Secretary has indicated a large degree of flexibility on his part, and I think this is helpful. While we need suggestions of specific language, at the same time we need a willingness on the part of the Secretary, on the part of the farm organizations and Committee members to accept many details which are not a part of their own plans or programs. I have been pleased that the Farmers Union and most of the other major farm and commodity organizations have been able to get together on specific legislation. It is helpful that we can have this degree of unity.

On the other hand, I hope that this will not result in fixing their ideas in cement.

Neither the so-called Coalition Bill, the Poage Bill, the Farm Bureau Bill, or the Departmental Bill is going to be passed as it is introduced. There are going to be many modifications and once those of us who are especially interested in agriculture have come together in support of a program, we must still recognize that we must have the cooperation of the consumers. We are all consumers but about 90% of our people are consumers without any personal interest in production, and altogether too many of those people feel that their interests and those of agricultural producers are in conflict. I think this is a mistaken viewpoint. I think it is based upon a failure to understand the fundamental elements of agricultural production but people do not act upon the facts. They act upon what they believe the facts to be.

As I have pointed out, the American people are buying a bargain in food. The truth is they are getting this bargain because of the tremendous technological advances made by American agriculture. Our schools, our scientists, our extension service and our agribusiness firms have all teamed up to make modern technology available to our farmers, but it doesn't come free. Probably every farmer in this audience knows how to do a better job of farming than he has been doing, but in very few cases could he afford to do any better than he has done. Most of you know you could grow more if you applied more fertilizer, if you irrigated, if you used better machinery, etc., but in most cases you feel that it might not pay to make the expenditures necessary to get the increased production.

If the consuming public is unwilling to pay a fair price for agricultural products the volume of those products will in the long run decline—not because of the perversity of our farmers, but because they just wouldn't have the ability to use the expensive technology necessary to produce abundantly. If we are so foolish to restrict the ability of our farmers to produce cheaply and efficiently because of an inadequate income, we must be prepared to pay substantially higher prices for everything we eat and wear, and that within a matter of a relatively few years.

Admittedly, a policy of low farm prices and no production controls could bring about increased production for one, two or three years. Farmers, like everyone else, seeing their unit prices going down would seek to maintain their living standards by increasing the number of units they could offer for sale. As long as they had any reserves or could get any credit they could do this, but as existing machinery wore out and farm credit was restricted, as a lower price level would automatically restrict it, farmers would more frequently find it impossible to use the techniques which our modern science and research have made available and production would fall.

A failure to understand this relationship between cost of production and volume of production has, I think, been the basic error in the philosophy of so many who have in recent years been bemoaning the fact that the world could not feed itself. I want to make a categorical statement that the world can feed its present population with a very good diet but to do so farmers the world over are going to have to have a return which will allow them to share with other producers on a more comparable basis than they have done in recent years.

If they can't get such a share, obviously many more of our American farmers will be forced to leave the farm. Production will fall into fewer hands, and right here I want to make it clear that I am talking about what will happen—not what I would like to see happen. When we get to the point where we have no more agricultural producers than we have producers of gasoline, the price of agricultural products will respond as does the price of gasoline to the needs and wishes of

those who control the production. I don't want to see this happen, I think it would be a tragedy for all America—just as much a tragedy for urban America as for rural America.

A HELPING HAND PAYS IN THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the United States extended a helping hand to the Republic of China after its government was forced off the Chinese mainland by Communist forces 20 years ago. The assistance paid off. In a few short years the Republic of China became self-sustaining and now it is extending help to other nations.

In 1960, a year in which no less than 17 African countries achieved independence, the Government of the Republic of China decided to strengthen its friendly relations with these newly independent countries. Considering the similarities in climatic conditions and the stage of economic development between Taiwan and most of the African countries, the Chinese Government felt that the valuable experience China had acquired in Taiwan in her rapid agricultural development might be of use to the African people.

Accordingly, a technical cooperation program for Africa in the field of agriculture was conceived. In November of 1961 the Chinese Government sent to Liberia its first farming demonstration team following the signing of a technical cooperative agreement between the two countries. Since then additional agricultural teams have been dispatched to all the newly independent African nations.

Responsible personnel of the cooperating countries have visited Taiwan to observe its agricultural development and the methods employed to increase farm production. Fellowships have been granted to technicians of friendly countries to attend seminars or to receive on-the-job training in Taiwan. Following the dispatch of agricultural specialists on survey teams to determine the needs of the countries concerned, farming demonstration missions and agricultural technical missions were sent to the cooperating countries. Assistance has been given in helping to set a general pattern for the development of a sound rural economy so that the host country can carry on future development on its own.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing effort by the Republic of China deserves high praise. In these African countries the key to the improvement of the economy and to raising the standard of living of the people lies in increased agricultural production. It is gratifying to know that the Republic of China for the last decade has thrown its energies and knowledge into extending precisely the kind of assistance the African peoples most need. We should cooperate with them in this endeavor and in everything which strengthens our friendship and solidarity.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., in saluting the business and professional women of America during National Business Women's Week, October 19-25.

The club has 180,000 members in the 50 States and in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. They comprise not only a vital and constructive force in the business and professional community but in the areas of civic responsibility and service as well. From the many letters I receive from club members, I know they take a deep interest in legislation and are extremely well informed.

Over the last half century, they have played a most important role in American public life.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the legislative platform of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs:

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY
THE NATIONAL CONVENTION JULY 20-24,
1969, ST. LOUIS, MO.

ACTION ITEMS

Item 1. *Constitutional Amendment.* Support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

Item 2. Actively work for pending legislation providing for: (a) a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; (b) increased personal exemption and credit for dependents under the Internal Revenue Code; and (c) a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

Item 3. Propose and support legislation to provide: (a) uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, equal employment opportunity, including retirement for age; (b) equal treatment for working men and women in the area of survivor and retirement benefits; and (c) increased child care deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

Item 4. Propose and support state legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

Item 5. Propose and support legislation to bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

POLICY ITEM

Support measures within the framework of the Constitution of the United States that promote peace and strengthen national security and make more effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant, without relinquishment of our basic freedoms.

Special note is called to the United Nations Convention pending before the United States Senate on the political rights of women and to the long-standing support for ratification of this convention by the Federation.

PROCEDURE

State federations and clubs are urged to review the National Legislative Platform as published in *National Business Woman*.

Who May Submit Proposed Changes: National Legislation Committee, Executive Committee, National Board of Directors, State Federations. Clubs may also submit suggestions for changes in the National Legislative Platform, but such proposals must be submitted through their state federations for review and possible recommendation.

Procedure For Submitting Proposed Changes:

State federations shall submit proposed changes to the National Executive Offices within ten days after adjournment of their state conventions. Such proposals shall be signed by the state president and forwarded by certified mail with return receipt requested.

The Executive Committee, National Board of Directors and the National Legislation Committee shall submit proposed changes, properly signed, to the National Executive Offices at least 30 days prior to the date the National Legislation Committee convenes, except in cases of emergency. If such proposals are mailed, they shall be forwarded by certified mail with return receipt requested.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, October 19 through 25 is National Business Women's Week. Thousands of America's business women are members of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, and one of the most important interests that the federation's members share is legislation. I know this because some of my constituents are members of the Baltimore and Towson Clubs of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women.

At the 50th anniversary convention, the federation adopted a national legislative platform—which I have long supported—calling for action on legislation concerning women's rights. One item of legislation concerning women's rights includes a proposed constitutional amendment providing that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex." A second item calls for broader head-of-household benefits under the Internal Revenue Code which the House of Representatives provided in the Tax Reform Act of 1969. A third item calls for equal treatment for working women and men in retirement and survivor benefits. In this area, I have sponsored legislation that would permit working couples to pool their Social Security credits and thus draw higher benefits. My bill would also permit widows with minor children to earn income without reducing their benefits.

No Congressman who manages to keep his job underestimates the power of a woman. During National Business Women's Week, I commend the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs on their continuing interest in legislation that is important to their members and to all other women in the United States.

PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL—A THREAT TO OUR YOUTH

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Mario A. Procaccino, the distinguished comptroller of the city of New York, testified before the House Postal Operations Subcommittee yesterday morning.

His remarks go to the substance of the pornographic and salacious material that plague our entire society, but particularly are a threat to our Nation's youth.

I insert in the RECORD today his testimony before the committee:

TESTIMONY FROM TRANSCRIPT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE HEARING ON PORNOGRAPHY, OCTOBER 22, 1969

Mr. NIX. Our next witness is the Honorable Mario A. Procaccino, distinguished Comptroller of the City of New York and the gentleman from Montana, our distinguished colleague on this committee, Mr. Olsen, will present Mr. Procaccino.

Mr. OLSEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure to present to the Committee the person, a very distinguished person, the Comptroller of New York City, Mario Procaccino. I know that he has long been strong in support of law and order and it is in keeping with his career that he would come here and support legislation that would protect people against the pandering of smut through the mails.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to present Mr. Mario Procaccino.

REMARKS BY NEW YORK CITY COMPTROLLER MARIO A. PROCACCINO AT HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL OPERATIONS AT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 22, 1969

At the outset, let me thank you Mr. Chairman (Robert Nix) and the members of your Committee for giving me this chance to be here today. I want to congratulate the Committee on what it is doing to combat one of the most growing evils of our times, the peddling of smut through the mails.

I came to Washington from New York because I am deeply troubled over what is happening. I speak not only as a parent concerned for his own family, as a citizen concerned for his neighbors, but as an American concerned for the future of our country.

There is no question that the way to destroy our nation is to corrupt its youth, to capture the minds of the young, to enslave them to the evils of perversion. The easiest way to prey upon the unsuspecting and the innocent is through the mails.

The situation has become so bad that I have been stopped by people in the streets begging me to do something to curb this vicious assault upon the senses of their growing children. Pornography has become a mailbox menace.

This crime against society doesn't stop with youth. It promotes perversion in all people at all ages. It seeps poison into the minds of rich and poor. It reaches into all levels of society and destroys not only the morals but the principles of every person it touches.

Unbridled pornography is a disease that can ravage a nation, rob it of its strength, dissipate its talents, and lay waste its national heritage. History, itself, proves that either we must destroy it or it will destroy us.

There has been testimony of national im-

portance to prove that American homes are being bombarded with the largest volume of sex oriented mail in history.

This mail is unsolicited, unwanted and deeply offensive to those who receive it.

There is no question that the law of our states and our nation must be strengthened to prevent this disease from spreading its infectious poison any further. Steps must be taken and ways must be found to deal with the people who make money out of pornography.

One of the things that moved me to take action myself against this menace was a note from a woman who refused to identify herself but just signed her plea "Desperate Mother."

She sent me a copy of a pornographic publication her 13 year old son had received through the mail illustrated with nude men and women in various poses called "Love's Picture Book."

Under it was the title—Love Lust and Pleasure. What startled me most was the fact that this unsolicited publication had come through the mail right out of my own city, the City of New York.

I am submitting this advertisement to this Committee for examination.

One may argue all he wishes about the right of free speech and the liberty of human expression but there are other rights involved. For example, the right of a person not to have his privacy invaded, the right of a parent to shield his child from what he may consider harmful, the right of a community to maintain high moral standards.

Sending obscene and lewd material through the mail benefits no one but the peddlers of smut. No one becomes richer except hoodlums and racketeers.

It is bad enough to see the newsstands cluttered with filth and perversion, on a scale never before known. It is difficult enough to find a theatre where one can take his child to see a good family movie.

However, in dealing with mail we have an even more serious problem because the mails reach everybody. It goes into every street, and every highway, and to every city, every region, every state.

I know the problem of control is difficult. I know there will be opposition to those of us who wish to stop this menace. We must be mindful of our constitutional guarantees, we must also respect our obligations to our families and the necessity of protecting our communities.

In the general distribution of smut literature this Committee will come up with the kind of meaningful legislation that will stop the mails from being used to distribute this smut.

The bill pending before your Committee H.R. 10867 represents a new legislative weapon to be used in attacking this issue. I support the passage of this bill vigorously.

In the general distribution of smut literature our powers of control have become weak because the courts have had great difficulty in wrestling with this problem.

The mail, however, offers us the one field in which we can fight for regulation and protection to some extent. The mail which is under Federal control is the one area which we can take a giant step to combat pornography.

The law must be strengthened to stop promotion of the kind of advertising that goes through the mails, that reaches not only into the home, but into colleges, seminaries, churches, and even prisons. The peddlers and dealers of smut must be dealt with harshly and the punishment made severe enough to discourage those who would make a business of it.

Once the profit is taken out of smut, the evil of pornography will die or destroy itself.

I think the job of this Committee is not merely to find ways and means of combatting pornography in itself, but to help educate

the public, the parent as well as the children and the need to maintain a vigorous and healthy society, and the need to conduct a higher state of well being.

I thank you Mr. Chairman and the members of your Committee for giving me this opportunity to express my views.

I think it is an obligation of every Mayor to do what he can in his own City to fight smut and thus help the Congress in this area.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Proccacino, let me say to you I think it is most encouraging to this Committee that because of your deep concern over the pernicious evil that we have under discussion that you come here at a time that I consider you are at your busiest period in life to give us the benefit of your views and give the American people the benefit of your deep concern.

And I particularly wish to express my deep appreciation for the fact that you have come.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to apologize for being late, but as you know, Mr. Mayor, that we have many duties that we have to perform before we have a meeting, and I just want to join my friend from Pennsylvania who has been in the forefront as the chairman of this subcommittee, and the other members of this committee, leading the attack against smut that is being carried on in our mails today.

Of course, we had the privilege to be in New York City a few years ago when we were with quite a few members of a committee of citizens dedicated to removing smut from the mails and I just want to say that I am very happy that you have endorsed the bill before us and I am sure the testimony you have given us will give us a guiding light in a true way of dedicating ourselves to removal of smut from the mails.

I want to thank you and wish you every luck on November fourth.

Mr. PROCACCINO. I feel my trip has been worthwhile Mr. Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen, very much.

Mr. OLSEN. I want to join both of these gentlemen in commending Mr. Proccacino on his taking time from a very, very busy time. It demonstrates a genuine dedication to his point of view that he would come down here and take his whole day out of his campaign and I congratulate the gentleman. I sincerely hope that your message gets to the people of New York City, in this field and in all other fields, that they have the wisdom to elect a fine, leading Democrat to be Mayor of the City of New York. Thank you very much.

Mr. PROCACCINO. Thank you very much. Gentlemen, I didn't expect this. Thank you very much.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take note of the fact that the period of October 19 through 25 is National Business Women's Week. This event is being marked by the more than 3,800 Business and Professional Women's Clubs and their 180,000 members located in every State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. During this special week the clubs will focus on the role of women in today's world by means of congresses of career women leaders.

The role of women in business and in the professions has grown tremendously in this century to the lasting benefit of every area in which women have become involved. In spite of the progress which has been made in eliminating the discrimination which has hindered their full participation in the past, much work remains to be done toward guaranteeing the equality of rights for women.

The Business and Professional Women's Clubs have made a most valuable contribution by building an active and informed electorate on the part of their members. Through these efforts we may look forward to an increasing participation of women in the political life of our Nation.

On the occasion of National Business Women's Week, I am glad to stress the role of women in the economic, political, and professional vitality of the United States. In addition, I commend to my colleagues the legislative platform of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs which contains many constructive recommendations worthy of our further consideration.

QUINCY WATER-INTAKE FACILITY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, for over half a century the community of Quincy has gotten its water supply from the Mississippi River, which flows along the western border of the State of Illinois. Periodically, it has been necessary for the city to install new water-intake pipes at great expense and to repair and maintain existing ones, as the river has changed its course and as silt has covered up the pipes. Sometimes it was the meandering river which caused the problem. At other times it was due to relocation of the navigation channel by the Army Corps of Engineers, which was carried out as an aid to boats using the river.

From the turn of the century to 1959, the city was able to keep the water intakes functioning satisfactorily, but in that year the navigation channel was relocated and once again siltation began to cover up the last remaining intake pipe. The Corps of Engineers was responsible for relocating the channel, and one would think that therefore the Corps would also be responsible for the consequent siltation problem.

The citizens of Quincy cannot afford further delay. They must be able to plan for a new water intake facility, and they must begin that planning now. To wait any longer may bring on a severe and ironic water shortage in a city which is situated next to one of the largest rivers in the world. Therefore, I am today introducing special legislation which would authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to construct a new water-intake facility for Quincy residents.

SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today an omnibus social security bill which tries to take proper measure of the enormous role this program plays in our society and which tries, correspondingly, to correct the many deficiencies in social security today.

I have tried frankly to incorporate in my bill every worthwhile improvement which has been suggested since Congress last amended the Social Security Act nearly 2 years ago.

Our goal today should be, as it was in 1935 when Congress created the social security system, to secure social justice for the aged, the handicapped, and the poor.

Today 25 millions of Americans depend on social security for their existence. As our concepts of social and economic justice improve, we should add many more millions under this program.

Today one out of every eight Americans—the elderly, the poor, and the mentally and physically disabled—count on their monthly social security check for the essentials of a decent life.

It is true that two-thirds of all social security beneficiaries are able to maintain a level of living somewhat above the minimum poverty line. But it is also true that 8 million social security beneficiaries still live in poverty, and many millions more are discovering that despite the failure of Government criteria to classify them as poor, they are in reality, living in poverty.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

It is true that we now have medicare and medicaid. But it is also true that medicare and medicaid met only 70 percent of all health care expenditures of the aged in fiscal 1968; and the amount paid privately by the aged remains higher per capita than for the nonaged.

It is true that the average social security benefit for retired workers has been increased to \$98 a month; for aged couples to \$166; for aged widows to \$86; and for disabled workers to \$122. But it is also true that many people still get lower amounts, and about 2.8 million beneficiaries get the minimum benefit—a meager \$55 for single persons, and \$82.50 for couples. And it is also true that nearly 30 percent of the 25.9 million persons counted as poor in 1967 lived in households headed by an aged or disabled person.

In short, the progress we have made in recent years toward helping the aged, women who must support families, the disabled, and others who need governmental help to live at a minimal standard of living—shrinks under close inspection. It has been paper progress, harshly undermined by reality. Our expenditures for social security compare unfavorably with that of Western European countries.

An efficient, up-to-date, and compassionate social security system is needed

to protect and improve the quality of human values for important segments of our population.

The legislation I am proposing today embodies the basic steps we must take toward this goal. Below are the highlights of my bill:

GENERAL BENEFIT INCREASE

I propose a 35-percent increase in retirement benefits with average monthly benefits of \$133 for individuals, and \$220 for couples, and minimum benefits of \$100 and \$150 respectively. Together with my plan for automatic cost of living increases to eliminate the effects of inflation, I could foresee a gradual total increase in monthly benefits amounting to 50 percent over the next few years. The key point is that the upward adjustment on monthly payments would be dependent on the general economic picture, and a tool to insure such flexibility would be built into the legislation.

Increasing the monthly benefits under social security is the heart of my bill. An aged couple or person living alone must no longer be asked to live on less than half the money available to a working couple or single person. We must reverse the shrinkage of social security benefits which met half of a couple average retirement budget in 1950 but which today meets less than one-third.

OLD AGE BENEFITS

My bill will allow anyone to retire at age 60 with full benefits. This proposed legislation will also restore to full benefits those who are already retired on early and reduced annuities. In addition, a woman with 120 quarters of work credit would be able to retire at age 55.

RETIREMENT TEST

My bill increases the ceiling on earned income for persons over 65—thus a person could receive social security benefits even if he earned \$3,600 a year, and if he earned more, would have his benefits reduced only \$1 for each \$2 above \$3,600.

DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

It liberalizes the definition of disability, eliminates unrealistically long time periods for disability insurance to become operative and in other important ways broadens the coverage for the blind and disabled.

MEDICARE

Medicare benefits will be extended and retained under my bill. The elderly spend three times as much on health care and service as other age groups—the greatest amount going to longterm care in hospitals or nursing homes, and out-of-hospital drugs. My bill reduces the age requirement for beneficiaries under medicare and removes the present limits on the number of days for which benefits may be paid for posthospital extended care services; for \$1 per month, beneficiaries will be reimbursed for 80 percent of the cost of prescription drugs. Medicare coverage will be extended to Federal employees.

FINANCING

My bill would provide for Federal contributions from the general revenue to supplement the amounts now drawn from the funds earmarked for social security payments. The fact is that reasonable

comfort cannot be provided to beneficiaries without this Federal participation.

OTHER FEATURES

There are a number of other features of my bill which have a significant impact on those affected. For example, full benefits would be provided to disabled widows and widowers regardless of age and to widows and dependent widowers at age 50. Parents of recipients and otherwise eligible widows who remarry would be eligible for benefits. Men and women at age 60 would be eligible for full benefits; women with 120 quarters of coverage could qualify for benefits at age 55. Single persons who support brothers and sisters, and unremarried widows and widowers, would have the same benefits rights as married persons. When a husband and wife both work, their earnings would be pooled to compute their benefits. States would be permitted, under Federal-State agreements, to provide coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees not covered by the insurance system established under the Social Security Act.

The changes in the social security system which I propose in my bill may sound generous, but actually make possible only a modest lifestyle for the elderly. The crucial point is that this legislation would reverse a disturbing trend; three out of 10 people 65 and older were living in poverty in 1966—and an additional one-tenth of the elderly in this country were on the brink of poverty. Many of these aged people did not become poor until they became old.

My bill will not eradicate poverty. But it will provide the retired, the widowed, the orphan, the disabled, the temporarily unemployed, with income sufficient to insure an adequate level of living. And that, to 25 million Americans may bring some comfort.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues in saluting the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and its 180,000 members as they observe National Business Women's Week.

Once again, this occasion gives us the opportunity to pay tribute to the millions of able and dedicated women who are making outstanding contributions in every segment of business and professional life in our Nation. Largely through their own determined efforts, American women have proved that ability and achievement need not be limited by sex. In recent years the doors of every profession have been opened to them, and they have been able to exercise their talents and capabilities to the maximum.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has

played a large part during the 50 years of its existence in raising the status of American women. It has sought to elevate the standards of women in business and professional fields, and has inspired many young women to leadership and outstanding community service.

I am proud to applaud the efforts of this fine organization as we celebrate National Business Women's Week.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I sent the residents of Michigan's Third Congressional District a questionnaire designed to elicit their opinion regarding the pressing problems confronting them and their Representative in Washington. I was most pleased to receive over 13,000 responses, many of which contained additional helpful comments. It is interesting to note that approximately 70 percent of the questionnaires returned favored direct election of the President.

I am reporting the results of my poll in my newsletter to constituents and thought other Members might be interested. I therefore am inserting at this point in the RECORD, my "Washington Report" and the results of my questionnaire stated in percentages:

WASHINGTON REPORT

DEAR FRIENDS: The 91st Congress is now a little over eight months old. Some political analysts are saying that, in that time, it has shown little sign of life. In my judgment their diagnosis is less than accurate. The first months following the organization of any new Congress are traditionally devoted to study, drafting of legislation, and hearings on pending bills. In turn, the speed with which legislative proposals are reported out of Committee and brought to a vote in the House depends upon the coordinated impetus supplied by the President and Committee Chairmen. When these latter forces are fellow partisans, the impediments to prompt action are easily brushed aside—when the politics and philosophy of the President are different from those of Committee Chairmen, messages from the White House proposing legislation do not receive the automatic "green light" from the "traffic officers"—the Committee Chairmen on the Hill.

It should, therefore, be constantly kept in mind that a new Administration in the White House does not effect a change of administration in the Halls of Congress. We have a new President, but we in Congress still have the same leadership, the same Chairmen.

Some may promptly criticize this fact of life as permitting "politics" to override public welfare. I cannot agree, although I do feel a more consistent, responsible government results when a President has a receptive ear in the leadership of the Congress. I think the Congress should take an independent look at what the President is proposing, but that look should not be a furtive glance, predisposed to reject what the President is suggesting.

The foregoing should not be interpreted as praise or censure of the present situation in Washington. But, it is a fact that many Presidential proposals have been sent to the Hill, yet few have been seriously and actively considered by the appropriate Committees.

This may be characterized by some as a do-nothing, disinterested attitude by the Congress. Still, it should be remembered that even members of the outgoing Administration said this new Congress and this new Administration should spend most of their time implementing the programs, laws, etc., passed during the previous Administration rather than enacting new legislation.

The Banking and Currency Committee, on which I serve, is typical. We have been busier this year than in either of the previous years I have served in the Congress. We have had Committee meetings almost daily and have even had Saturday sessions. We have sought answers to many problems, including the prime interest rate increase, skyrocketing lumber prices, irregularities in the operation of Small Business Administration programs, housing programs, one-bank holding companies, urban growth, state taxation of national banks, and export control policies; yet, the Committee has had only two rather insignificant bills before the House for its consideration. Obviously, we will have an active fall and winter session of the Congress.

Although few truly important legislative proposals have been acted on by the Congress, the Nixon Administration has urged action in several areas deserving of mention. The rather bold reform of the postal system advocated by President Nixon, Postmaster General Blount, and supported by me, provides the potential for a better postal service whether one is an employee of the system or only a customer. The steps toward deactivation of our participation in the Vietnam conflict, selective service reforms, and his

recently announced welfare and Federal assistance programs, are examples of the President's responses to the challenges of today.

They may be viewed as too little or too much; too fast or too slow; too costly or too austere, but, they represent attempts at improvement in each case.

SURTAX—TAX REFORM

Despite lack of formal action on some of these proposals, several tough issues have been faced and favorably acted upon by the House of Representatives. Foremost of these issues was the surtax and the related matter of tax reform.

I supported the extension of the surtax primarily because I thought it was the only responsible thing to do to help curb inflation and to make possible a balanced Federal budget, an essential element in stabilizing the economy while meeting the domestic and foreign demands of Federal policies and programs. It should be remembered that a slight reduction in the rate of inflation would have almost the same beneficial impact as a surtax reduction with respect to spendable income. Whereas inflation eats away at your purchasing power at the rate of 4% to 5% presently, the surtax amounts to only 2% to 3% for the average taxpayer.

Most of you have informed me of your displeasure over the impact our present tax structure has on the middle-income taxpayer. The tax reform measure passed by the House recognizes this inequity and provides significant relief to this group of taxpayers as well as specific relief to the low-income person. Much too comprehensive to discuss here,

the tax reform bill adjusted the tax liability or imposed new tax obligations with respect to private foundations, heretofore tax-exempt organizations, charitable contributions, farm losses, tax preferences, depletion and depreciation allowances, capital gains, and numerous other special tax treatment areas or "loopholes" as they have been called. Applauded by many, criticized by some, it is without doubt one of the most comprehensive tax revisions to have been acted upon by even one House of the Congress in many years.

Needless to say, it is not yet the "law of the land"; having been passed by the House of Representatives, it now must receive Senate approval. Those of you who feel changes should be made in the House-passed bill should contact Senator Griffin and Senator Hart. Not bound by the rules of our chamber, which prohibited the offering of amendments, the Senate can make such changes as it deems advisable.

I cannot conclude this part of these introductory remarks without commenting briefly on our over-all economy and fiscal situation. There are many indications that our economic well-being as a nation is improving and that the inflationary pressures may be subsidizing. To the extent that government policies have contributed to those pressures in the past, it can be said that the caution and hold-the-line attitude of the new Administration have helped.

Stabilization of our economy still poses this nation's greatest domestic challenge because of its impact on the resolving of other critical homefront problems.

RESULTS OF THIRD LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

	His			Hers						His	Hers
	Yes	No	No response	Yes	No	No response					
I. 18-year-old vote, ABM, Welfare:											
1. Favor extension of vote to 18-year-olds.....	34	63	3	36	60	4					
2. Support President's proposal on deployment of ABM.....	52	40	8	46	38	16					
3. Favor national welfare standards.....	56	34	10	57	29	14					

THE FORT CUSTER STORY

For the past two and one half years I have been working with Federal, State and local officials on resolving the problem of how to put surplus government-owned property at Fort Custer to the best possible use, both for now and in the future. Following is the status of the various proposals.

STATE PARK

I am most pleased to be able to announce that an exchange of land, under negotiation

between the U.S. Forest Service and the State of Michigan for the past 18 months, has now been agreed upon. According to the terms, the State will obtain nearly 3,000 acres of Fort Custer land for public park and recreational use, and some 15,000 acres of undeveloped State forest land in the Upper Peninsula will be added to our National forests—a benefit for both governmental units. Although land appraisals in the UP will delay completion of the exchange for some months, arrangements are underway to make this

land available under a license arrangement for hunting this fall and for other recreational purposes pending actual State acquisition.

NATIONAL CEMETERY

A lack of grave space in existing national cemeteries, and the non-existence of burial sites near urban population centers such as Detroit and Chicago, have created a national cemetery crisis of gigantic proportions. Recognizing the pressing need for expanding

our present system, I have introduced legislation to establish a national cemetery at Fort Custer. However, this bill and similar ones have been locked in Committee until legislative action is taken to first consolidate Federal cemeteries into one system administered by the Veterans Administration.

Because both the State and Federal governments recognize the significance of this issue, the State has agreed to withhold its interest in some 600 acres of excess property surrounding the present Fort Custer Post Cemetery until such time as Congress acts upon the question of expanding our national cemetery system. Thus, the way has been cleared for the creation of a cemetery at Fort Custer when the basic policy decisions I have described above have been resolved.

REGIONAL AIRPORT

Another recommended use of Fort Custer acreage was to establish a regional airport. The rough, wooded terrain was, in my judgment, more ideally suited to recreational use than to airport construction. The report of the Burke Airport Consultants and the Federal Aviation Agency concurred with this reasoning. Both recommended a location south of I-94 between Galesburg and Climax as the best possible site. I believe few will disagree that a new airport facility will be needed in the near future and will attract industry and stimulate the regional economy. However, the decision to proceed is properly a decision to be made by the citizens of Kalamazoo and Calhoun Counties who will vote on the issue. Should their decision be to go ahead, you may be assured I will do all in my power to help obtain the needed Federal funding to make the proposed regional airport a reality.

INDUSTRIAL PARK

The closing of Fort Custer has also given the City of Battle Creek and surrounding townships the chance to acquire some 1,892 acres of surplus property at the eastern and northern—most portions of the Reservation. Battle Creek City and Bedford Township officials have responded and have taken steps to obtain this property for industrial and residential development. Consummation of this aspect of the utilization of Fort Custer lands is expected to be finalized in 60 to 90 days.

We have tried to look at the whole picture—the most advantageous use of Fort Custer. By keeping in mind the location and acreage requirements of all the proposed uses of the Fort Custer land, we have been able to assure that each will have its place in the non-military development of this historic site. As a result, the entire Third Congressional District will benefit whether one's interest is in park and recreational activities, development of a national cemetery or furtherance of housing and industrial projects. For myself, it has been gratifying to participate in a project like this which will help meet the needs and desires of today's residents and future generations.

NEW MILITARY "ID" SYSTEM

To initiate Congressional action on inquiries involving a member, or former member of the Armed Services, it is necessary to provide my office with complete identifying information.

On July 1, the Army and Air Force instituted a new identification system for all personnel on active duty, retired, and in the reserve components. Issuance of the traditional "serial number" was discontinued and replaced by their civilian Social Security number.

Because of this new system, I ask that all future inquiries include the following data: Full name, grade, social security number, MOS or branch, current duty station.

The use of Social Security numbers to

identify servicemen applies only to Army and Air Force personnel. The Navy and Marine Corps will not adopt this procedure until 1972. Therefore, be sure to advise me of his military serial number when making an inquiry regarding a member of the Navy or Marine Corps.

"SAFEGUARD"—THE ABM ISSUE

The Administration's controversial Safeguard missile defense system will soon be up for consideration by the House now that the Senate debate has culminated in a close, approving vote. As the lines of battle are drawn it appears that in the House the margin of victory will not be razor-thin as occurred in the Senate. The Armed Services Committee has approved ABM deployment by a 10-7 vote and approval by the entire House is considered likely.

This will be one of the toughest decisions to properly analyze I have had to face. I am predisposed to accept the decision made during the Johnson Administration as restrictively modified, but reaffirmed, by the Nixon Administration regarding the ABM program. I feel both Administrations in arriving at their decisions assessed the considerations of cost, relative priority in the context of national goals and objectives, current technology and the impact upon arms limitation and international relations. Both Administrations have decided an ABM system is necessary in the interest of our national security.

I have not blindly accepted these decisions. I have tried to examine completely and carefully all of the arguments in opposition to the proposed ABM system. Although cogent and convincing, and voiced by very interested and sincere spokesmen, public and private, these arguments against the proposed ABM system have not to date overcome what I believe to be the more convincing arguments in support of the President's proposal.

Probably no recent issue has been as energetically debated, formally and informally, as the ABM issue. Although, as I have indicated, I intend to support the appropriation which is being asked for full fiscal year 1970 for the system, I commend the in-depth study and well-articulated position of those who oppose the system.

It is truly unfortunate that mankind has not reached a stage of development in relations among men and between nations that would make unnecessary the use of our resources for tools of destruction or for devices for defense of ourselves and our nation. I would hope that progress will be made in arms limitation talks and in international relations so that it will not be necessary in the years to come to agonize over the decision we make this year. I reject the proposition that a decision to initiate the steps toward deployment of an ABM system this year commits one to support a continuance of the program in succeeding years. Our government can only be as successful as it is flexible in recognizing changes in conditions, circumstances, and technology rather than steadfastly adhering to decisions of the past.

BROWN BILLS OF INTEREST IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

H.R. 3778. To limit the categories of questions required to be answered and subject to criminal penalties in the decennial census of population and housing.

H.R. 3860. To establish a catalog of Federal Assistance programs to aid potential beneficiaries in identifying types of aid available, determining eligibility, and making applications.

H.R. 8267. To amend Internal Revenue Code to increase the deduction allowable for expenses of medical care of persons over 65.

H.R. 8973. To improve the operation of the

Legislative Branch of the Federal government by instituting congressional reforms.

H.R. 10208. To authorize Federal Credit Unions to provide employment disruption insurance to member-borrowers.

H.R. 10483. To increase the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by two members who shall be elected town or township officials.

H.R. 11563. To make the Export Control Act more effective and to promote a trade policy under which all free-world nations apply the same restrictive guidelines on products sold to Eastern Europe.

H.R. 11752. To improve the postal system by removing the Post Office Department from the President's Cabinet and establishing a Postal Service public corporation, owned by the Federal Government.

H.R. 11902. To promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal government.

H.R. 12064. Directs the Government Accounting Office to provide regular, annual scrutiny of government contracts of all executive agencies with respect to cost increases and delivery delays.

H.R. 12222. To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 thereby providing for a more effective food stamp program.

H.R. 12341. To provide for a National Cemetery at Fort Custer.

H.R. 12440. To provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national timber land thereby promoting long-range lumber supply and price stability.

FIRST ANNUAL CONSERVATIVE AWARDS DINNER

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed pleased to participate in the First Annual Conservative Awards Dinner held at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., on October 4, 1969.

Jointly sponsored by the two leading conservative national publications and the two major conservative political action groups, the dinner was a success from every point of view. This was the first occasion on which the four sponsors, the American Conservative Union, Human Events, National Review, and Young Americans for Freedom, have joined together in presenting such distinguished service awards to conservative leaders in Congress.

Those present included many officials of the Nixon administration and Members of Congress who joined in applauding the distinguished recipients of the awards, our colleagues, Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator from Delaware, and the dean of the Iowa delegation in the House, Hon. H. R. GROSS.

At this point I would like to include an article from the October 18, 1969, issue of Human Events which describes the First Annual Conservative Awards Dinner.

The article follows:

CONSERVATIVE AWARDS DINNER

More than 300 leaders of the American conservative movement turned out Saturday

night, October 4, for the First Annual Conservative Awards Dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C. The dinner was sponsored by the American Conservative Union, National Review, Young Americans for Freedom and Human Events.

The highlight of the dinner was the presentation of awards for outstanding congressional service to Sen. John Williams (R.-Del.) and Rep. H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa). The awards were bestowed by Rep. John Ashbrook (R.-Ohio), chairman of the ACU, who reminded the guests of how thankful Americans should be for the valiant work Sen. Williams and Rep. Gross have each performed in Congress for more than 20 years.

Sen. Williams, first elected in 1946, is planning to retire next year upon the conclusion of his fourth term and many times during the evening he was urged to reconsider. But the Delaware senator who has sparked so many important congressional investigations remained firm in his resolve not to run again now that he has reached age 65. The guests were disappointed, but had to admire a man who insists upon standing by his principles even if it means giving up a job he enjoys.

Rep. Gross, a conservative known nationally for the sharp "no" he so often hurls at various spending schemes, received perhaps the biggest ovation of the night when he turned to the subject of Viet Nam. "We should win that war," he said, "or get the hell out."

The evening's keynote address was delivered by columnist James J. Kilpatrick. While noting that opposition to foolish government programs was certainly necessary, Mr. Kilpatrick also urged conservatives to "apply their talents to affirmative answers to American problems"—problems like conservation, pollution, penal reform and low-cost housing. Conservatives have the proper principles at heart, he said, but "if I had only one political wish, conservatively speaking, I would wish to see us translate broad conservative principles more frequently into specific, affirmative action." Mr. Kilpatrick applauded those men and women who for so many years have volunteered their services to the conservative cause. He said that more than ever before their dedication was needed, because "there is much work to be done."

Other remarks at the dinner were delivered by William F. Buckley Jr., editor of National Review, and Robert Bauman, secretary of ACU and a former national chairman of YAF, who served as master of ceremonies for the evening.

Among the members of Congress who attended and joined in honoring two of their congressional colleagues were Sen. Strom Thurmond and Reps. Don Clausen, Jim Collins, John Hammerschmidt, Manuel Lujan, William Scherle, and E. Ross Adair.

Guests from the White House staff included presidential adviser Dr. Arthur Burns, speechwriter Patrick Buchanan, Special Presidential Assistant Dr. Martin Anderson, congressional liaison man Bill Timmons, "inspector-general" Clark Mollenhoff and presidential staff aides Mort Allin and Tom Huston. Among the other Administration appointees in attendance were USIA director Frank Shakespeare, Ted Humes of the Labor Department and Defense Department aides William Baroudy Jr. and Jerry Friedheim. Other guests included John Mahan, chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and Ken Towsey of the Rhodesian Information Service.

Also attending the dinner were such well-known conservatives as Holmes Alexander, Lemuel Boulware, Allan Brownfeld, Ralph de Toledano, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, Willard Edwards, Victor Lasky, Fulton Lewis III, Dean Clarence Manion, Neil McCaffrey, Stefan Possony, William A. Rusher, Phyllis Schlafly,

George Schuyler, Paul Scott, Ken Thompson and Tom Van Sickle.

The sponsoring organizations hope that next year's dinner will be even better attended and that conservatives from all over the country will try to get to Washington to help honor two more members of Congress who, like Sen. Williams and Rep. Gross, have done so much to strengthen the conservative cause.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of National Business Women's Week, October 19 through October 25, coming this year during the 50th anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, presents us with a most appropriate opportunity to pay tribute to those women who have made a particularly significant contribution to our communities.

For myself, the selection of a truly outstanding professional woman who deserves special recognition was made easy for me, when earlier this year President Nixon nominated Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley of Baltimore, Md., to be Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. Mrs. Bentley will be sworn in on Monday, October 27, 1969, when she will become the first woman ever to occupy this vitally important post.

I was proud to testify in favor of her nomination before the Commerce Committee of the United States Senate earlier this month, and I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks I made at that time:

STATEMENT OF HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

President Nixon has made a wise choice in his selection of Helen Delich Bentley to fill this important post. When the President announced Mrs. Bentley's nomination he stated, "she has established a record of professional excellence unsurpassed by any maritime expert in the country." In this judgment, I agree with the President one-hundred per cent.

During her distinguished career as Maritime Editor of the Baltimore Sun, Helen Bentley has been recognized throughout the world as one of our foremost contemporary writers on maritime affairs. She has gained this recognition and also gained the respect of the men who man the ships, the longshoremen on the docks, the ship owners, and Members of Congress, who are concerned with our Merchant Marine, because she works hard and is not afraid to go where the action is.

From the docks in Baltimore, to the military bases in South Vietnam, to the icy Northwest Passage, Helen Bentley goes where the ships go and writes about them from first-hand knowledge.

For many years she has warned us of the alarming decline in our Merchant Marine, and the growing threat to our commerce and trade, posed by the buildup of the Soviet merchant fleet. Although her primary concern as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission will be the regulation of services and the rates of our waterborne commerce,

I am confident that she will work closely with the Federal Maritime Administrator in insuring a maximum effort to revitalize our Merchant Marine.

And while I normally am not a betting man, I am confident enough to make a small wager—that Mrs. Bentley will be wearing a brand new hat the day she is sworn in."

EDITORIAL PRAISING POST OFFICE

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 2 and 3, the CBS affiliated television station here in Washington, WTOP, Channel 9, carried an editorial critical of the part played by unnamed postal unions in opposing the administration's postal corporation plan. That editorial has been brought to the attention of the Members. However, Station WTOP, on October 3 and 4, carried an editorial of rebuttal by Don E. Dunn, national executive vice president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks. For the benefit of those Members who may have been back in their districts that weekend, I am inserting a copy of Mr. Dunn's editorial in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY DON E. DUNN, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, UNITED FEDERATION OF POSTAL CLERKS, AFL-CIO

Station WTOP poorly serves its public by scolding un-named postal unions for fighting the postal corporation scheme.

The postal service is not on the brink of disaster. And we in the United Federation of Postal Clerks think we know more about it than the author of the offending editorial.

Just today, for example, we moved 270 million pieces of mail. That's more letters and packages than there are people in the United States.

In the course of just one year our members will move 80 billion pieces of mail—a figure that exceeds the number of seconds that have ticked by since the death of Julius Caesar.

In the context of this enormous volume anyone who tries to translate occasional human error into sweeping generalizations of bad service just doesn't know what he's talking about. It's like saying that because direct dialing doesn't always work the phone company ought to be turned into a government monopoly.

WTOP also goofed when it claimed the administration has given us a major concession by agreeing to binding arbitration in postal labor disputes.

Not true. The administration would bar us—but not management—from initiating such arbitration unless a separate federal panel decides first that our complaint is justified. Even the New York Times in an editorial last month called our objections to this procedure "reasonable enough."

We see nothing reasonable either in depriving us of our right to appeal to Congress without some offset such as the right to strike. And that really is the heart of the issue right there.

There's nothing wrong with the postal service that can't be cured by paying decent wages and by treating its employees as human beings with rights equal to those of other American working people. Lacking these, nothing can save it.

SDS EXPERIMENTS WITH WORK AND CLEAN LIVING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the clairvoyance of the U.S. Supreme Court ruling that American citizens have a constitutional right to travel in Communist countries—although, apparently, not in Rhodesia—may prove fruitful on several accounts:

First. Further the education of recruits with a firsthand experience at work.

Second. Give the People's Volunteer Corps a firsthand encounter of living the clean life under a closed society under a Communist dictatorship which does not tolerate such progressive freedoms as marihuana and fornication.

Third. Castro can exploit for propaganda purposes our youth as examples of capitalist decadence.

Fourth. While they are out of the United States, the American people can enjoy a brief respite from their activities.

Perhaps someone should advise the sugar volunteers not to try to liberalize the power structure in Havana—lest the respite be permanent.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 22, 1969]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY FROM THE UNITED STATES TO HELP IN CUBA

(By Michael Anders)

More than 150 Americans have registered so far to work for two months without pay in the Cuban sugar cane fields this winter.

Radical organizers of the "Youth Brigade" ultimately hope to sign 300 workers from across the nation for the work tour beginning Nov. 30. A second two-month work tour of 300 persons is set for Jan. 30.

The organizers said the harvesting invitation was extended by the Cuban government after such a work force had been suggested by several Americans there this summer. The Cuban government has agreed to provide housing, food and support facilities.

When the group leaves, it will be the largest batch of Americans to visit Cuba since Premier Fidel Castro knocked Fulgencio Batista out of power in January 1959. Castro is pushing for a sugar harvest of 10 million tons in "The Year of the Decisive Effort," symbolic of his decade as Cuba's leader.

The U.S. State Department, unaware of the planned trip until queried yesterday by a newsmen, said it was powerless to interfere due to a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision allowing citizens the right of unrestricted travel. The Department formally still denies citizens, however, the privilege of franchising to certain Communist-bloc countries including Cuba.

The trips are being coordinated by a nameless, loosely-organized group with a six-man executive board. Members include Julie Nichamin, a member of Students for a Democratic Society and the North American Congress on Latin America; Carol Brightman, editor of Leviathan Magazine; Lucas Daumont of SDS, and Phil Hutchison of the Student National Coordinating Committee. Two seats are vacant.

Bruce Jacobs, a staff member, said in a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

telephone interview from his New York headquarters that the volunteers are being forewarned that they face hard work and that their living conditions will be the same as those of Cuban workers.

The application form states that volunteers must obey all Cuban laws and explicitly warns that marijuana and other drugs and narcotics will not be tolerated because of the "very stringent" drug laws there.

Dormitory facilities, consisting of huge tents and barracks, are to be sexually segregated at the request of the Cuban government, Jacobs said. There will be no accommodations for couples.

Jacobs said the group hopes to recruit an equal number of blacks, whites and Latin Americans for each trip. He said the trip is not for "politically sophisticated people" but for the average young American who "wants to see what a revolutionary and socialist society is like. . . ." Teenagers under 18 must have parental permission.

Still to be definitely settled, according to Jacobs, are the embarking point, mode of transportation and financing. The organizers are hoping the Cuban government will pick up the transportation tab but have raised several thousand dollars in the event Castro does not.

A State Department spokesman said although "we can still deny people the right to travel to certain countries, we can't prosecute them."

"If they want to go, the Department of State is not going to wring its hands," he added. "But suppose the kids get into trouble?"

"They find themselves up to their eyeballs in trouble and then we have parent trouble and congressmen calling us."

In Washington, Bert Garskof, the local organizing chairman for the harvest, said the response has been excellent although the drive started only last week. He could not say how many persons have registered.

A SALUTE TO THE BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN OF AMERICA

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an unusual privilege for me to join in this well-deserved salute to the business and professional women of the Nation during the observance of National Businesswomen's Week.

Over the past 50 years, the pride and the promise of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs have been reflected in the outstanding accomplishments of its members in the economic, social, cultural, business, and professional life of our Nation.

As the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 370, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women, I was pleased to note that the NFBPW endorsed this legislation at its 1969 national convention in St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is in order that we extend our congratulations to the 180,000 members of the federation throughout the United States, the Dis-

October 23, 1969

trict of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. May the next 50 years of progress for the women of this Nation be as golden as those of the past half century.

NICKEL STOCKPILING

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for the legislation proposed today by our colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) aimed at ameliorating the present tight nickel supply situation confronting thousands of user firms in this Nation. To those fellow Members who might not have affected businesses in their districts, or to whom this problem is a line, let me emphasize that the nickel supply picture is indeed desperate. When I hear from companies in my own 33d California District that their very existence is threatened by the nickel shortage, I believe them because their cases are amply documented and I have to feel that there must be thousands of similar type firms around this country facing an equally uncertain, precarious future.

Allow me, please, to pass among just one pertinent quote from a letter which I have just recently received from a company in San Bernardino County. Here is what the head of a Pomona electrochemical company says about the shortage:

If this severe condition continues we will not only have to pay a ridiculous premium, but we will not be able to obtain nickel, period. Being in the nickel-plating business this means we are out of business, unless we are able to obtain some kind of relief in securing nickel supplies.

What that reflects, and what has been stated in previous correspondence, is a series of frustrations in trying to obtain nickel either from suppliers or from the national stockpile. I believe that our colleagues here will realize that this is not any lobby-inspired or frivolous letter. This is the plea of an individual company president who is virtually standing on the brink of financial disaster. And it is my hope that every Member will keep this in mind when the time comes for definitive action on this bill.

The provisions of this legislation pose no threat to our national defense supplies. What we are seeking, simply, is congressional approval for the immediate disposal of 15,000 short tons from the national stockpile. This would leave untouched 35,000 short tons, which is 15,000 more than what the Office of Emergency Preparedness considered essential from January 1967 up until May of this year. Furthermore, we would not tap the 2,000 additional tons available to the Treasury Department for coinage purposes. I will conclude with the ardent wish that our colleagues recognize the validity and worthiness of this proposal and give it the support it deserves.

URGENT NEEDS OF THE AGED

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be the first Member to testify before the House Way and Means Committee at its opening public hearings on proposals to improve and expand our social security and medicare system. I feel most urgently the need to act now to meet the acute needs of our older citizens and I include my statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE 11TH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

It is a great privilege and pleasure for me to appear before this very distinguished Committee on Ways and Means in behalf of the many thousands of older citizens in my congressional district and the many millions in our nation who depend upon the Social Security System for the hope of living out their remaining years with some measure of security and dignity.

I have always been an ardent supporter of this system, and I am proud to have had some part over the years in improving and expanding its provisions, especially into the area of hospital and medical care.

The Social Security System, although still far from perfect, is one of the major achievements of humanitarian social policy which the Congress has ever adopted. In its one-third of a century of existence, it has become the firm and indispensable foundation of our social defenses against the fear of poverty and dependency which so often has prevented the average citizen from approaching old age with any degree of hope and anticipation of repose and reward for a long life well lived.

Today, 92 per cent of all of our senior citizens, 65 and over, rely upon the old-age insurance program for a significant part of their incomes. Many millions more rely upon the provisions for early retirement, for total and permanent disability, and for the protection of surviving mothers and children.

You in this committee and we in the Congress, should not shrink, however, from the fact that an inadequate income is still the number one problem of one-third of the 20 million Americans now over 65 years of age, and we cannot hide from the reality that an inadequate income will continue to be the number one problem for years to come if we continue to allow inflation to outrun our best efforts to improve the Social Security System.

The fear of facing poverty in their retirement years also plagues new millions in the younger generation. They have but to look around them to see that the fundamental economic problems of old age are still unsolved.

I feel most strongly that we in the Congress must act now to remove the threat of poverty from our elderly and enable them to enjoy meaningful retirement years.

The economic events of this year have already outrun the principal provision of the bill, H.R. 1273, which I introduced early in this session. I proposed at that time a 15 per cent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits and an increase in the minimum primary benefit from \$55 to \$70 a month. I had hoped that in addition to compensat-

ing for some increase in the cost of living, we might give Social Security beneficiaries a real increase of some 10 per cent in their standard of living.

Now, I believe nothing less than a 25 per cent increase, effective immediately, will offset rising living costs and give a meaningful increase in real benefits. I have asked the Social Security Administration to give me a benefit table based upon a 25 per cent increase and a minimum primary benefit of \$80. I have not yet received this table and have, therefore, not introduced new legislation incorporating this proposal. I intend to do so at the earliest possible date and make this information available, as it will be, of course, to the committee.

An immediate 25 percent increase in benefits is required to offset the nearly 10 per cent increase in the cost of living since the last benefit increase, which went into effect on February 1, 1968. This inflationary rise in the cost of living for our older citizens makes a 10 per cent benefit increase, effective April 1, as proposed by the Administration, totally inadequate to the needs of the aged or to our responsibilities as Members of the Congress.

I feel we should adopt a cost of living provision to raise Social Security benefits automatically in the future. But I do not feel we should lock our older citizens into benefits at their current standards of living. We must, I think, make significant improvements in the benefit level at the same time. Indeed, I believe we should incorporate provisions in legislation now which would provide for a real increase of at least 50 percent over the present level of benefits. This increase might well be staged over several years. But I favor making the decision to raise the living standards of our senior citizens now.

I also believe, as I mention later in discussing my bill, H.R. 5849, that we might well experiment with the principle of the guaranteed minimum income by applying it to our senior citizens who have little opportunity to work and who are not expected to compete in the labor market. We could begin, I feel, by guaranteeing a \$100 a month income to our older citizens, supplementing Social Security and other incomes with direct payments from the Treasury.

Now, that is simply to guarantee that from all sources, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, an older citizen would receive \$100 a month, and I don't see how anybody can expect anybody to live in America today on less than \$100 a month.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge, as I have urged previously, that you include in your legislation raising Social Security benefits provisions which would prevent the poorest of our Social Security beneficiaries from losing the supplementary payments made to them under the Public Assistance Program. I hope you will also provide that our veterans will not have their benefits diminished, but that they also will get the full benefits of any Social Security increases. We should not let the technical provisions of our public assistance and veterans programs deny to the poorest of our citizens and to our veterans the full benefits of the better living standards which I hope the Congress will approve at this time.

In H.R. 1273 I also recommend what I believe is a fairer system of computing benefits on the average of the five highest wage years rather than on the present basis using all years except the lowest five. And, incidentally, that precedent has been just established by the Congress in respect to Federal employees.

Another change I propose would help the 2½ million widows now receiving inadequate Social Security benefits. At this time the

average benefit paid to widows is only \$86 a month which is considerably lower than the \$100 average monthly benefits paid to retirees. I do not understand why widow's benefits should be so much less. Therefore I am proposing that their benefits be increased to 100 percent of the deceased husband's benefits. These benefits should also be increased as the cost of living increases.

In addition, I introduced H.R. 10754 which amends Title II of the Social Security Act so that a widow or widower would retain a larger portion of insurance benefits when he or she remarries.

The social security program benefits more than just the aged. For years I have wanted changes in easing disability qualifications, and I remember, as do many of you who have been here a long time, the struggle we have had back over the years to try to get the benefits payable to the disabled at an age lower than the age at which they are entitled to Social Security. Under the present law a blind person under 55 years of age is not able to qualify for disability benefits on the same basis as older blind people. Older blind people who are unable to do a job calling for the skills they used in their previous work are eligible for benefits even though they can do other types of work. I feel that we must act now to liberalize the qualifications under Title II governing eligibility of blind persons so that every person who is blind and who has at least 6 months of coverage will receive disability insurance benefits.

What does age have to do with it, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, if a person is condemned to the eternal darkness of night?

In addition, as I provided for in H.R. 1273, the waiting period for receiving disability insurance should be reduced from the present 6 months to 3 months and the requirement that a disability must last for a continuous period of at least 12 months or consummate in death in order for a worker, widow or dependent widowers to receive benefits should be eliminated. People who are disabled need benefits immediately. All you need to do is to establish the character and assurance of the disability and not have the arbitrary waiting period.

I say people who are disabled need benefits immediately and any delay may complicate their disability and their rehabilitation.

I also introduced in the 90th Congress and have introduced in the 91st Congress in H.R. 1273 a necessary provision to make Medicare benefits available to all those receiving disability benefits. There is no doubt that disabled Social Security recipients have a great need for Medicare in view of the simple truth that medical costs are high and their incomes are too low to cover the costs. The Social Security Administration says that as many as 54 percent of the disabled receiving benefits today are without some kind of health insurance and that their costs are three times the comparable costs for older people now under Medicare. We must make it a right for the disabled to be eligible for Medicare. For many it would be their sole means of meeting medical costs.

Another serious problem concerns me, and I am sure every member of this committee, which is why I introduced a provision in this bill that would further amend the hospital insurance program. I would like to see Medicare cover the cost of prescription drugs for our elderly. Medicare is not fully meeting the needs of our elderly as long as they are burdened by the cost of prescription drugs. As I have emphasized over and over again the major item in medical expenses is the cost of drugs. I only have to repeat the statement by the August 1968 task force on prescription drugs set up by the Department

of Health, Education, and Welfare to point out the severity of this problem. The task force concludes in a 1968 estimate "that 20 per cent of the elderly would have no drug expenses, while the costs would be less than \$50 for 41.5 per cent, between \$50 and \$99 for 19 per cent, between \$100 and \$249 for 15.5 per cent, and \$250 or more for 4 per cent."

In light of these figures we know that Social Security recipients could only afford adequate drugs if they were reimbursed under the Medicare program. I strongly feel that the cost of prescription drugs should be a reimbursable medical expense under the supplementary insurance program.

The last provision in H.R. 1273 would authorize the financing of the supplementary medical insurance program (Part B) from general revenues. I feel that the Social Security program has become such an integral part of our national economy that it should be fully integrated into the Federal budget. This step can begin by eliminating the monthly charge for medical insurance and transferring this charge to general revenues. This small change would aid poor people and at the same time only cost the Federal Government \$940 million a year—not a large amount when its purpose is to rid the effects of poverty from our nation's citizens.

We in the Congress must also give firm attention to another principle which I have embodied in my bills. I introduced H.R. 5849 because I firmly believe that it is of immediate importance to this nation. Today's Social Security recipient who has the will and the ability to work is punished for his initiative, yet we continue nurturing this system.

I do not deny, Mr. Chairman, that under the economic conditions which prevailed in 1935, when this great measure of social security was inaugurated, the concept was the one that we have followed since that time, but I do respectfully submit that the time has come when the Social Security System must not be thought of as a way of getting people off the work rolls and into retirement so there can be jobs for the younger citizens. I think the Congress committed this country in 1946 to the principle that it was the duty of the Government of the United States not to provide everybody a job but to provide an economic climate in which everybody ready, willing, and able to work could work, and that did not exclude older people.

I know you have your problems in funding it, but I respectfully submit that the time has come for us to admit, as I think we should candidly, that any recipient of Social Security should be permitted to draw whatever the law allows and to work and derive as much from earned income as that individual can earn and not have his or her Social Security benefits diminished on account of whatever the earnings may be. They aren't going to earn too much, most of them, but it would simply enable them to have a higher standard of living.

Senior citizens must be able to work indefinitely and still reserve their social security benefits. And, as you know, I happen to be 69 years old. If anybody were to tell me that I had to quit work, that I couldn't be active and try to do something, I know life would fade in significance, in meaning to me and it is that way with a lot of other people who pass the age of 65.

Give them an incentive. If they want to work, give them an opportunity to work and, at the same time, don't deprive them of their Social Security benefits to which at least they have contributed half of the cost.

I commend this great committee and the Congress for the relaxation of those restrictions from time to time, but I have long believed that we should relax them entirely.

Just raising the income limits in the retirement test as proposed by the present Ad-

ministration's bill is not enough nor is it at all acceptable to a nation that prides itself on hard work. I have been a long time advocate of supporting any system which encourages one's ambition to work for a decent living. I do not believe the Federal Government should implement any programs contrary to this ideal.

This is why I urge the passage of my bill H.R. 5849 which removes completely the limitation upon the amount of outside income an individual may earn while receiving benefits under the Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance program. The retirement test for all Social Security beneficiaries and for all survivor annuitants under the Railroad Retirement Act must be eliminated.

In addition this bill provides a new title, Title XX, which is guaranteed minimum annual benefit for every person reaching 62 years of age who has an annual income of less than \$2,400 in the case of a head of a family and \$1,200 for an individual not supporting a family. This would mean providing a guaranteed minimum income of \$100 a month per person or \$200 a month per couple.

These benefits would be paid on a monthly basis unless benefits payable to an individual for any month is less than \$5 in which another plan would be implemented. The amount of benefits received would be determined by the total amount of annual income any individual receives during a calendar year and benefits would come out of general revenue.

All I am suggesting is that we assure that every individual 62 years of age or over be able to receive from all sources, including Social Security, a minimum income of \$100 a month.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the Congress over the years has taken great steps of improving the Social Security Act which so many citizens in this country depend upon for part or complete survival. There is still, however, an urgent need to do more. We must not rest until we assure Americans an opportunity for a good life. At a time when all Americans are concerned with priorities we must advise all our colleagues to reflect the needs of the real world by immediate passage of my very necessary amendments.

Mr. Chairman, and members, I add only this: A few weeks ago I went down to the southern part of Miami Beach, which is one of those typical American paradoxes where a lot of very rich people are living contiguous to a lot of very poor people. We had about three or four hundred, I suppose, in a hall which we were addressing and talking to them primarily about Social Security matters. I asked them, "All of you who are living on Social Security hold up your hands," and nearly every one of them held up their hands. All these were older people.

I said, "All of you living on less than \$100 a month hold up your hands."

Well, I am sure at least 75 percent of them held up their hands.

I said, "All of you living on, getting less than \$75 a month hold up your hands."

Well, I am sure between 50 and 60 percent of them held up their hands.

Now, the City of Miami Beach has just passed a rent control ordinance trying to protect those old people down there on South Beach, who are living in conditions that should be shameful to us. I am going from here to an appointment to see if we can't get some help for better housing for this area, but if they had a little bit better income they could pay a little bit more rent. It is just hard for us to realize how many people in this country in the midst of plenty are really living in poverty.

The great Chairman of this great Com-

mittee has done a marvelous job for the people of this country and I know you are going to continue to press forward, making things even better for these people so we can finally realize, in Browning's words, "Grow old along with me; The best is yet to be; the last of life, for which the first was made."

As a senior citizen, I salute you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

LEGAL AID PROGRAMS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial, but most worthwhile programs in the antipoverty program, has been legal aid to the poor. The efforts of such organizations as the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County, California Rural Legal Assistance, and the Legal Assistance Center of Washington Township have been controversial because they have been effective. At one time the journalistic profession took as its motto the job of "comforting the afflicted while afflicting the comfortable," while many members of the legal profession took the role of "comforting the comfortable while afflicting the afflicted." Today, the legal profession, through such organizations as the Legal Aid Society, has reversed that role.

By taking up the challenge of providing everyone, including the poor and the minorities, with equal protection under the law, these lawyers are attacking a system which has long needed attack. We all know of the truth in the statement that the rich do not go to the gas chamber, or to jail for drunken driving. But the poor, without legal defense, have not been so lucky. They have no guarantee of equality under the law, acquittal when innocent, or protection from those with money enough to hire attorneys. It is natural that such a radical concept as equal protection under the law should come under attack. It is also natural that some of those in authority should be angered when their decisions, sometimes arbitrary, are put under attack.

A county board of supervisors, which denies hunger exists in a rural county, may well be incensed when another government agency challenges that fallacy and takes it to court in order to make it provide food-stamp programs. Equally, when a store has for years abused the collection provisions of the law, or a slum landlord has abused his tenants, then it comes as a rude shock when the rights of the poor are protected. Sadly, not all of the above examples are content with equal justice under the law and they have rallied powerful forces in support of their demand for more than equal protection under the law for the rich and powerful.

Yet, such organizations as the Legal Aid Society, Legal Assistance Center of Washington Township, and California Rural Legal Assistance have proved one

of our best hopes for continuing and improving the society in which we live. The kind of conditions they are attempting to correct are the kind of conditions which breed revolutions and revolutions. Our problem today is not with those disenchanted with the system, but making the system work so that all can live under it. The keystone for bringing peace to this society is in providing and making work the guarantees which are written into our Constitution. Such talks may sound revolutionary, or too idealistic, or irrelevant, but I do not believe so. I am one who believes in the American system and I believe that it can be made to work. I am proud that fellow members of the legal profession are setting out on this task, and I am proud of this new generation of attorneys who are more interested in justice than in money.

I cite the work of the Legal Aid Society and the California Rural Legal Assistance as examples of this new breed and new concept.

Dick Flood, San Jose Mercury-News staff writer, an excellent reporter who has done much to make known the complexities and the problems of living in the Santa Clara Valley, reported on the activities of the Legal Aid Society in Sunday, October 19, 1969, edition of the Mercury-News. I include his report in this RECORD.

In addition, at the request of Marc Poché, a professor of law at the University of Santa Clara and my executive assistant, the California Rural Legal Assistance has reported on some of its most significant cases. I include that report in this RECORD.

The reports follow:

**CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE,
Gilroy, Calif., August 6, 1969.**

Hopefully the following will serve as a summary of some of the more significant cases this office has handled (for constituents of Mr. Edwards or persons representing a class including constituents of Mr. Edwards) since I became Directing Attorney on October 1, 1968:

(1) A class action against a major multi-store California retailer. (The settlement agreement provides that neither the defendant's name nor the precise infraction involved may be publicly discussed.) The terms of the settlement agreement bind the defendant to cease and desist from filing improper litigation and to set aside upwards of ten thousand judgments which it has irregularly obtained against its customers in the past five years.

(2) *Hernandez v. Hardin* U.S.D.C. #50333—as a result of a temporary restraining order issued against the Department of Agriculture in this action every California county now has a Food Stamp program.

(3) *Macias v. Finch* U.S.D.C. 50956—action to overturn welfare practice whereby persons fully employed (but making less than their actual needs as calculated by the Welfare Department) are not eligible for a welfare grant to supplement their income up to their minimum actual needs. Under this rule, a family can receive funds sufficient to meet its minimum actual needs only by refusing to work and going on welfare. Case is now under submission before a three-judge federal court.

(4) *Jenish v. State of California* U.S.D.C.—Action to challenge welfare rule by which families in need of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (because the father has deserted the family) are ineligible for wel-

fare for three months from the date of the desertion unless the mother divorces the father. The rule is challenged as discriminatory against Catholics and as depriving women who desire to reunite their families of the opportunity to do so.

(5) *Cline v. Credit Bureau* Cal. Supreme Court—Action to challenge prejudgment wage attachment. Wisconsin prejudgment wage attachment statute (which is very similar to California's) was recently declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court found that a statute allowing attachments without notice, hearing or preliminary finding of liability deprived low-income Defendants of due process, right to counsel and opportunity to defend themselves. Not being able to survive while their income is being attached, they are forced to compromise with alleged creditors.

(6) *Perez v. Russo; Russo v. Perez*, Santa Clara County Superior Court—Action to enjoin a slumlord from evicting a tenant because she complained to housing authorities and because she engaged an attorney; also seeks damages and return of rents because the premises were in massive violation of health and safety code requirements.

Although there are three or four other important cases, this letter has probably occupied too much of your time already. If you are interested, please phone me or drop me a note and I'll send a supplemental letter. Thank you very much for your kindness.

Yours very truly,

DON B. KATES, Jr.,
Attorney at Law.

**LEGAL AID ATTORNEYS BRING EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAWS TO EQUAL
(By Dick Flood)**

Equal protection of the laws, a byword of the social revolution, has become a reality for thousands of Santa Clara County residents through the efforts of a hard-working band of young attorneys.

The 11-member staff of the Legal Aid Society, headed by acting chief attorney Leon Poe, last year provided free legal help to no less than 5,216 county residents, 92 per cent of whom had incomes below the federal "poverty line" and 47 per cent of whom earned less than \$1,500 a year.

Cases handled by Legal Aid attorneys ranged from consumer and domestic problems to major class suits designed to bring about peaceful change within government and educational institutions.

Beneath the froth of day-to-day legal problems of the poor, staff attorneys put in long hours advising community organizations, providing "Preventive education," and developing and pursuing legal, administrative and legislative reforms in areas adversely affecting the poor.

According to Poe, the salaried staff members put in an average 55-hour work week. A non-attorney, Dee Harris, was recently hired to take charge of community education and seven IBM Corp. attorneys have volunteered their evening hours to free regular staff to work on major issues.

Legal Aid offices are located at 235 E. Santa Clara St., San Jose; 222 S. Jackson St., Jose; 111 Willow St., San Jose; and 377 S. Murphy Ave., Sunnyvale.

Funded with a \$300,000 anti-poverty grant and directed by the Legal Aid Society board, the program has been designated by federal officials as one of those which will be continued if the embattled Economic Opportunity Commission is disbanded.

Perhaps the most far-reaching action since the program started in June, 1967, is the society's attempt to abolish the tracking system in Santa Clara Unified School District and the ability grouping system in the East Side Union High School District.

A petition for injunction pending before the U.S. District Court in San Francisco declared that children of Mexican descent and their parents are denied equal protection of the law by the ability grouping system.

Disproportionately large numbers of children of Mexican descent are placed in "lower" ability groups, including those for "mentally retarded" and "educationally handicapped" children, and a disproportionately large number of them fail to complete high school or to go beyond the 12th grade as a result, the suit alleges.

It challenges the validity of group tests, given in standard English, to place students in ability groups. Such tests, the petition declares, "cannot provide meaningful or accurate information about the intelligence or learning capacity of pupils of Mexican descent."

The suit also alleges that East Side Union High School District service boundaries are drawn to segregate students of Mexican descent into a few schools, that counselors consistently fail to give them information to prepare them for college work and that disciplinary rules of the district are enforced in a "racially discriminatory fashion."

Legal Aid attorneys Steve Manley and Grace Kubota, the team that produced the school tracking suits, recently won another class action to prevent the San Jose Housing Authority from evicting a welfare mother with seven children.

The court granted their motion to quash the three-day eviction notice on grounds the woman had been denied her constitutional right to a hearing, an action certain to have far reaching effects on landlord-tenant relations.

Other "class" court actions pending include a federal court challenge of Article 34 of the State Constitution, which requires a referendum election for public housing programs.

Working with attorneys from California Rural Legal Assistance and the National Housing Center in Berkeley, Legal Aid attorneys are challenging Article 34 on the grounds it deprives low-income citizens equal protection of the laws in that they do not have equal access with middle and upper-income citizens to federal housing assistance.

The suit, pending before a three-judge panel in San Francisco, claims that California, with 10 per cent of the population, received 15 per cent of all FHA-insured housing and 14.9 per cent of all VA-insured mortgages from 1934 to 1966.

By way of contrast, the suit points out California has only 23.4 units of public housing per thousand population compared with 66.7 units per thousand in New York, 73.1 units per thousand in Illinois and a national average of 45 units per thousand.

Only 52 per cent of the public housing referendums placed before California voters during the past nine years have been approved, according to the suit.

On appeal before the State Supreme Court is a Legal Aid suit which would give juveniles the right to counsel whether their families can afford it or not.

The case involves a 17-year-old who was sentenced to the California Youth Authority after he waived his right to counsel because he did not want his father billed for the services of a public defender.

With the National Consumer Center at Boston College of Law, Legal Aid attorneys are opposing the uniform Consumer Credit Code proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

According to Legal Aid attorney Richard Elbrecht, the proposed credit code would be a "disastrous step backward for the California consumer," providing for an increase in interest rates up to 36 per cent a year and higher in some cases.

The present limit in California is 12 per

cent a year, with exceptions ranging up to 30 per cent.

The uniform credit code, now under joint hearings by the Assembly Judiciary and Insurance and Finance committees, would replace all existing California credit statutes.

Also in the consumer field, Legal Aid attorneys have processed 26 violations of the state's truth in lending laws.

VIETNAM—PEACE THIS YEAR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days there has been great discussion about ending the war in Vietnam. All Americans seem to be agreed that it should be ended as speedily as possible. The disagreement is over method and cost.

The loudest and most certainly voiced solution—immediate withdrawal—is advocated by those who know the least about war.

Our trained and experienced military commanders, whose profession is ending wars, have scarcely been heard.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1968, at the request of 28 distinguished retired officers, I filed with the Clerk of the House their petition for redress of grievances.

Retired from active duty, and free to speak, their voices are worth listening to. They represent a cumulative total of more than 600 years service. They volunteer their advice which is not only professional but entirely unselfish, prompted only by love of country.

I am reminded of the admonition which was delivered with the presentation of the petition:

This petition, we hope, will go just a little way toward attaining the victory of peace and overcome just calmly writing off our dead and maimed heroes and prisoners for nothing—as we did in Korea.

We should give weighted consideration to their experience and expert advice. It makes sense to listen to Dr. Wernher von Braun, rather than college freshmen or Dr. Benjamin Spock, on questions of space travel, but no one proposes to call Dr. von Braun to treat a sick child.

These officers tell us that the way to bring peace in Vietnam is to end the war by winning it. They say unanimously that our Armed Forces can do this, with conventional weapons, within 6 to 8 weeks. All that is required is to free our fighting men from the political restrictions which forbid victory.

Had President Johnson followed their advice then, the war in Vietnam would have been over 14 months ago. If President Nixon follows their advice now the war will be over this year. And we will be able to bring home, not only our soldiers, but also our prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, I include the petition, together with an article from the March 1968 issue of *Science & Mechanics* magazine, setting forth the views of 12 other illustrious American officers, following my remarks:

PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES BY RETIRED OFFICERS OF RANK AND EXPERIENCE

Whereas we who have served our country long and faithfully are grieved and shocked at the manner in which the war in Vietnam is being conducted, wasting our blood and treasure without hope of victory, and

Whereas experienced professionals all agree that the control of the conduct of the war cannot be successfully concluded from Washington by civilian politicians not fitted by training or experience, and some of doubtful devotion to this country, and

Whereas many of our greatest former military leaders have publicly stated in *Science & Mechanics Magazine* of March 1968 that this war can be won in 6 or 8 weeks or less:

Therefore, we respectfully petition the Government of the United States, in accordance with the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, for a redress of these grievances:

1. That the Congress assert its constitutional right and duty by declaring war against North Vietnam.

2. That the Chief Executive mobilize our armed forces according to recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

3. That the military commander in the theatre of war be given the responsibility and authority for its rapid and victorious conclusion.

4. That the U.S. Government inform all nations concerned that we are at war with North Vietnam and will consider any assistance in whatever form given to that country as an act of war against the U.S.A.

5. That the Government of the United States secure the services of the 600,000 Free Chinese Armed Forces for the prosecution of the war, as offered by Free China.

6. That P.L. 87-297, The Arms Control & Disarmament Act, be instantly repealed.

7. That every person in public office or military command whose loyalty to the United States and its Constitution is by their acts shown to be diluted by other loyalties inimical thereto, such as World Government or Limited World Government, be promptly cashiered or impeached as provided in the United States Constitution.

8. That the criminally insane policy of relaying our strategic and tactical plans for conduct of the war in Vietnam to the communist controlled Security Council of the United Nations be stopped instantly.

SIGNATURES TO PETITION

NOTE.—General Cates, before signing the petition, deleted paragraph #5 and made the following comment concerning paragraph #1: "The time has come, in my opinion, to do one or two things. Either admit a defeat and execute a gradual withdrawal or declare war and prosecute it to the fullest. The latter is strongly recommended."

Gen. Clifton B. Cates, USMC (Ret.) Former Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

Gen. Edwin A. Pollock, USMC (Ret.), Battalion Commander, landing on Guadalcanal, Commanding General, 2nd Marine Division Commanding General, 1st Marine Division in Korea, 1962-1963, Commanding General, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S.C., Commandant, Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, Commanding General, Fleet Marine Forces, Pacific, Commanding General, Fleet Marine Forces, Atlantic.

Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, USMC (Ret.), Commanding Artillery, Guadalcanal, Commanding Artillery, 3rd Amphibious Corps, Guam, Commanding, 1st Marine Division, Okinawa, Inspector General, U.S. Marine Corps, Director of Personnel, U.S. Marine Corps.

V. Adm. Ralph W. Christie, USN (Ret.), Commander Submarines, Southwest Pacific, W.W. II.

Lt. Gen. Ralph J. Mitchell, USMC (Ret.), Commander, Marine Air SOPAC, W.W. II, Commander, Air SOPAC, W.W. II, Com-

mander, Air SOLS, W.W. II, Commander, Air NOROLS, W.W. II.

Lt. Gen. James P. Riseley, USMC (Ret.), Forty-one years of military service; last troop command, 1 Prov. Corps, Army and 3rd Marine Division in Japan, 1954-55.

Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, USAF (Ret.), Commanding General, Far East Air Forces under General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, AUS (Ret.), Asst. Chief of Staff, G-2, to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

R. Adm. Chester Ward, USN (Ret.), Former Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

R. Adm. Joseph H. Nevins, Jr., USN (Ret.), Principal Command: Commanding Amphibious Attack Group with Marines embarked in Sixth Fleet.

R. Adm. John G. Crommelin, USN (Ret.), Brig. Gen. Hanson R. Thyng, USAF (Ret.), Air Defense Command.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lemly, USMC (Ret.), Last Command: Marine Air Defense Command One, Marine Air Wing Two, Okinawa, Ryukyus.

Brig. Gen. Eugene S. Bibb, AUS (Ret.).

Brig. Gen. Robert Lee Scott, Jr., USAF (Ret.), Former Director, Information, USAF; Fighter Advocate for General C. L. Chenault in China 1942-43; Commanding Officer, 23rd Fighter Group in China, 388 combat missions; Fighter Ace with 13 confirmed victories in aerial combat. Author: "God Is My Co-Pilot" and a dozen other books; At present, Senior Vice-President American Triad Corp., Tacoma, Washington.

Brig. Gen. William L. Lee, USAF (Ret.), Commanded the 49th Bomb Wing in Italy during W.W. II and the 13th Force in the Philippines, 1954-56.

Capt. E. C. Beck, USN (Ret.). Lt. Col. Charles Richardson, Jr., JAGC (Ret.).

Lt. Col. John L. Hitchings, AUS (Ret.), Flying instructor, W.W. I, Commanded Anti-Aircraft Group in S.W. Pacific, W.W. II.

Col. Charles Ellis, Cavalry AUS (Ret.), W.W. I, W.W. II, Comdg. 91st Cav., RCN Sqn & 3 Task Forces W.W. II; Chairman, Nat. Def. Committee, Military Order of the World Wars.

Cmdr. Homer Brett, Jr., USNR (Ret.). Capt. Frank Stoutenburgh, S.C., USN.

Col. H. A. Mathews, AUS (Ret.). Capt. B. Y. Ramsey, Jr., USN (Ret.).

Lt. Col. Matthew P. McKeon, AUS (Ret.). Capt. Medrick G. Johnson, USAF (Ret.).

Lt. John C. Williams, USN (Res.). Thirteen letters of commendation in thirteen years commissioned service.

Brig. Gen. Richard B. Moran, USA (Ret.).

SIGNATURES OF CIVILIANS

Mr. Thomas Crompton, Commander, MacArthur Post, V.F.W.

The Honorable John G. Schmit, State Senator, California.

WE CAN WIN THE WAR IN 6 WEEKS

(NOTE.—Why is the world's most powerful nation being frustrated in its attempt to defeat its relatively tiny Vietnamese foe? *Science & Mechanics* sent writer Lloyd Mallan to Washington to get the views of military experts on this question. His surprising and informative findings are reported here.)

(By Lloyd Mallan)

I spoke with a dozen top-ranking military officers, most of them at great length, as the basis for this exclusive article. Among these leaders are two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a famed Chief of Naval Operations, a retired Chief of Staff of the Army, two Vice Chiefs of Staff of the Air Force and the former Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command (SAC). Two of the dozen, still on active duty, cannot be named or even identified as to their military departments.

The others are identified by their ranks and positions below:

1. General Maxwell D. Taylor, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
2. General Nathan F. Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
3. Anonymous, General, U.S. Army.
4. Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations.
5. General George H. Decker, former Army Chief of Staff.
6. General Frederic H. Smith, Jr., Former Vice Chief of Staff, Air Force.
7. General Thomas S. Power, former Commander-in-Chief, Strategic Air Command.
8. Lieutenant General Ira C. Eaker, former Vice Chief of Staff, Air Force.
9. Lieutenant General Arthur G. Trudeau, former Army Chief of Research and Development.
10. Major General Gilbert L. Meyers, former Deputy Commander of both the Second Air Division, Pacific Air Force, and the Seventh Air Force in Vietnam.
11. Brigadier General Henry C. Huglin, former U.S. Representative to the NATO Military Committee and Standing Group and presently Senior Military Scientist with TEMPO, General Electric Company's Center for Advanced Studies.
12. Anonymous, Brigadier General, U.S. Army.

If you are a parent with draft-age sons, if you are any draft-age male, if you are simply a decent American who desires all peoples of the world to live in peace and freedom—then you will be happy to learn that the war against North Vietnam can be irrevocably won in six weeks. It may also make you happy to know that Communist intimidations and aggressions in the free areas of Asia can also be struck a paralyzing blow in that same brief frame of time.

And once the war in the North is ended, the remaining Vietcong guerrillas in the South could be conquered within six months—their tactics of terror and murder reduced to sporadic individual acts of desperation. Eventually, these, too, would vanish under pressure from the free Vietnamese people.

The foregoing time-estimates for victory in Vietnam are based on serious, lengthy discussions with some of the most experienced and astute military strategists in this country. Not one of these military authorities knew in advance what the others had told me. Yet every one of them was in strict agreement with every other one. They were also unanimous in their confidence that neither Russia nor Red China would dare step in physically to confront us—if we did what we have to do for victory.

Here are their recommendations for a quick victory in Vietnam:

Officially declare a state of war against the Hanoi Government.

Immediately close the port of Haiphong, through which Hanoi receives at least 70 percent of her war supplies.

Invade the North above the 17th Parallel. Swiftly destroy all targets of consequence, after first warning the North Vietnamese people to get out of the target areas.

Warn Red China and Russia that we are now legally at war with North Vietnam—and that any attempt to supply the North with arms would be answered militarily as an overt act of war against us.

Harsh as these measures may appear to be, they are the only way abruptly to stop a war that may go on for another five, ten or more years—if it continues to be fought as at present.

The average person—no matter how well-informed he may be in other matters—cannot possibly know what goes on behind the scenes of Government. He cannot know the spurious political "reasoning" that determines why we are fighting a war in a weak-sister manner that is unprecedented

throughout the history of military science—when we have the strength to squash North Vietnam in practically a single blow.

Feeling that the American public has an inalienable right to know why our Government is not doing just this, Science & Mechanics assigned me to the task of finding an answer. The task took three months of steady digging and interviewing for behind-the-scenes information.

My first bit of information was surprising: I tried the Pentagon and discovered that no military officer of either high or low rank was permitted to talk about why we are doing things the way we are in Vietnam. They are allowed to give you a "briefing" on the way things are going in the war, but they are not allowed to give you their personal criticisms—even "off-the-record." As one Public Affairs Officer in the Department of Defense explained it to me: "Even if you would not attribute your quotes to a specific officer, his name would be known after you published your article—because there would be a record here of the officers we cleared you with for interviews. That record is mandatory."

In other words, the press of this free nation does not have a right to inform the public about Government policies that could be wrong. I was effectively blocked by the Department of Defense at the very beginning—or so they thought. Since I happen to have a few old friends in the Pentagon who are willing to see me without the intervention of the DoD Public Affairs people, I went directly to one of them who had spent more than a year in Vietnam and was not long back in his new job. To make things "legal," I talked with him outside of the Pentagon. Although I cannot identify either him or the military department in which he works (otherwise he would be in deep trouble), I can say that he is a ranking officer with considerable experience. Here's what he told me:

"I can't understand the way we're fighting this war. We knew about the SAM (Russian Surface-to-Air Missile) sites at least five months before the first one was fired—and we did not knock them out for fear of killing Russians working on them! Now the SAMs are killing our boys. So now we attack those missile sites—after the enemy has had a chance to protect them with modern radar-controlled weapons.

"In fact, our slowpoke way of fighting this war has given the enemy the time and security to build up the most concentrated anti-aircraft firepower in military history."

What would he suggest doing to win the war faster than we are now doing?

"Although the element of surprise is now gone," he answered, "the North could be paralyzed quickly with an all-out invasion by air, sea and land. Blockade all of Hanoi's harbors. We could do this effectively by filling some of our old Liberty Ships with cement, drive them on up there to the harbor-mouths and scuttle them—sink them in the shallow waters. Of course, they would have to be conveyed to their scuttling destination by our Navy and protected against enemy fire by both the Navy and our Air Force. But it can be done.

"I would also mine the Haiphong harbor. It would be comparatively easy to drop the mines from our aircraft. Hell, the enemy has mined the harbor at Saigon—and caused a lot of damage to our shipping. Why don't we do the same thing to North Vietnam?"

"Meanwhile, an amphibious landing of our forces in the area surrounding Haiphong would be decisive. It would force Ho Chi Minh's hand. He would have to recall his troops from the South to fight for survival in his own homeland. And I might mention that our firepower is superior to that of the North Vietnamese Army. Another factor, an extremely vital one, in this kind of invasion is the psychological one. The people of North Vietnam would see that we meant business.

It would shake them up. And Ho would be faced with internal dissent as well as with external military force.

"Add to this an invasion over the 17th Parallel and concentrated bombardment of every important target by air and sea—and the war in the North would be finished within six weeks."

"But how about the Vietcong in the South?" I asked. "Wouldn't they continue to fight their guerrilla war against Saigon?"

"They would—for awhile," he said. "But anyone who wants to fight effectively needs food as well as arms. Their major supply of both would be cut off with the defeat of Hanoi. Then you blockade the borders of Cambodia and Laos—and you cut off their minor sources of supply. The Vietcong couldn't last. They would just dry up and drop off the trees."

There remained a great big question: why are we not fighting the war in Vietnam the way it should be fought? I asked this of another officer, even higher in rank and broader in experience. Understandably he wants to remain anonymous. His answer was: "Politics, people who mistrust the military, naivete and fear resulting from misinformation. Another important quality involved is the concept of 'flexible response,' which was derived from the personal aspirations of a single individual."

This very high-ranking military officer then told me the following story:

"Just after the Air Force was disengaged from Army control and set up as a separate military department, the emphasis was being placed on air power. At the time, President Eisenhower saw the vital importance of building a powerful Air Force, second to none in the world. So the biggest portion of the Defense budget went into realizing this aim.

"General Maxwell Taylor, then Army Chief of Staff, resented this. He personally had two dislikes. Number one, with a vengeance, was the Air Force. Number two, with lesser intensity, was the Navy. He saw the Army being neglected, losing the elite prestige it had held during all the years before. He tried persistently to persuade the President to build up the Army rather than the Air Force. His reasoning was that, if a shooting war ever again got started, there would be a huge vacuum if the Army were not supported.

"Ike wouldn't buy this reasoning. There are some enemy armies—the Red Chinese, for instance, with their multitudes of potential conscripts—that you cannot effectively fight with a land army. But you can destroy an enemy's capability to support an army with superior firepower from the air and sea; you knock out his means of communication, industrial production and food production. Thereby you paralyze not only an enemy's capability but his will to wage war. So who cares about the vacuum? You can't step into it anyway.

"Nevertheless, General Taylor continued to badger General Eisenhower about the need to fill that vacuum. He finally went to his friends in the Congress, asking them to put pressure on the President. Ike got mad. He called Taylor in and very firmly demanded that Taylor stop hitting away at the subject on Capitol Hill and elsewhere.

"General Taylor was silenced until a new President was elected. Then he went to JFK with his old pitch. He also proposed a new approach to warfare—because he wanted to get some Army troops into Vietnam. (During Ike's Administration, a comparative handful of U.S. military advisors had been sent to Vietnam at the request for aid of the Saigon Government. And Ike had insisted that these advisors wear civilian clothes.) Taylor's new plan would be step one toward rebuilding the Army's prestige and power.

"He proposed the present system of minor escalations: hit an enemy, but not too hard, and stop and wait to see what he will do

next. This was the theory of 'flexible response.' It is a slow-moving way to fight a war because it keeps you basically on the defensive. But it served its purpose for General Taylor.

"The idea appealed to President Kennedy and his intellectual advisers in the White House, Department of State and Department of Defense. Most of them mistrusted the military anyway. They thought that this would be a 'humane' way to show the enemy we were supporting the South Vietnamese Government—without any danger of an actual confrontation with Red China or the Soviet Union.

"After they bought the idea, General Taylor saw his Army gradually come to life again. The comparatively few American military advisers wearing civilian clothes in Vietnam under Eisenhower soon expanded to 16,000 troops in uniform under Kennedy. Because the 'flexible-response' technique actually bought time for the enemy to infiltrate more and more troops from the North into the South, the United States was forced to meet the challenge by sending an ever-increasing number of troops to Vietnam. As of right now (mid-November 1967), there are almost a half-million of our men in Vietnam, much more than half of them being troops of the U.S. Army. Little more than ten percent of them are Air Force and Navy personnel.

"So under LBJ, the war has escalated in terms of men and firepower. But both are restricted to a 'flexible response'—which is not so flexible after all, because it places us in an unscientific straightjacket of limiting our objectives. In the minds of those civilian Government intellectual advisers to the President, the phrase 'Limited War' has been equated with 'Limited Warfare.' And this is a no-win policy."

After listening to this story, I was stunned. It just couldn't be true that a tiny group of intellectual advisers could control the destiny of the most powerful nation on Earth. Whether or not they were sincere in their beliefs is beside the point. I decided to check out the story at its source: I phoned General Maxwell D. Taylor, now retired from the Army, at his home in Washington, D.C. He was at work and his wife gave me the phone numbers for his two offices. One of these was in the White House. It was late in the afternoon and I could not reach him. But next morning I caught him in at home. Here's how our brief conversation went:

"I'm Lloyd Mallan from Davis Publications in New York."

"Yes. What can I do for you?"

"One of our magazines *Science & Mechanics*, is trying to do an objective article on the war in Vietnam, from a military point of view. I wonder if you'd mind answering a few questions?"

"No, I'm not for quotation, thank you."

"Well, at least, can you give me some background information?"

"No. Just read (he laughed) . . . Just read the record. (A pause.) Call General (Earl) Wheeler. He's on duty. I'm not."

"I did try the Pentagon. They won't talk."

"Well (another laugh), they're the people that ought to talk. I'm just another private citizen, out here reading the newspaper."

That was it. But I was curious about his having an office in the White House, so I phoned to ask for his title. General Taylor wears two hats in the White House. He is Special Consultant to the President and a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. Some "private citizen!"

My two anonymous military friends had earlier given me an excellent suggestion: try to get in touch with general officers of outstanding experience and insight, who are now retired. No Pentagon restrictions can prevent them from talking and being quoted by name. They suggested a few names to

start and this led me to others. Altogether I interviewed nine generals and an admiral. All of them took valuable time away from other work to talk with me for periods of one to two-and-a-half hours.

I will now present their cases for a quick end to the war in Vietnam, trying to list them in the order of their position and rank, as well as alphabetically in these terms wherever possible.

Air Force General Nathan F. Twining is a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the recipient of 27 medals from the United States and numerous foreign governments in recognition of his skill and courage. During World War II, among many other duties, he was respectively Commander of the Mediterranean Allied Strategic Forces and Commander of the 20th Air Force in the Pacific.

General Twining feels most strongly that "either we should hit the North of Vietnam with everything we've got, bring them to their knees fast—or get out. My own opinion is that we should declare a state of war and invade the North. Then we could legally blockade the harbor of Haiphong—and sink any foreign shipping that attempts to violate the blockade. Running the blockade would be a tacit act of war against us—and the Russians as well as Red China and any other nation supplying the North well know this."

He is not worried one bit about China or Russia coming into a war against us. He is only worried that the longer we wait to finish the job, the more strength we're allowing the enemy to build. "I would tell them all that we're changing our strategy, that as of right now we are starting a new war. I'd ask them to get their people out of important target areas—and then I'd lower the boom on them! We'd win that kind of a war real fast."

Regarding the desultory way we are now fighting in Vietnam and the way in which we give Hanoi sanctuaries to build strength by stating that certain targets are off-limits to our flyers, General Twining has this to say: "I played a lot of football in my day. You are in there to win the game, so you don't ever tell the opposing team when you are going to try a pass or make an end run. But this is exactly what we are doing in Vietnam. We even tell Ho that we have no intention of destroying either his economy or Government. Therefore he knows that there are vitally important targets we cannot destroy."

General Twining told me an exceptionally interesting inside story to illustrate how Russia and Red China have our Government's civilian advisers hoodwinked—and how these same advisers can impress their views upon the highest office in the land, unless at least one person with ranking authority bothers to investigate all sides of the issue. The issue in this case was the crisis in Lebanon, when the Russians were preparing to send in their tanks and armies to take over that small Middle Eastern nation. If the Kremlin could take over Lebanon, they would feel confident to attempt other coups among the Cento (Central Treaty Organization) and even the NATO nations. President Eisenhower was worried about engaging us in a war with Russia if we took military steps to prevent a Kremlin invasion of Lebanon. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was even more deeply disturbed because the President was depending upon his advice.

At two o'clock in the morning on the day of decision, General Twining received a phone call from the Secretary of State. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs was asked to come over and discuss the situation from a military point of view. The Lebanese Government had requested American troops to thwart the Kremlin, but Dulles' civilian advisers had warned him that by making a

show of force in Lebanon, World War III would be started.

Twining found Dulles pacing the floor when he arrived. The Secretary's first words were: "Nate, I want you to advise me about this. Is there any real danger that the presence of our troops in Lebanon would cause the Russians and their allies to go to war against us?"

The Chairman shook his head. "Negative. Not a chance," he answered. "They know our response would be massive—and our power is superior to theirs."

"Are you absolutely sure of this?" asked Dulles.

"Nobody can be absolutely sure of anything," said Twining. "But I am sure as anybody can be that it will not happen."

Dulles was still disturbed. "If that's the real truth, why are my advisers so worried?"

"I don't know," answered General Twining. "But maybe they misread the situation and underestimate our military strength—something that the Russians never do. But if you want, I'll phone the Chiefs of Staff and ask them to come over here and verify what I've just told you. They'll tell you, I'm sure, that the real danger to world peace would be to allow the Soviets to get away with this maneuver."

The Secretary of State smiled "That won't be necessary, Nate. I've known you for a number of years and asked your opinions on many serious questions. You've never let me down yet. Go back home and go to bed."

Not long after that early morning meeting, more than 3,000 Marines were landing on the shores of Lebanon. Khrushchev, who had been loudly rattling his tanks and rockets, never sent a single weapon to stop them.

According to General Nathan Twining, John Foster Dulles was one Secretary of State who wanted to stay on top of military matters. He frequently consulted with the Joint Chiefs of Staff for information about current opinions and strengths. He understood that the validity and effectiveness of any foreign policy are dependent upon the military force ready to back it up.

This is something that the civilian intellectual advisers in the White House, State Department, and Department of Defense have yet to learn. Their naivete not only promotes the concept of "flexible response" in Vietnam but goes even farther afield with another concept: that of military parity. They feel that by reducing our own military power to the level of our next most powerful enemy, we will gain the confidence of that enemy to the point where he will be content with a status-quo deadlock. In other words the Government civilian intellectual advisors feel that the destiny of this nation is in their hands, that world peace can be maintained only by reducing American superiority in arms to a parity with Russian military strength.

As General Twining put it to me: "I was never afraid of our military superiority causing a war. I knew that we had no intention of using it in an aggressive way. It was there solely as a deterrent, to discourage any other major power who is a potential enemy from attempting acts of aggression."

One thing that bothers the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs most is the misuse of airpower in Vietnam: "What is going on there now might someday reduce our Air Force to a small ineffectual fighting force—when we will most sorely need it! In Vietnam, the role of airpower is being played down. Research and development of new aircraft is practically at a standstill. And everything in Vietnam is controlled from Washington—all the target-strike decisions are made here, none by commanders in the field—even down to the platoon level in the case of the Army and Marine Corps."

In full agreement with General Twining about the way the war in Vietnam is being mishandled is Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, the

only man ever to hold the position of Chief of Naval Operations for three successive terms. During World War II in the Pacific, he became known as "31-knot Burke" because he pushed the destroyers under his command to their targets at just under boiler-bursting speed. The nickname is symbolic of how you win wars: strike fast, hard and with full force. Admiral Burke was a member of the United Nations Truce Delegation in Korea to negotiate with the Communists for a military armistice—so he is well-familiar with the sneaky and evasive tactics of the Reds. He has been decorated many times for "extraordinary heroism," for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity," for "exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States" and for "exceptionally meritorious conduct." He has received three Distinguished Service Medals and three Legion of Merit awards.

At present, Admiral Burke is Director for the Center of Strategic Studies of Georgetown University. I spent more than two hours with him in his spacious oak-paneled office. Against the wall facing his desk are three flags: flanking each side of the centrally placed American Flag are the Navy Department Flag and his personal 4-Star Flag as Chief of Naval Operations. A large ashtray on his desk is filled with pipes. Shortly after we shook hands, he picked up a pipe, filled it with tobacco—and then forgot to light it as we talked.

Well over six feet tall, he stood up and paced the room to emphasize his answers to my questions. There was an interesting contradiction in his quietly philosophical attitude as he made emphatic points.

When I asked him: "What would you do to win the war in Vietnam?" his answer was instantaneous.

"I would put our entire nation on a war footing. Mobilize the Army, Navy and Air Force. Go into mass-production of airplanes, take battleships out of mothballs (we are only just now beginning to use the 'New Jersey'). I'd call up the reserves. Then I would attack the enemy on all fronts—and show him that we really mean what we are doing, that we want to win.

"Individuals always act on an emotional basis—not on the basis of logic. When an enemy sees that you mean to win, his emotional response will be to retreat. He may still try to harass you and come back at you on a small scale—but if you convince him that you are out to win he will psychologically know he is defeated. Provided you have superior war power—as we do.

"At no time in the entire history of warfare has a war been won through minor escalations. Yet this is what we are doing in Vietnam—using minor escalations. So the enemy must feel that he can hold out. His reasoning goes: 'We're not being hit as badly as we thought we would be. We can hold out this way long enough for the peace-doves in the United States to prevail.'

"So we escalate ten percent at a time—and each time the enemy feels that he's not being hit so hard after all that we're not hitting him as hard as we can hit him, if we wanted to.

"Of course, if you go all-out to convince an enemy that you really mean to win, it may at the moment appear to cost more money. But it's much better to have more men and equipment than you need—than to have too little.

"This is where Mr. McNamara makes a sad mistake. He is basically interested in 'cost-effectiveness': 'Do I get the maximum value for each dollar I spend? And does this value represent the minimum necessary force to maintain our military strength?' But he is so much concerned with minute details that he cannot see the broad picture. He is lost in a murky morass of details—yet he is absolutely self-assured that he is correct.

"Only God and McNamara know they are right.

"In fact, the reason that Mr. McNamara was chosen as Secretary of Defense by the Administration was precisely because of his attitude—his interest in saving money—and not in saving lives or equipment. His is truly a political job—and not a military one. To him, war is a game of showmanship, often of salesmanship but rarely of a deep desire to win.

"Then there's the matter of body-counts. I believe this was Mr. McNamara's idea—to release counts on the number of enemy dead versus our own dead. But body-counts don't mean a thing—they're barbaric to begin with—because you don't want to kill people; you want to paralyze an enemy to the point where he is convinced that he must lose if he continues the war.

"We are not doing this today in Vietnam. And as a result, our own people are becoming discouraged, tired, disinterested and disenchanted. Many of them want us to pull out of Vietnam—and that would be fatal now.

"We can't pull out, because if we do, the Communists—and the world—would think we are weak. But nobody in the Pentagon—particularly Mr. McNamara—among the civilian planners ever asks the question: 'If we fall with our present attitude in Vietnam, what is our alternative to win the war? We have no alternate plan.

"At the present rate of minor escalations of the war, we'll be in Vietnam for another five or six years—or more. Maybe we'll eventually contradict the known facts of military history and win. We probably will. But the cost in lives, equipment and money will have been tremendous."

"Well," I ask, "if we take your approach toward winning the war, how about the Soviet Union and mainland China? There are a lot of intelligently thoughtful people who feel that a third global war would be started if we invaded North Vietnam.

Admiral Burke nodded and smiled. "You're right. Many people who know nothing about military science are afraid of what Mainland China and the Soviets would do if we invaded North Vietnam—and I would invade the North as well as mine the harbors, Haiphong and all the rest. In the case of Red China, they have their own internal political problems. Besides, their logistics to support an expeditionary force in Vietnam would be formidable. Our Navy and Air Force could strike and destroy vital targets anywhere inside the great Chinese land mass, thereby cutting off supplies from the Chinese Army in Vietnam. As for the USSR, their logistics would be also formidable—and their economy might be so strained in these conditions that they would just say to themselves: 'It's not worth it. Let's pull out altogether.'

"These are alternatives that the Administration and many of our people never seem to consider."

"Admiral Burke," I said, "if you were given full command of the war in Vietnam, how long do you think it would take you absolutely to defeat the enemy?"

He smiled again. "Nobody really can know how long it will take to win a war. There are too many variables and individuals involved. But considering the time required to mobilize and deploy the required forces, I would guess at from eight weeks to three months. At any rate, it would be a much, much shorter time than the years it will take using our present rate of minor escalation."

Supporting Admiral Burke's thesis that the war in Vietnam, if properly fought, could be won quickly is four-star General George H. Decker, a former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Among his many important assignments, General Decker has been Deputy Commander-in-Chief, U.S. European Command; Commander-in-Chief, United Nations Command; Commander, United States Forces in Korea; and Commanding General,

Eighth United States Army. He is a soft-spoken, earnest and intelligent man—a thoughtful person who is not given to snap judgments. Before our interview began, he asked me to emphasize that he was not on a soap box to promote his ideas, but any answer that he gave to my questions would be carefully considered. I spent a full hour talking with him.

My first question was: "What can we do, that we are not now doing, to win the war in Vietnam fast?"

His answer was: "Invade the North and blockade the port of Haiphong."

"Wouldn't that actively bring Red China and Russia into the battle?" I asked, to see whether or not his answer would match the answers of Admiral Burke and General Twining.

It did: "I am not afraid of mainland China or Russia. We are the most powerful nation on Earth today. We might not be able effectively to inactivate the Chinese foot armies, but we wouldn't have to. If we destroyed their strategic targets—notably their nuclear development installations—they would be defeated. They know this and it could be a strong deterrent to their entering a war against us. People around the world would cheer if we knocked out Red China's future potential as a nuclear power."

My next question was: "Then why don't we invade North Vietnam and blockade Haiphong?"

He grinned. "We try to build the illusion that this is not our war, that we are co-operating with friends—which we are. That illusion would be destroyed if we formally declared war against the North. But although this is essentially an Asian war, it is actually our war—a war to protect our national interests. A Communist-controlled Asia would be a real threat to those interests. Yet unless we do declare war against the North, we cannot legally invade or blockade.

"We do not have to fire shots to blockade. We merely tell the Soviet Union, Red China, Britain—whatever nation is delivering supplies to Hanoi—to keep their ships out of the area, if they do not want them damaged or sunk. This would be an effective deterrent.

"We have to be credible. Because of our present position of weakness, neither Hanoi, nor the Soviet Union, nor Red China believes us. They do not believe that we are determined to win.

"China entering the war physically would be abhorrent to Hanoi because they would overrun the North. They would probably pretend that their armies were comprised of volunteers, as they did in Korea, but this would make no difference if we were legally at war with the North.

"How about the Vietcong in the South?" I asked.

"They would dry up on the vine," answered General Decker. "Without supplies from the North and/or the Soviet Union and Red China, they could not continue to fight. Right now they have trouble getting recruits from among their own Southern people. They have had to draw on the North for 'recruits.'"

"Then you do believe that the only answer to sure and quick victory is to go 'all-out' to win right now?"

He nodded. "Now our stated policy is that we do not want to destroy the Government of North Vietnam. Invasion might do this—but not if we handled things as General MacArthur did in Japan. We could make a treaty with Hanoi and place restrictions on their aid to the Vietcong among other things. They would have to abide by that treaty, whether or not they wanted to, because we would police them."

"General Decker, would you mind elaborating a little more on why Red China would not enter a war against us if we invaded North Vietnam?"

"Well, there are a half-million National-

ist Chinese troops on the island of Taiwan. I saw them practice maneuvers—and they are excellently trained soldiers and airmen. They are eager to take a crack at the Red Chinese. In case of war, we, of course, would have to transport them to the mainland of China. But in the doubtful event that we are in a formal state of war with Red China, such a move would be routine.

"I don't know how nervous mainland China would be about this threat from Taiwan, but the threat is not inconsiderable—in a practical physical sense."

General Decker's personal attitude is, in summary: "We have never won the war in Korea—because of our methods. We are not winning in Vietnam for the same reason. If we are going to fight a war—we should fight it."

General George Decker should certainly know whereof he speaks. As Commander of all United Nations troops, including those of the United States, in Korea for two years his experience is firsthand.

Another officer with great firsthand experience is Air Force General Thomas S. Power, who not too long ago was Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command. In fact, as Vice Commander of SAC under General Curtis E. LeMay, he was responsible, along with his boss, for building the command into the world's most powerful strategic force. This was accomplished within six short years. Today, SAC remains the world's most potent force for peace, since no potential enemy of the United States would dare to challenge its power.

Apart from his combat duty of North Africa and Italy as a B-24 pilot with the 305th Bomb Wing, during World War II General Power was also Commander of the 314th (Very Heavy) Bomb Wing in the Pacific. He directed the first large-scale B-29 fire-bomb raids on Tokyo. He was also Commander of the Air Research and Development Command (now the Air Force Systems Command). In 1959 he was presented the Air Force Association's H. H. Arnold Award as "Aviation's Man of the year."

His decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit with one cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal with one oak-leaf cluster, the Commendation Ribbon with one cluster, and the French Croix de Guerre with palm.

I asked General Power: "What would you do to end the war in Vietnam—fast?"

"First I'd close the port of Haiphong," he answered, "and then I would keep going until the works of man were literally destroyed. At any time along the way, the North Vietnamese could end the war—if they wanted to. All they have to do is say: 'We will stop the killing in South Vietnam. We will get out of South Vietnam.' And the war would end at that minute. They have complete control over ending the war."

"So if you were in command, what specifically would you do to convince Hanoi that their goal was futile?"

Without hesitation, General Power said: "I'd destroy the works of man in North Vietnam."

"You mean, all strategic targets?" I asked.

"I mean *all* targets. *All* the works of man." He paused and then stated emphatically: "If you show them that you mean what you say, you're going to defeat them."

"Do you feel that they think we mean what we say right now?"

"Well, right now we're doing things in a very restrained and moral way—but in this way we lose the psychological impact. We cause the enemy to think he can survive, because someday we'll be forced to quit due to internal pressure."

"And of course all these damned fools here in this country who are creating the wrong

image—one of weakness—cause Ho Chi Minh to think that he is going to win this war in Washington. And this is what keeps him going."

"How would you change his mind?"

"I think the thing to do is just increase the level of pressure on him—so that he'll be damned well convinced that these knotheads in the United States who are so loudly protesting for peace are not going to be able to stop our actions. Because those actions will be coming at him too fast for him to be encouraged."

"The worst thing you can do in a war is to fight it piecemeal—because then you encourage the enemy to keep going. And we're piecemealing the whole thing right now. I think we're winning, but very slowly. The enemy can't take all that pounding day after day and not be somewhat discouraged. But air power—and any other power—is not being used properly in North Vietnam. We're piecemealing it."

"One of the lessons we learned in World War II was: never go back to a target: In other words, you're going in to destroy it—so destroy it. For two reasons: one, it saves your life—you don't have to keep on going back into that flak again and again. But the second thing is: the psychological impact of destroying a target—all at once, for good. This has a tremendous impact. Now if the enemy survives an attack, this kind of gives him hope that he'll survive all attacks—which, psychologically, is bad."

"If our Government acted on your advice, how soon do you think the war would end?"

General Power paused. "It would depend upon the condition the North Vietnamese are left in. There's not too much in their country to begin with. But after all, they have to have something—they have to have food. So if you closed their ports and then really hammered them—that war would be over, but quick!"

"My only point is this—and this is a crude example: if we leave Ho Chi Minh sitting on a broken down orange crate with his bare butt sticking out of his ragged trousers while he looks over his whole country in ruins, then he would have to ask himself: 'Well, Little Man, was it such a good idea after all to invade the South?'"

"I think we ought to ask him if he'd like to be in that position."

"And if he *does* end up in that position, I think we ought to tell all other potential gangsters who are trying to grab countries, such as Thailand, for instance: 'Take a look at Ho! This is what can happen to you. This is no child's play. We're just not going to let you get away with aggression. And if you try, here's what will happen to you. That's the way I feel about the war in Vietnam.'"

Another Air Force General, Frederick H. Smith, Jr., has equally strong feelings about the way the war in Vietnam is being fought. General Smith was Vice Chief of the Air Staff under General LeMay. His other credentials include: Chief of Staff, Strategic Air Command; Commanding General Eastern Air Defense Force; Vice Commander, Air Defense Command; Commander, Fifth Air Force; Commander, United States Forces in Japan; and Commander, United States Air Forces in Europe. He has been awarded 14 major decorations, several of them with clusters, and is a keen, earnest student of military history.

How does General Smith feel about our present tactics in Vietnam?

"The war could continue for years if it is carried on at the present rate. We allow the North Vietnamese to get used to our bombing each time before we step it up. Then they get used to the step-up. And so it will go for a long, long time. Using this approach, at the very beginning we lost the element-of-surprise advantage that is vital to winning a war. That war would have been over

in less than a year—if we fought it correctly at the beginning."

"What would be the correct way to fight it?" I asked.

His answer matched the answers of every other knowledgeable military man I had spoken with: "Blockade or mine the port of Haiphong. At least seventy percent of all supplies to Hanoi come through Haiphong and ancillary ports. Once the ports are knocked out, the main supply-load would be placed on a couple of railroads from mainland China—which could easily be knocked out at strategic points."

"Then there are the dikes and canals in North Vietnam which feed the rice paddies. If we knocked them out, the people would soon be without food—and give up. Once they surrendered, we could supply them with food, of course, and help them rebuild their agriculture and industry."

I asked: "How soon would the war be over if we did as you suggest?"

"A couple, three months—maybe less," he answered immediately.

"Would this apply to the Vietcong in the South as well?"

"Well, they would be cut off from supplies because Hanoi was cut off. We could then go all-out to pacify the Vietcong—divide, 'splinter' them. When the Southern villagers saw that we meant business, when they *knew* that we were fighting for them, then they would not cooperate with the Vietcong—who get their support by intimidation and terrorism. The villagers really do not care for the Vietcong—but under the pressure of threat they really don't know what else to do but support and supply the Communist guerrillas."

The question of small nuclear weapons came up, since General Smith is an expert in this field. He does not recommend their use—but feels that if we did use them the war would be over in a week, without any radiation danger either to the people of Vietnam or of the world. As he put it:

"The radiation effects would be local, they would not spread if we used small two-tenths-of-a-kiloton bombs in air bursts. Only the dust kicked up would be radioactive and soon would be dissipated harmlessly to the atmosphere. A nuclear ground burst, of course, would create a 'hot spot' at the site of the explosion. But you could get away with air bursts for specific targets."

"The public, including the press in general, doesn't know the difference between tactical nuclear weapons of low yield and strategic weapons of megatonnage yield. They equate both—and our own Government has laid the foundation for this belief by years of 'abhorring' the use of nuclear weapons. Now this present Administration *cannot* dare to employ even the smallest tactical nuclear weapons. It would take a new Administration, using a solid educational program on the subject, to be able to build up to the use of small nuclear weapons."

"Of course, if we did employ these small 'nukes' there would be a big fuss kicked up by Russia and Red China. But neither would dare attack us. They would know that we meant business. The Russians would try to harass us in Europe, of course, as they did in the situation that caused the Berlin airlift—but they would not want to start a global war over our use of small nuclear weapons in Vietnam. Neither would China want to start such a war. They know that the odds would be against them. Peking is extremely sensitive to the well-trained half-million troops on Taiwan. Before employing any small tactical nuclear weapons, we could make a big show of getting those troops ready for an invasion of Red China; we could openly build their efficiency even further by giving them practice in war-games. We could have a number of landing barges sitting in the Taiwan harbors. This would intimidate the Red Chinese leaders—who would expect an

invasion of their homeland if they entered the war against us in Vietnam. But I don't really advocate the use of nuclear weapons—except for their element of surprise and to clear out the Demilitarized Zone in Vietnam."

Regarding the so-called Demilitarized Zone, which is used as a staging area by the North Vietnamese Army, General Smith pointed out that a tremendous saving in time, American lives and equipment could be accomplished swiftly by the use of low-yield nuclear bombs. One 20-kiloton tactical nuclear bomb would be equivalent in its effect to 16,000 sorties of tactical aircraft each carrying two napalm-tanks under its wings. If Hanoi wants to fight dirty, he feels, so should we. But we can do it without any dirty fallout of radiation—even if we used tactical nuclear weapons.

Still another Air Force General, one with three stars this time, who is bitterly critical of the way that our Government is waging the war in Vietnam is Lt. General Ira C. Eaker. General Eaker is an oldtimer with considerable military experience and insights. He has assiduously kept himself current on all aspects of world affairs, and especially on the war in Vietnam. General Eaker was Vice Chief of the Air Staff under the famous and forward-looking General "Hap" Arnold, the man who founded and developed the science of air supremacy. General Eaker was Commander of the Eighth Air Force in England during World War II. Later, he became Commanding General of all U.S. Army Air Forces in the United Kingdom. Following this assignment, he was named Air Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces. He has also been Chief of the Air Staff.

One of General Eaker's many citations reads: "His contribution was of major importance in the successful prosecution of the war against the Axis."

As regards the prosecution of the war in Vietnam, I'll let General Eaker speak for himself:

"Without question, Ho Chi Minh is encouraged to continue his efforts against us by the Vietnam war-critics in this country. His continued aggression is now causing more than 2,000 U.S. casualties each week.

"Having a few of our people give aid and comfort to the enemy appears to be a price we pay for fighting an undeclared war. Such criticism of national policy was not tolerated in World Wars I and II—and it probably would be muted now if we were officially and legally at war.

"Our civilian leaders have also said that they do not wish to build up a war-psychology in this country. This might bring irresistible pressure upon them to use more force than they presently desire to employ. Well, they can't have it both ways. They can scarcely expect all-out popular support when they themselves are not sure whether we are really at war.

"The most serious form of dissent and criticism of our tactics in Vietnam is the constant expression, in some quarters, of a morbid fear that our effort there may bring Red Chinese or Russian forces into the conflict. This hand-wringing, craven attitude is an open invitation for such an intercession. If the Red Chinese become convinced that our national leadership is palsied with fear and can be deterred from our just purpose in Vietnam, they will certainly invade there as they did in Korea.

"The clearest lesson from fifty years of dealing with Communists must be this: negotiate only from strength and with firmness. Our leadership should now issue an unmistakable warning that any Russian or Chinese forces which invade South Vietnam will be destroyed promptly."

Among the many points made to me by General Eaker, the following are most pertinent to our quick success in Vietnam:

1. "After our determination to go to war, subsequent decisions involved the forces to

be committed and the strategy and tactics to be employed. These have been made by our political leaders, sometimes without—or heedless of—military advice. These leaders made such frequent and pleading proposals to the enemy to come to the peace table that Ho Chi Minh drew the natural conclusion that he was winning. At times our political leaders have appeared to be palsied by fear of world opinion, or of what Russia and Red China would do. The Israelis recently demonstrated that these need not be controlling considerations."

2. "Our political leaders elected to fight a land war, where every advantage lay with the enemy, and to employ our vast sea and air superiority in very limited supporting roles only."

3. "Surprise, perhaps the greatest of the principles of war (confirmed by the Arab-Israeli conflict), was deliberately sacrificed when our leaders revealed our strategy and tactics to the enemy. For example, they told the enemy that he need not fear invasion of North Vietnam. Whether or not we ever intended to invade the North, we should have employed every ruse known to the military art to convince Ho Chi Minh that invasion was imminent."

4. "The enemy was told also that we would not bomb populated areas, heavy industry, canals, dams and other critical targets—and thus sanctuaries were established by us along the Chinese border and around Haiphong and Hanoi. This permitted the enemy to concentrate antiaircraft defenses around the North Vietnamese targets that our Air Force was permitted to attack—greatly increasing our casualties. Missiles, oil and ammunition were permitted to enter Haiphong harbor unmolested and without protest."

5. "Unified command in the war zone, a necessity for military success as demonstrated in World War II and Korea, has not been established in Vietnam."

6. "U.S. political leaders have said that we do not desire to eliminate a viable economy in North Vietnam. This is tantamount to forswearing victory—since a prime essential for military success is a viable economy. If Allied leaders had pursued such a policy in World War II, Hitler and Tojo might now be in charge of Europe and the Pacific nations."

7. "The Vietnam war is costing Russia about one billion dollars a year (at the dubious Russian established rate-of-exchange). It is costing the Red Chinese even less. The United States is spending more than twenty-five billion dollars in Vietnam annually. And the Allies are suffering over ten thousand casualties a month, of which about seven or more thousand are Americans. The Kremlin and Peking obviously look upon Vietnam as a very profitable venture in the overall East-West conflict. They can be expected, therefore, to insure that it continues so long as it proves profitable."

8. "Our leaders have elected to remain on the defensive in Vietnam. If we had stayed on the defensive in Korea, we might still be fighting there. If the Israelis had remained on the defensive in the Arab War, they would not have won."

What is General Eaker's recommendation to end the war in Vietnam quickly? It is exactly the same as the recommendation of every other experienced military expert with whom I have spoken: invade the North, close Haiphong and destroy every target that permits Hanoi to continue carrying on the war against us and the South.

One of the most astute of the military experts I questioned is Lt. General Arthur G. Trudeau, former Army Chief of Research and Development. His earlier assignments of importance, to name only a few, include: Commandant, Army War College; Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence; Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, Headquarters, United Nations Command and Far East Command; and Commanding General, Headquarters, First Corps,

in Korea. At present, General Trudeau is President of the Gulf Research and Development Company, Gulf Oil Company. He has been awarded a dozen important decorations for heroism and distinguished service.

Regarding the "threat" of mainland China and the Soviet Union, he said: "Red China doesn't bother me. They won't enter the war. They have too many internal troubles. And to support a war today would be beyond their logistic capabilities. Soviet Russia would not overtly enter the war either. They might try to harass us in many ways—to divert our efforts and energies. But again, their logistic lines would be impossible for them to support a war against us in North Vietnam."

With that big bugaboo cleared away, General Trudeau then proceeded to analyze the war situation in Vietnam as it stands now: "Two years ago, we could have quickly defeated Hanoi. When you decide to apply force—as we have decided to do—then you must apply it once and on as massive a scale as possible.

"But the way we're doing it is like someone suffering from a long illness that gradually gets worse. The gradual development allows the victim to become accustomed to more and more pain—so he learns to bear it. While if he were in an accident and broke a leg, or suffered an even worse, more abrupt shock, his tendency would be to give up. It's an 'unbearable' situation—because he was not prepared for it. In warfare, the element of surprise shock is vitally important. And we have not used that element in Vietnam."

"Is there any possibility," I asked, "that we can still recover that advantage of surprise and shock. How would you do it now?"

General Trudeau was thoughtful for several moments. "What would I do to bring this element into being again—although now it's late and much tougher to achieve? One, I would close the port of Haiphong. Two, I would destroy the rail communications between Hanoi and Red China. Three, I would cross the Seventeenth Parallel and set up a land army at two positions above the line to command passes and roads to the South.

"This would not be easy to do, but it's possible—if we controlled access to the sea, we could supply our troops by sea. It appears to me that we are already in control of the sea—if we wanted to make a point of it."

General Trudeau picked up a pencil and drew a map for me. He pictured the Chinese island of Hainan, on which Russian MIG fighters are based, safe from our bombs because we are afraid to irritate Russia and the Red Chinese. From the sanctuary of Hainan, the MIGs fly out to engage our tactical bombers and fighters. They've shot down far too many of our pilots as of this writing. But General Trudeau was not talking about control of the sea. "Our ships pass by this island at will right now. The Chinese have done nothing to stop us."

Next he drew the Vietnamese seacoast and indicated the positions of Haiphong, Vinh and a small mountainous area with a high point of 3,000 feet. The area is 150 miles north of the Seventeenth Parallel. He continued to draw in the Ho Chi Minh Trail and the roads that branch from it into Laos and Cambodia. Over these roads come a percentage of war supplies for the Vietcong from the two "neutral" countries. He indicated the position of a pass along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, which lies south of the roads and just below the 3,000-foot high-ground area. Finally, he penciled in the railroad from the Port of Haiphong to Longson on the Chinese Border, as well as another railroad that branched off from it at Hanoi to No Cay in China.

"Now," said General Trudeau, "if we make an amphibious landing of troops and settle them in on the high ground, they can control that pass and prevent supplies from going south to the Vietcong. Then we close Haiphong and destroy those railroads—to

prevent supplies from China and anywhere else from reaching Hanoi. If we do this, the war will be over fast."

"How fast?" was my natural question.

He paused long and thoughtfully. "That's tough to answer. But let me put it this way: if we close off the enemy's supply lines as I suggest starting now, it would be a great big boost to the Democrats' convention next August. I am not saying that it would take that long for the war to end. I am just giving you a time-envelope so you can make your own deductions."

"Personally, I am a Republican—and I would hate to see the Democrats gain such a boost. They would win the election, probably. But I would like to see them do this right now—for the good of our country. The security and survival of the United States must not depend upon partisanship. It must cut across all political considerations."

"The war in Vietnam is not merely an Asian war to give the South Vietnamese a chance to govern themselves. It is much bigger than that. It is a policy war to stop those behind both the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. It is aimed at preventing both Russia and Red China from gaining their stated objectives—which are to defeat their mightiest 'enemy', the U.S.A."

"In this sense, it is a war of survival for us. And the sooner the people of the United States understand this, the healthier and safer we will be."

As to closing the port of Haiphong, General Trudeau believes that the easiest way would be to sink the North Vietnamese barges that are continually clearing out and deepening the port's shallow channels. The barges could be sunk from the air.

General Trudeau punctuated our interview with an indignant postscript:

"McNamara claims that Haiphong supplies only a small percentage—he says about fifteen percent—of war materials to Hanoi. He is simply not correct. A major source of supply is Haiphong. It's more like seventy percent."

Neither General Trudeau nor Admiral Arleigh Burke is alone in their censure of the Secretary of Defense. One very high military authority, who doesn't want to be named, told me: "Mr. McNamara has never made a major military policy, decision or forecast about the war in Vietnam that has been correct." Still another authority said of the Defense Secretary: "He reasons from a conclusion to a hypothesis."

A more bitter critic of the Secretary is Air Force Maj. General Gilbert L. Meyers, a man who has been intimately associated with the Vietnamese war. In fact, until about a year ago, he ran the air war both inside and outside of Vietnam. As Deputy Commander of the Seventh Air Force, he had the practical nuts-and-bolts job of not only managing the air strikes over the North but also of directing the Thailand-based B-52s in their bombing of the South. One of my Pentagon friends says of him: "Gil Meyers is the most knowledgeable man you'll ever find regarding the war in Vietnam."

General Meyers himself says of Secretary McNamara: "If you can't come up with a numerical figure that proves we're going to win, why he won't buy any plan or suggestion. He's always looking for evidence. And you just can't look at a war on a facts-and-figure basis. For example, Mr. McNamara uses a figure to show why we don't have to knock out Haiphong. He claims that in South Vietnam the Vietcong and the North's regulars need only a relatively small tonnage of supplies to continue the war. And that if we knock out Haiphong, they could still bring in that minimum amount of tonnage without any difficulty."

"Is that true?" I asked.

"No, it isn't true!"

General Meyers continued. "I think the

best description I've heard about the way Washington runs the war in Vietnam was General Eaker's. The sum and substance of his comment was that in the past, wars were fought by the civilians and managed by the professionals. But in this war, it's being fought by the professionals and managed by the amateurs."

General Meyers certainly has the professional background to speak out authoritatively. He is a fighter pilot with many important credits and 22 major decorations and medals. He was Commander of the First Fighter Group, the first jet fighter unit in the Air Force. For two years, during the Korean War, he was Director of Operations of the Fifth Air Force. Under his command, the 368th Fighter Group was the first Air Force unit to land in Normandy during World War II. More recently, before he was assigned to Vietnam, he was Commander of the USAF Tactical Air Warfare Center. His personal philosophy of life is: "Initiative and hard work will solve any problem." This is borne out by his survival of almost 60 tough combat missions on which he destroyed tanks and gun positions.

What does General Meyers think we should do to end the war in Vietnam quickly?

"You go after the lighters that unload the ships in Haiphong Harbor. The water is fairly shallow up there and the ships from Russia, China and Eastern Europe have to anchor some distance offshore—which means that the lighters have to travel a considerable distance. They can obviously be intercepted and destroyed by our Navy and some of them by air. I don't see any reason why we'd have to come in contact with the ships themselves—if we're afraid of angering the Russians and Chinese—in order to destroy their cargo."

"And I'd keep going after those lighters until the enemy ran out of them, could not build any more. Then there are other important targets I'd hit. There's the Command Headquarters in Hanoi. The Air Defense Headquarters are there too. These are the kinds of targets, for example, that we hit all the time in World War II. And all I'm suggesting is that we use the same kind of targets in North Vietnam."

"So why don't we?" I asked.

"Well, that question defeats me. Of course, in Washington, the big bugaboo they talk about is a fear that the Russians and the Chinese will come into the war. I think that's ridiculous! Our civilian planners in Washington always refer to the 'increased risk.' Now, I'll admit that there would be some increased risk. But you have to qualify that risk. It's a one-in-a-thousand kind of thing—which is a heck of a lot different than if it were one out of two. Nobody has ever attempted either to qualify or quantify it. And as you well know, our Secretary of Defense is a great man for quantifications. He quantifies many other things. Why not this risk?"

"Personally, I think that the greatest risk we ever took in the war was our initial attack against the enemy in the Gulf of Tonkin. If the Russians and Red Chinese wanted to come in against us, that was the time to come. Obviously, today, in Vietnam, we're in a much better position to fight the Russians and the Chinese if they decided to come into the war. But if they were afraid to come in against us earlier, why would they want to come in against us now? There are too many reasons against it."

"As far as Russia is concerned, she'd have to bring her troops in through Chinese territory—and obviously, the Chinese wouldn't let Russian troops come into her territory, I know. Sure, China would permit the Russians to support the war—just as she's doing now, with supplies and instructors. But Russia couldn't really do much about fighting us—not much more than she could do about our confrontation with her over the Cuban missiles."

"On the other hand, China is so occupied at home that she needs all the troops she's got just to maintain law and order within the country. So when you add these two facts together, I just don't see how there can be any chance at all of those people coming into the war against us."

If we fought the war as General Meyers feels it should be fought, how long does he think it would take to victory?

"Well, I'm going to estimate this on the long side intentionally. It would probably be much shorter than this—but I'd say we'd have it over in six months, at the most."

Hypothetically, if General Meyers were given complete command of the situation, what would he do?

"In the air war, I'd hit the North with everything we had. And in the South, I would give Westmoreland the ground troops that he needs to win the ground war. He's never been given what he's asked for. And I know this, though it never comes out publicly. I know what he thinks: I've talked with him many, many times about this. What we're doing now violates every principle of warfare that we in the military have ever known. For comparison take the Israeli-Arab affair. Israel got there 'firstest with the mostest'—and the war was over in six days. That's because they went all-out."

"You can't win wars necessarily by killing people. You've got to overwhelm the enemy. And when you overwhelm him, you kill fewer people than you do by picking at him day after day—as we do now. This has been my feeling all along. And Westmoreland and the Army people certainly feel the same way about this as I do."

"But you never read this in our newspapers. This is why I feel so strongly about the situation. It really hurts me to see American people over there dying unnecessarily. You have to understand all the little details—how the targets are picked, for instance—to really know how closely this war is being run from the White House and the Department of Defense. Every target, of course, is cleared with the President. I don't think the general public knows this."

"Let me give you an illustration: when Lyndon Johnson was sick with his first operation a year ago, we didn't get any new targets. I'll give you the man's name who told me this, but please don't use it. (It was someone exceptionally high up in Government.) I met him in Vietnam on a visit. And I asked him: 'Why aren't we getting more air targets?' And he said: 'Gil, you've got to remember the President is sick—and nobody wants to bother him.'"

My final interview was with Brig. General Henry C. Huglin. General Huglin is a military-political scholar and a specialist in strategic warfare. He was Deputy U.S. Representative to the NATO Military Committee and Standing Group from 1959 to 1963. He is a graduate of the National War College and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, as well as the Institute for Strategic Studies, London. At present he is Senior Military Scientist with TEMPO, General Electric Company's Center for Advanced Studies.

General Huglin's is the objective scholarly approach. He feels that we're coming along fairly well now in the Vietnam War—but not well enough. He told me:

"I think that several years ago we should have put on a lot more concentrated pressure with our air strikes—and I think that would have helped to defeat the enemy. Right now I would like to see the port of Haiphong mined—or closed off. And I would like to see more overall pressure used against Hanoi."

"I also think that we would have had the results we were seeking if we hadn't had the dissent in this country that Hanoi has misread into thinking that they could hold on a little bit longer—until finally the dissenters would prevail."

"How about mainland China and the Soviet Union?" I asked him.

"I'm not worried a bit about them. Never have been."

"Why should Soviet Russia take us on over Vietnam, when she didn't take us on over Cuba—where she was directly concerned? And China—belligerent though she is verbally—has been extremely cautious in actual actions wherever our interests or commitments are involved. And rightly so. Because things are so much different now than they were during the Korean War—where we were relatively weak. We are so very much stronger now. And China isn't any stronger today than she was during the war in Korea. Politically, she's much weaker. The atom weapons that she may have don't make that much difference. And she's not about to give us an excuse to launch even conventional air strikes against key installations that we would choose to strike. Such as her nuclear research center or her transportation system—or anything."

"We wouldn't have to fight a land war with China. And I don't think we would choose to do it. So I don't think there ever has been any real chance of China coming into the Vietnam War—although, of course, a lot of people have been worried as hell about this. Many of these are really thoughtful people, not merely peaceniks. But they just don't assess the situation the way I think that the Chinese have to assess it—before taking any action."

Thus General Huglin, from the scholarly point of view, is in agreement with everyone else I interviewed regarding the tenuous "risk" we would be taking if we went all-out to win the war in Vietnam. So why don't we win it?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The foregoing represents a body of opinion which, we feel, deserves to be and should be heard by the American people, who for too long have been given piecemeal and confused reports on the causes, the meaning, and the conduct of our war effort in Vietnam. While we recognize it is our duty to give this opinion a medium of expression, we do not necessarily concur with the conclusions of these respected retired military leaders. We invite your attention to another article in this issue, in which a very wide range of views on the war are expressed by leaders in a variety of walks of life. We feel that only by weighing carefully all the informed opinions that are expressed on this matter, and judging them in the light of our own knowledge, can we firmly decide in our own minds on the wisdom, justice, and efficacy of our course in Asia.)

CEASE-FIRE

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I am pleased to include the following address delivered by a former distinguished Member of the House, Hon. Hamilton Fish, Sr., before the Oak Grove Grange on September 26, 1969. Many Members of the House know Mr. Fish and will be interested in his point of view:

CEASE-FIRE

(Speech of Hon. Hamilton Fish)

Fifteen years ago, in opposing the SEATO Treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I stated that the signatories

would run out on us and leave us holding the bag, which they did, including France and Britain. I further stated that if we became involved in a civil war in Southeast Asia, and sent our armed forces there, "that the Communist Politbureau and the Communist General Staff would get drunk for a week, as they would like to keep our armed forces in the jungles and swamps of Vietnam". And that is exactly what they have succeeded in doing by draining our financial resources, killing 36,000 Americans and wounding a quarter of a million while they are taking over economically, politically and militarily, the Arab Nations in the Eastern Mediterranean area.

I am convinced that the time has come for constructive action to end the war. I believe in the integrity and sincerity of President Nixon in his determined efforts to end the war in Vietnam on the basis of a fair and honorable peace. I commend him for taking the first step by the withdrawal of 25,000 American troops from Vietnam and believe that within a year, it will be reduced by 100,000. But why continue the killing of American soldiers, those of our allies in Vietnam for a single day in this tragic war; the longest in the history of the United States and the fourth deadliest.

I urge President Nixon to offer a cease fire by all our Armed Forces and those of the enemy without any reservation of any kind on the basis of the status quo. This should be done not later than November 11, 1969—Armistice Day. Such an offer by the President would be welcomed by most Americans, except a few militants who insist on all-out victory regardless of the cost in lives. It would be acclaimed by all neutral nations as a definite act by the United States to secure peace in Vietnam and to stop the bloodshed.

If North Vietnam and the Viet Cong turn down a peace offer based on cease fire, then all the neutral nations will place the stigma for any continued fighting and killing upon the Communists in North Vietnam and the Viet Cong. There may be some risks but there are always risks in war. But as a former member of Congress, I think they have been grossly exaggerated and am inclined to think that many of our top Generals would favor a cease fire. Actually, a cease fire may be a military advantage for us, as a major part of North Vietnam is a sanctuary against air bombing. If more North Vietnamese troops invade South Vietnam or Laos, they would be a constant target for our bombing if the war of attrition continues.

If President Nixon publicly urged a cease fire, it would stop all Vietnam War sniping going on in the United States and change overnight our prestige and influence with the free nations of the world. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God."

Speaking to one of the largest Granges in the Hudson River District, I know that all Grangers are interested in the preservation of freedom and peace. I urge the Congress to adopt a constructive policy that no American citizen or his family, shall go hungry, if he is willing and able to work. We have large surpluses of food available. Americans and their families should have preference over foreign hand-outs. If necessary, foreign aid should be reduced to provide food for our own under-fed citizens.

I disapprove of the recent proposal of Senator Goodell of N.Y. to have Congress cut the funds for our armed forces in Vietnam by the end of 1970. This proposal would be playing into the hands of the Communists and would undermine the peace conference at Paris.

If a Cease Fire is agreed on, it may take a year or more to finalize peace terms which will afford time to the armed forces of South Vietnam to be trained and equipped on a larger scale.

The American people want to stop the fighting and killing at the earliest possible time with honor. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives for 25 years, I hope President Nixon will give these suggestions his constructive approval to end the war on a fair basis. The greatest Christmas present that President Nixon could give to all Americans, regardless of partisanship, would be an immediate Cease Fire agreement in Vietnam.

THE ALASKAN NATIVE STORY: AN INDIAN CHIEF SPEAKS

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs traveled more than 3,000 miles in and across Alaska, seeking facts regarding the Alaska native claims question.

An impressive witness was Alfred Ketzler, president of the Tanana Chiefs Conference.

The Ketzler statement tells a great deal about the origin of the native claims and the legislation now pending before the Congress. The text of that statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ALFRED KETZLER

My name is Alfred Ketzler. I was born and raised in Nenana, Alaska. I am president of the Tanana Chiefs Conference. First, I would like to tell about the Tanana Chiefs Conference.

The Conference was organized in 1962, shortly after statehood and long before the discovery of oil. A number of people in Fairbanks and Nenana got together and discussed the sure and gradual loss of the native land around the homes of people present at the meeting.

We asked ourselves: Was this the same all over Alaska? We had no way of knowing. We then decided to call a meeting of villages at Nenana. The Nenana Native Council had dog races and a potlatch scheduled for early March.

In mid-February, we wrote a letter of invitation to 30 villagers in Interior Alaska. Of these, 10 responded to the meeting which was held in early March.

At this meeting, we found the land problems to be similar in all the villages. It was decided that we would hold a meeting at Tanana and we would invite all villages to attend. At Tanana, where the Tanana and Yukon Rivers meet, Athabaskan Indian chiefs traditionally met.

The Nuchulayya, meaning both the location and the meeting, was the seat of government for all the Interior Athabaskan tribes.

We decided to revive the meetings and called the Tanana conference for late June of 1962.

Thirty villages responded to our invitation. At that time, I stated that main motive for the meeting was the land problems. Other topics under discussion included hunting, trapping, and fishing rights, as well as educational needs.

Each village attending the meeting was represented by the village chief or a representative appointed by him. A name, Dena Nena Henash, was selected. The Interior Athabaskan Indians were once again joined into one central organization.

The name of the organization has since been anglicized, now being called the Tanana Chiefs Conference. When the Conference was formed, there was yet no statewide organization which would represent all the Alaska Native Peoples.

Four years passed by. Other regional associations were formed. As greater challenges were made to Native owned lands and subsistence rights held by Natives, the need also grew for a statewide organization.

This need was fulfilled with the organization of the Alaska Federation of Natives in 1966, with which we are affiliated and through which we seek a settlement of our native land claim.

The Tanana Chiefs Conference supports legislation proposed and authored by the AFN and their counsel.

We support all proposals included in the A.F.N. legislation: \$500 million as compensation for lands lost prior to the enactment of the bill, 40 million acres in fee title, and retention of a two per cent overriding royalty, and the creation of native owned and native operated development corporations as specified in the A.F.N. legislation.

Although we support the proposals, we believe that our claims do not ask for the full measure of what we deserve. When Alaska Natives first began to push the claims, we thought that the figure of 80 million acres was not enough land to support our people. Should we have asked for as much land as each village historically used and occupied, the figure would have vastly exceeded 80 millions of acres.

When we began to discuss the 80 million acre figure, representatives of the Interior Department and the State of Alaska said that such a claim would be unacceptable; we compromised at 40 millions of acres. The attachment of the Native people to the land is so great that they would reject any of their leaders who attempted to compromise further.

Native people have been told that we do not have a title, a piece of paper which asserts our ownership to our lands.

We believe our ownership and our ties to our land far exceeds any deed. We never did need any document to tell us the land is ours. This we have always known.

It is true that we have fished, and hunted, and harvested our livelihoods from the land, as did countless generations of our people before us. This, with our instinctive feeling of ownership, tells us that the land belongs to us.

We need the land for other reasons, too. We would like to establish a very long-term economic base with our land. It is our belief that we must receive the amount of land which we request so that we may retain a share of the benefits from our land.

It is our belief, also, that we should receive a fair land settlement, so that what we receive will be equal to the true value of the land with respect to future development. In this way, we hope to insure a permanent settlement.

This is also why we ask for the two per cent overriding royalty. Our ancestors maintained a share in the land; we now claim a share to the land; we want our children and their children after them to retain a share in the land.

This we feel can be done if we receive a 2 per cent overriding royalty.

Should you render justice to the Alaska Native, in granting us the full amount of money, the full amount of land, and the overriding royalty, you must also allow us self-determination in managing our settlement.

We present our case to the Congress of the United States so that we might avoid the legal entanglements involved in going before the courts. To further avoid entanglements and the complications of federal bureaucracies, the administrative patterns of

the settlement must be developed by Natives.

The major property interests must be held by Natives, and not by state or federal agencies. Those who are the owners must have the greatest say. The royalty benefits must be spread widely, but with full regard to private property concepts.

The legislation which we have authored and proposed through the AFN is designed to utilize modern corporate forms, so that we will be able to compete along with anybody else in a capitalistic society.

Among the most important aspects of our bill are the safeguards which are therein provided. The Alaska Native Commission is such an example.

You have heard other than myself who have told you of how our people used and occupied more land than that which we request. I hope that you can now understand, that even by the most conservative estimates, we request only from five to ten per cent of the true worth of our claim.

Please give the matter of our claim the most serious consideration. It is the final opportunity for justice—both for the Nation and for our people.

Thank you for the opportunity to present you with this statement.

KENT UPHELD IN HANDLING SDS TROUBLE

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey conducted at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio, revealed that 81 per cent of its students and 91 per cent of its faculty approved firm handling of SDS disruption on their campus.

I think these are interesting statistics highlighting the fact that the broad body of students and faculty at Kent State are fed up with the radical tactics and goals of SDS. It is heartening news when one may wrongly interpret from the media that universities are ready to spawn revolution.

I include an article from the Cleveland Press on October 7 which details the results of the survey of Kent State University:

KENT UPHELD IN HANDLING SDS TROUBLE

(By Bud Weidenthal)

A survey at Kent State University shows 81% of its students and 91% of the faculty approved of calling police to put down a Student for a Democratic Society disruption on campus last spring.

The findings are contained in an opinion study conducted by a Columbus firm.

The cross section sample of more than 600 students showed that 54% approved of everything the KSU administration did in reacting to the SDS incidents.

The encounters came to a climax when about 50 student radicals smashed their way into a campus building to break up a disciplinary hearing involving some of their leaders. Fifty-two students and outsiders were arrested.

The firm of Goettler and Associates reported to KSU president Robert I. White that 64% of the students were critical of "communications between the administration and the students." But that 90% felt that the incidents were "primarily related to national problems and not specifically related to Kent."

Of campus activities protested by SDS, 87% of those interviewed favor continuing Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) in some form on campus, 91% favored continuation of the law enforcement training courses and 80% had no objection to criminal investigation research projects.

The report said in general that "the overriding conclusion is that the majority of students and faculty are quite satisfied with Kent State University."

It found that students believe "racism, racial problems and racial prejudice are the most important issues facing the American people today." The Vietnam war was second.

A DAY FOR THE HISTORY BOOKS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is obviously too early to know what long-range significance will attach to the Vietnam moratorium observance held on October 15. However, the assistant managing editor of the Tucson Daily Citizen sees it as possibly the beginning of a new force in American political action.

Three days after the event Tony Tselentis wrote an article for the Citizen which I think is eloquent in its description of what occurred in Tucson that day. I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

A DAY FOR THE HISTORY BOOKS

(By Tony Tselentis)

"Beautiful, you're beautiful," the speakers told the crowd during the downtown segment of the Vietnam Moratorium.

And the predominantly student crowd indeed was beautiful in its behavior.

They came, several thousand strong, to make a peaceful protest and fulfilled their mission to a T.

They were dignified and disciplined. In view of much that has gone before, this does add up to beauty.

They exercised their rights of assembly and free speech without infringing on the rights of anyone else.

They said their aim is to preserve the nation—though many believe their action could lead the other way.

There's nothing wrong in arguing with their logic. But there's everything wrong in questioning their patriotism.

These participants in the Vietnam Moratorium were to a large degree the sons and daughters of Tucson.

When the day's activities were over, many of them went home out Broadway, out East 5th, out Speedway, out First Avenue, out Oracle Road, out South 6th Avenue and out the other routes that Tucsonians take home.

What did they and their counterparts throughout the country accomplish?

The answers are varied. The pros say it was a success—that the Vietnam Moratorium will lead to a greater national mandate for peace. The antis say that either nothing has been changed or that the days of peace has been retarded because the enemy will draw new strength from the moratorium.

Each person saw the day through his peculiar perspective. For some, it was dressed with sunshine and hope; for others, with darkness and foreboding; for others, mixed feelings; and still for others, puzzlement—detached questioning.

One conclusion is certain: Oct. 15 will not be forgotten.

Although there have been large-scale peaceful protests in this land before, there never has been any quite like last Wednesday's.

The jury will be out—perhaps for a long, long time—on what effect the Vietnam Moratorium has on the war.

When the answer is known, it will go into the history books.

Probably an even larger effect than what Oct. 15 meant to the Vietnam War will be what the day meant as the crucible of a new force in American political action.

SOUTHWEST WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION FOR FINE ARTS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, too often in this day and age, many people think there is a lack of initiative in rural America. And yet this is not so. Rural Americans are doing more for themselves than ever before. A perfect example is the Southwest Women's Association for Fine Arts, which is located in my district, in southwestern Minnesota. This organization is working to bring exceptional talent to its communities.

So that all may know of how rural Americans are working to bring the arts to their communities, I hereby insert a letter to the editor of the Redwood Gazette written by Mrs. Thomas Ehlers, which explains the organization:

To THE EDITOR:

A year and a half ago a group of women from 19 counties met to discuss how we could enrich our lives in rural America. Mrs. James Flinn and I represented Redwood county. All present agreed that our small communities guaranteed the most peaceful and rewarding mode of living in America, with the exception of live entertainment and enjoyment of the fine arts. Other than the impressive concert series held in most all of our communities, we had very little culturally to offer ourselves or our children.

The Hill Foundation had very generously offered to help fund a rural organization that would work to bring exceptional talent to rural communities. We found, also, that a certain percentage of our tax dollars on both a federal and state level were available for such activities. (Metropolitan areas had made use of these government funds for many years, while the money from the rural areas had sat untouched.) Thus, having the necessary funds, we organized together to form Southwest Women's Association for Fine Arts (SWAFA). We are the first such organization in America, and many communities, all over the United States, are watching the growth and success of SWAFA, hoping to copy our example.

The past year SWAFA has sponsored four presentations of the Minnesota Orchestra, 118 performances of professional theatre (the majority being given to high school audiences), and numerous art exhibitions. We have, thus, brought outstanding artists and talent to deserving communities all over southwestern Minnesota.

In May of this year, SWAFA held a charter membership drive, with 650 women joining. Seventy-five of these women joined the Redwood Falls SWAFA chapter. This month we are having a second membership drive, which will terminate with a big Redwood SWAFA kickoff, for all members, October 27. We wish to extend an invitation to join SWAFA to all

of the women in this area, especially those that live in communities outside of Redwood Falls. We have many wonderful programs and opportunities planned for the months ahead, and we want our efforts to be enjoyed in every community, no matter the size.

Anyone interested in belonging to SWAFA may do so by contacting our membership chairmen, Mrs. James Wetherbee, 501 Veda drive, Redwood Falls. There is a \$2 membership fee.

Sincerely,

Mrs. TOM (SANDY) EHLERS,
Publicity Chairman.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION AND VIETNAM

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials broadcast by WJIM-TV of Lansing, Mich., were devoted to Richard Nixon's handling of the Presidency, both generally and with regard to the situation in Vietnam. I believe these two statements offer a particularly well balanced view of the first months of the new administration and deserve to be carefully noted by all observers of the national scene. I, therefore, insert them at this point in the RECORD:

EDITORIAL

SEPTEMBER 18, 1969.

The political columnists profess to be confused by the Presidential performance of Richard Nixon during his initial eight months in office. This, we believe, is a sure sign he must be doing something right.

Columnists like labels. They're handy and all-purpose and take thinking out of their work—thinking, they find, is difficult at best.

Try as they may, they can't put a label on the man currently occupying the White House.

Early in the game they tried out the "conservative" tag—then further confused them by proposing the most far reaching and liberalized tax reforms in the nation's history. So they went back to the thesaurus and trotted out the "hawk" label—then lo and behold, for the first time in this decade Nixon became a President who took troops out of Vietnam instead of putting more in.

Now, the Restons, the Alsops and the Novaks were really concerned—lights burned late in Georgetown libraries and overnight the word for Nixon became "flexible." Well, maybe this time they've hit it right. In desperation the pundits have settled on the non-label and admitted they just can't classify this President with their typical, simplistic transparency.

As far as we're concerned that's first rate. It's also what the country wants in a President in our estimation. A man who works hard at the job every day, who changes and shifts as conditions change—a man for all seasons, because he is a man of all seasons.

OCTOBER 9, 1969.

The nation's two major newsweeklies are on the stands declaring, as if with one voice, that the country is heading into a Winter of discontent. Indeed, there are indications aplenty that the coming months will vex, try and perhaps decisively test this nation and its President of less than a year . . . Richard M. Nixon.

On October 15, unless current predictions widely miss the mark, we will witness the greatest anti-war demonstration in America's history.

And now, finally, in this gold and crimson autumn, over a decade since the first fatal steps were taken in Southeast Asia . . . it is Vietnam that is "Topic A."

The latest polls demonstrate conclusively the majority opinion ranging across the troubled face of America is that ending the war is our major national concern. So while there is a wide spectrum of expression on how to bring the war to a conclusion there is no longer any doubt that Americans are united in saying "get it over with."

WJIM believes this singleness of purpose . . . this unity . . . can be a source of national strength, welding together, even in fiery disagreement, the frayed, steel nerve ends of a divided national purpose.

On October 15, in our judgment, the key word should be "Understand" . . . now that we know the goal is "end the war", each of us, and each group of us, should think on October 15 about trying to "understand" the point of view of those who approach the identical goal from a different direction.

President Nixon certainly wants to get this country out of Vietnam . . . and in our judgment, criticism of his policy has been immoderate and thoughtless. Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson each increased our commitment in Vietnam while failing to establish goals and priorities. Nixon has reversed that trend, he is taking American troops out of Southeast Asia and has clearly indicated his intention to keep doing so.

AMERICAN PROPERTY SEIZED BY BOLIVIA

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the news coming out of Bolivia over the weekend which indicated that the property of Gulf Oil Co. is being seized is a further indication of the continued deterioration of American prestige throughout the world. According to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), foreign aid has cost America more than \$175 billion since 1946. And, yet, we allow countries such as Bolivia to seize American properties. These countries then set up a commission to determine the worth of the properties with the thought that at some indeterminable future date partial compensation will be paid. But in the meantime, those Americans who have had their property seized are the losers. I have today written the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and have asked that consideration be given to including a clause in the foreign aid bill which would require the immediate cessation of all American aid and loans to any country who seizes American property unless they have first made adequate compensation. The mere promise that at some indeterminable future date compensation would be made would not satisfy this requirement of law.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we stood up on our hind feet and told the nations of the world that we are not going to have our citizens kicked about and then continue to take taxpayer's money and give to these nations because of a device which holds out hope of payment for property seized.

THE ALASKAN NATIVE STORY: A YOUNG ESKIMO SPEAKS

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent and moving witnesses to appear before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs during hearings in Alaska last week was a young Eskimo by the name of Martha J. Sara.

A junior student at the University of Alaska, Martha Sara was a registered nurse at the age of 19 and director of an important State institution before reaching the age of 21.

Her statement was one of the most eloquent appeals for confidence in the young people of America that I have ever heard, and provides many convincing arguments in support of the native claims legislation.

The text of Martha Sara's statement follows:

DO NOT REFUSE US

(Statement of Martha J. Sara)

Mr. Chairman, members of the board, my name is Martha J. Sara. I'm an Eskimo. I was born and raised in Bethel. I'm a junior at the University of Alaska. My major is Sociology and I plan to go on and become a social worker.

On behalf of the Theata Club, which is an organization of native students on the University of Alaska campus, and on behalf of myself, I would like to say that I'm grateful for the right and am happy to take the responsibility to testify on behalf of the Native Land Claims.

Along with hundreds of other native young adults, I've taken the responsibility of becoming educated to better equip myself for our coming responsibilities in the management of our own affairs.

This is not an easy undertaking.

Although I am not the best example available, I will use myself. After high school I entered a school of nursing in Los Angeles. It was difficult for me because I had to overcome handicaps not faced by most American youths. I entered a different culture. Along with the dynamic process of learning what the school offered, I also had to adjust to new values and surroundings. I graduated and became a registered nurse at the age of nineteen. I was filled with a sense of accomplishment and I applied for employment at the Public Health Service Hospital in Bethel. Never before had they employed an Associate in Arts degree registered nurse—and so young. They had to get permission from Washington; permission was granted. I worked only one year when our community decided to open a Prenatal Home in Bethel through the assistance of the Office of Economic Opportunity. A Director was needed with the qualifications of a registered nurse. I enthusiastically wrote a letter of application even before applications were printed. I knew the people and a lot of the future clients having worked most of the year in the Maternity Ward in our hospital. To my delight I was hired. Complications arose, however, because someone pointed out that in order to be a Director of a Prenatal institution in the State of Alaska one had to be twenty-five years old, and I was not yet even twenty-one. Letters were written on my behalf and permission was granted from Juneau for me to keep and fill the position. The funding was unsure because the deadline for occupancy was nearing and the building was unfit for expectant mothers as

far as the State Sanitarian, State Fire Marshall, and Child Welfare Institution Directors were concerned. Complete renovation of the physical plant and procurement of necessary equipment was urgent. Needless to say, I became an amateur painter, plumber, carpenter, electrician, diplomat, beggar, and petty larcenist. Local men did the plumbing, carpentry, and electrical work in conjunction with the BIA. Local boys under the Neighborhood Youth Program did the painting. Used furniture was procured from the hospital through GSA. Supplies were ordered and opening day saw us admitting our first lady! We struggled and worked for what we wanted and got it. Of course we had the assistance and backing of the agencies, but the native peoples involved made it work. We were competent and proved it.

I am here representing a body of eager, willing young adults ready to learn, work, and show our capability in the management of our own affairs. I am just one of many who are willing to struggle for an education, who are willing to work hard, the way we worked on the Bethel Prenatal Home.

We are not asking for all our land—just a portion of it and if you grant it to us, we will have to strive very hard because what we are asking for is less than what we believe is fair. But we are capable of striving very hard.

And how shall you refuse us? You who have centuries of learning, education, civilization, colonization, expansion, domination, exploitation behind you? How shall you refuse us?

Do not refuse us because we are young! In youth there is energy, drive, ambition, growth, and new ideas. Do not refuse us because we are young! For we shall mature!

Do not refuse us because we are undereducated! We are learning fast; and utilizing our newly gained knowledge, comparing and weighing the truths and benefits of this knowledge. We know that the 40,000,000 acres we are asking for will provide a minimum protection to hunting and fishing. We understand that we need the identification with, and the feeling for our own land. We also realize that we need this land as an economic base for our people. The land will be used as a commodity in our economic base. We can accomplish this with 40,000,000 acres. \$500,000,000 is a lot of money. We understand what a vital role this can play in the economic base of our people. We realize that with proper and careful handling and investment of this money we can make it work for us. We do not plan to make improvements without first establishing a sound economic base which will provide for growth and return. After this is established, then we can begin our improvements. We will then be able to maintain and expand these improvements. We realize that we can not only benefit our people, but all of Alaska. All this for \$500,000,000. Do not refuse us because we are still learning! For we are fast learning!

Do not refuse us the chance to progress! We too have a dream for the progress of our land. We hold a superior position to develop our country because it is our country, and we love it. We will be more cautious in its utilization—and I deliberately use the word "utilization" instead of "exploitation." We will weigh each prospect carefully to assure ourselves that we are making the best decision for our generation and those generations to come. We are not here to grab; we are here to live with the growth of our native land. Do not refuse us the chance for progress. For we too share the dream of progress.

Do not refuse us because you are afraid we don't have competent leaders! I represent a generation of paradoxes. We are paradoxes in the fact that we are the closest links to the parties farthest separated in this issue. One of these groups is our beloved elders whom we left back home only a short time ago, who, along with others, still cling

to the old ways and depend upon the land for subsistence. Another group is made up of our able leaders, Native and White, who are presently in positions of decision. We are close to the old ones and the people back home because, having recently left them, their problems, worries, and fears burn deep in our hearts. We know what makes them happy; we know what can fill them with contentment; we know what gives them hope. At the same time we are close to our leaders in the fact that we are striving and aspiring to their positions of decision. Native young people are rising up to meet the demands and expectations of a foreign and sometimes hostile society. The day of our leadership is not too far off. When that day of fulfillment comes, I would like to think that we can proudly take our places side by side with the present leaders to direct the affairs of our own people. In their wisdom they can quell our fears, channel our energy, help shape our innovative ideas, direct our aggression, and interpret our anxieties. Together we can provide able leadership! Do not refuse us for fear of poor leadership! For we are capable leaders.

Do not refuse us simply because you purchased the sovereign right of our land! Our fathers since time began have paid dearly for our homeland every generation. They struggled against the harshest environment known to man and survived to teach us to do the same. Each generation paved the way for the next. Do not refuse us because you purchased this right! For our forefathers paid for it long before your forefathers had the money!

Do not refuse us because we are a minority! For this is America! We have proved in many ways that, not only do we take advantage of our rights and freedoms along with other Americans, but we are willing to, and have, fought equally for all its privileges. Our native soldiers fought and died for the United States in World War II, the Korean War, and in the present war in Viet Nam. As American citizens, we have equal rights and have taken on equal responsibility. So do not refuse us because we are a minority! For this is America!

In closing I would like to say that competence is something that has to be proven. And as young native adults we have demonstrated our abilities and are now proving it.

I would like to add that we are deeply grateful to you all for taking time out of your busy schedules to come and hear our testimonies. It is deeply appreciated. Thank you! Qu yana caqneq!

HUNGARIAN REVOLT

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago today, the world witnessed one of the most brutal episodes of modern times. The people of Hungary revolted against the Communist masters who held their nation in bondage.

While the world stood aside, the freedom fighters of Hungary—men, women, and children—were crushed beneath the treads of heavy Russian tanks.

The streets were red with blood of those whose crime was a longing to be free and a love of country. Some estimates of the slaughtered and executed reached 32,000. Another 200,000 fled.

Mr. Speaker, let us never forget these brave people who fought and died for freedom.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam moratorium demonstrations on October 15 have evoked a good deal of emotion, both pro and con. Personally, I feel that peaceful dissent is part of our American tradition. Our Constitution gives us the right to make our views known through legal and reasonable methods. That right must be preserved.

Unlike the SDS demonstrations in Chicago recently, which were violent, illegal, and which cannot be tolerated, the demonstrations on October 15 were, for the most part, peaceful and legal. The right to dissent, however, should not be confused with the rightness of the dissenters. If they were demonstrating for peace, few people would argue. I want peace and I am sure all Americans do.

If the demonstrations were aimed at President Nixon's Vietnam policy, I think the dissenters were wrong, even though they have a right to say so. It is my belief that President Nixon is moving rapidly toward a peaceful solution to the Vietnam problem, and I support his policy, even though I feel we could move faster.

The moratorium resulted in a particularly delicate situation for the officials of our universities and colleges. The president of the State University of Iowa at Iowa City, Iowa, Willard L. Boyd, has done an excellent job of handling this problem and drawing a distinction between the right to dissent, and supporting the policy advocated by the dissenters. I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the memorandum which he issued on that occasion, together with an editorial from the Des Moines Register of October 9 respecting this policy:

OCTOBER 15, 1969: DAY OF INQUIRY

(Memo from the Office of the President—A statement to students, faculty, and friends of the university)

I believe that The University of Iowa should devote itself on October 15 to a discussion of the issues involved in the war in Vietnam. I urge departments, colleges and other University organizations to arrange for seminars and discussions throughout the University during that day. To facilitate such consideration of the issues, all University facilities not otherwise in use, including the Pentacrest area, will be available for these discussions. In this way, students and faculty members will have the opportunity to participate when they desire to do so.

I have been requested to suspend all classes on October 15. I decline to do so for two reasons:

(1) As a matter of practice, adherence to class schedules and the question of attendance have been primarily collegiate matters at this University. Neither has been a matter for the central administration in the past, and I do not feel that this practice should be altered at this time. The varying circumstances and needs of each college, in light of the special requirements of its disciplines, staffing, facilities and responsibilities, war-

rant the decentralization of such decision making in this University.

(2) Even if I felt that decisions of class schedules and attendance should be withdrawn from the colleges, I would not be inclined to suspend classes because of the internal civil liberties issue involved. Many faculty members wish to teach on October 15th, and many students wish to attend classes as usual on that date. They should not be denied an opportunity to do so. This institution has a special obligation to respect the rights of all of the many individuals on its campus with diverse viewpoints and interests.

I believe that the existing scheduling practices of the colleges will permit widespread participation in the day-long collegiate and departmental discussions. By providing programs throughout the day, students will be able to attend sessions during their free hours. Because scheduling conflicts occur in a university of this size, faculty do on occasion cancel classes to permit students to attend important discussions which occur at the class hour. Makeup classes are provided for when the loss in time adversely affects the course plan.

The question of student class attendance is a matter determined individually by students and faculty members. Since October 15 is a day of personal conscience, I recommend that no student be penalized who fails to attend a class on that day because of his personal convictions. And where a faculty member cancels his classes and sets a future makeup date, I feel that none of his students should be penalized for inability to attend such a makeup class if he had been willing to attend class at the time originally scheduled.

It seems clear that October 15 cannot be considered as an isolated event, in light of announced intentions in the press with regard to moratorium action in November and December. Although I have been assured that there is very little likelihood that a two-day suspension of classes will be proposed for November, I feel we must face that possibility now. Moreover, there are other great issues which will face this country in the years ahead, and I believe that to cancel classes now would set a precedent with which we would have to reckon frequently.

At the same time, I believe that these great issues are the appropriate subjects of discussion on a university campus. Therefore, I urge the Faculty Senate, the University Calendar Committee, the Student Senate and the collegiate faculties to consider carefully in the period from now until November what the proper University policy should be which will afford opportunity for discussion of great issues and at the same time protect the rights of the individual members of the student body and the faculty.

Among the possible ways of affording discussion in the future would be to alter the University calendar in advance, so that one or more days would be set aside by the calendar each semester for discussion of national issues.

Another possibility would be to schedule an open hour once each week for this purpose.

Still another possibility is to increase the length of the academic year so that time for makeup classes can be provided. One problem posed by this alternative is that it would infringe upon the rights of faculty and students who wish to hold classes on the regularly scheduled day.

As with the agonizing question of Vietnam itself, there are no simple answers to these complex issues. They also cannot be realistically discussed without considering such factors as institutional autonomy and the politicization of the University. Debate last week in the Faculty Senate, and letters and comment directed to me in recent days, clearly reveal great and sincere differences in opinion on such questions.

I urge not only the faculty and students of the University to listen to each other in the debate of October 15, but I urge everyone within and without the University to listen to the discussions.

WILLARD L. BOYD.

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 9, 1969]

MORATORIUM DAY AT THE UNIVERSITY
OF IOWA

University of Iowa President Willard Boyd has done a commendable job of sorting out the issues in deciding what the university's role should be on the Oct. 15 Vietnam War Moratorium Day.

Boyd said he will not suspend classes. In this, he overrode a close 27-23 vote of the Faculty Senate which favored a one-day suspension. He said, however, that all university facilities not otherwise in use would be available for seminars and discussions about the war. He urged faculty members and students to take part in these meetings. He said no student would be penalized for not attending classes "because of his personal convictions."

This moderate policy probably won't satisfy extreme doves or hawks. The sharpest critics of the war may see the university as against them, because classes will be held. The stoutest defenders of the war will be unhappy with any university concession to the anti-war Moratorium Day.

The U. of I. president gave one strong argument against suspending classes. A civil liberties issue is involved, he said. Many faculty members want to teach, and many students want to attend classes. They should not be denied these opportunities.

The university is an institution which fosters the scholarly pursuit of truth. The scholarly goal often is in conflict with political goals, such as those of the war's critics. Scholarship requires the hesitant statement of opinions, the careful evaluation of alternatives and the qualified assertion of conclusions. Politics requires the quick retort, the brusque dismissal of criticism and the dramatic overstatement of one's platform.

Students and faculty members are both scholars and political actors. They should combine a reverence for scholarship and a zest for political action.

But they shouldn't confuse the two. They shouldn't distort the scholarly function of the university by seeking to make it an agent of political change.

U. of I. students and faculty members, as political men and women, should, if they choose to, take part vigorously in Moratorium Day activities. They should not demand, however, that the university, the steward of scholarship, become a tool of their political action.

President Boyd's ruling shows a wise understanding of the separation of academic and political functions.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL
BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. JOHN MELCHER

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF MONTANA

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Business Women's Week. It is a week during which we mark the accomplishments of American women in business and the professions.

We have by no means yet fully recognized the value of our women, and we continue to exclude them from many oc-

cupations and professions. We need to assure women of the same occupational opportunities that are now provided to men.

We Montanans, and Westerners in general, feel a particular admiration for women, who provide sound judgment and persistent work in the development of a good environment and a better life for all of us.

LOWERING OF THE VOTING AGE

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, this November the State of Ohio will vote on whether to lower the voting age from 21 to 19. It has been a topic of not only State concern but of national interest in the movement to enfranchise young people.

A particularly reasoned and convincing argument for lowering the voting age to 19 comes from Mr. Chester T. Cruze, who is a State representative to the Ohio General Assembly. I think my colleagues would benefit from learning of Mr. Cruze's remarks. His comments not only apply to the State of Ohio; they have relevance for any government body's consideration of lowering the voting age to 19, a move that I heartily endorse.

I include Mr. Cruze's statement for insertion in the Record in full:

AMERICA'S YOUTH—Too Young To Vote?

On November 4, 1969, the voters in Ohio and New Jersey will be given the opportunity to amend their respective state constitutions, in Ohio enfranchising young people at 19, and in New Jersey at 18.¹ It has been a long fight in those particular states, and is a fight that will spread across the country in years to come.²

The real issue is: "Are 18, 19 and 20-year-olds really incompetent," and should the older generation "show them" that they must "graduate," not only from high school, but "mature" for three years before they can claim citizenship—or shall the efforts of

those in Ohio, New Jersey and those other states who have manifested their political maturity be rewarded with that valued prize—the vote.

The history of the American franchise has been one of constant expansion ever since President Andrew Jackson in 1830 advocated the abandonment of property ownership as a voting qualification. The expansion of the franchise continued after the Civil War and proponents of expanding the franchise saw the passage of the 14th and 15th amendment to the U.S. Constitution which finally brought suffrage for the American Negro. The 19th amendment, fought for in the 1920's, brought the franchise to the American women and in the 1960's Americans again acted to enlarge the franchise by eliminating the poll tax as a qualification for voting.

In preparing the legislation, the fight for Women's Suffrage was reviewed and noted; opponents claimed women were too emotional and too stupid to vote. The dire results predicted have not materialized. It is obvious that similar charges against young people are equally fallacious.

There are two basic issues that ought to govern qualifications for voting. The first is that voting is a public decision, not merely a personal right. It is the act by which the people choose men to occupy public offices and to govern the community. From this point of view, the question is whether lowering the voting age will tend to produce an electorate that is superior to the present one and better qualified to choose honest and capable public officials.

The other issue is this: No segment of the community should be excluded from the electorate, if its rights and interests cannot be adequately safeguarded by an electorate of which it does not form a part.

Pro and con discussions are waged on a number of levels; some appealing to the intellect and others not. "If you're old enough to fight, you're old enough to vote" is perhaps the number one phrase used by proponents of reduced voting age, not because they see it as a super-relevant statement, but because it sells.³ That is the job to be done, to sell the idea, on a non-partisan basis.

President Nixon in March 1969 stated the more relevant Pro reason: "I favor voting at 18, not because, as many say, 'If you're old enough to fight you're old enough to vote' but because you are smart enough to vote."

Today's young people are smart enough to vote, not only because of their formal education, but because of the areas of political involvement that are open to them. The public media of television, radio, the increasing numbers of politically oriented reading matter, etc., factors omnipresent in everyone's lives, sometime give young people, I am ashamed to say, a better understanding of issues and problems than many of their elders.

The average 18 to 21 year old is a high school graduate.

He has extensive knowledge of the world around him, and the breadth of his knowledge and even of experience is far more than the great majority of our populace had during any previous generation—certainly for more than previous generations. People should acknowledge the product of excellence in education by bringing youth into full participation in public decisions.

A prime pro argument, seldom heard, is that in the immediate post high school years a young man will decide just which way he will go in his life. The U.S. Census Bureau

backs this idea up and terms the years from 18-25 as "the ages at which adult roles and responsibilities are assumed". Not only can the habit of voting be matured in those important years, but a young person can discover a way to vent his political feelings, in a sedate and peaceful way—the vote. For example, New York Senator Jacob Javits notes that the political activism among 18 to 21 year olds is "all happening outside the existing political framework." Therefore, he and others of his persuasion, feel that enfranchising 18 year olds would bring that activism within the acceptable democratic framework for instituting social and political change.

In the same vein, Dr. Thomas E. Shaffer, Professor of Pediatrics at Ohio State University, feels that "a lot of irresponsibility (among 18-21 year olds) is the result of not being given responsibility in the first place." Thus, in his estimation, giving the vote to 18 year olds would be a vote of confidence in their ability to assume political responsibility, thus encouraging them to exercise such responsibility wisely.

Also several million young women and more than one million young men 18 to 21 years old have established homes and families but have no vote on the issues at city hall, the courthouse, or the capitol.

A more basic argument is that 18, 19 and 20 year olds pay taxes and in numerous areas of law are considered adults at present. "Taxation without representation is tyranny" applies to the twentieth century as it did to the eighteenth century. Young adults pay heavily in sales, use, gasoline and income taxes. Beyond the idea that the young help support government monetarily, it is easily seen that there is a legal inconsistency—seeing law enforcement as an adult province, while the privilege to vote is withheld as being beyond youth's capabilities. A person is responsible to the law—but not responsible enough to make law in the representative sense.

Most, however, are committed to it, because of the therapeutic nature it will have upon this country. In a society that is adding to its longevity but also to its youth population, the average age 27.7. Yet the average voter's age is 45. How can a nation sustain itself when such a large share of its population has no voice in choosing its government?

Though no organized opposition has yet formed, the "silent vote" is feared by all supporters of a lowered voting age, and it is there task to dispel words such as "ungrateful and immature". These words are currently being leveled at the younger generation, while they should actually be directed at the less than - percent who have earned such a name.

The Con discussion invariably begins with those persons who are in the political activism of 18 year olds dangerous tendencies that should not be given political expression. For example, they fear that 18 years olds would tend to vote for extreme leftist parties and issues, and presumably their vote could not be balanced by the more conservative votes of their elders. Some even see such philosophies as "anti-adulthood" being translated into political policy. There is a hesitancy to unleash a new tool to those people in our society who riot, disturb the peace generally, and appear ungrateful to the past generations who so painstakingly constructed this country to be the finest in the world.

These same people who will vote against the issue see the further consequence of allowing persons as young as 18 or 19 to hold office or be inconsistent suggesting less than true confidence in the work of majority rule. However, the Founding Fathers felt that a

¹ The authority of the states to determine voting qualifications is embodied in the 10th amendment of the U.S. Constitution providing that any power not specifically granted to the federal government, nor denied to the states, is reserved to the respective states or to the people. The 14th amendment protects against the denial of suffrage to persons twenty-one years of age, but it does not purport to set twenty-one as the legal voting age.

Every state, except West Virginia, has a constitutional provision setting an age qualification upon suffrage. Therefore, any state changes in the age qualification to vote would require a constitutional amendment in the other forty-nine states.

² Mexico may beat the U.S. to the punch giving 18-year-olds the right to vote. The change is now under study. President Diaz Ordaz likes the idea. He says youngsters today are better prepared to vote at 18 than his generation was at 21. More than 58 percent of Mexico's population is under 21. With youth clamoring for change, the President says, the vote could head off possible future violence.

³ U.S. News & World Report disclosed that of the 34,000 U.S. Servicemen killed in Vietnam since 1961, about half of them were too young to vote in most states.

person should be 25 years of age to be a U.S. Representative, 30 to be a Senator, and 35 to be a President, which certainly indicates they saw no major problem with an "inconsistency" between being able to vote for an office and actually holding one.

Tied to the issue, is concern from both parties that the new voters would register more in one party than another, a thought which is easily dispelled by several polls.⁴ Partisanship on the issue, nevertheless is better kept out, placing country above party or personal gain.

The political question is really neutralized since both parties support it, but you will still hear that it is generally recorded by political scientists that newly enfranchised voters are, for a period of time, grateful to the party that enfranchised them. The Whigs made a big thing of it during the 19th century in England, as did the Republicans and then the Democrats in the United States in vying for the Negro vote.

The drinking issue too is drawn into the discussion, many persons being hesitant to vote for Vote 18 or 19 if it allows people that young to drink hard liquor. The fact here, is that the drinking age is determined solely by statutory enactment, i.e. acts of the legislature.

The pocketbook certainly cannot remain divorced from any political issue and we find this true with the voting age discussion. Many persons fear that the young voters would vote unnecessary and additional taxes—a thought buried by political scientists in Kentucky and Georgia, both states with 18 year voting.

It remains only to be said, that the reasoning of those who favor the lowered voting age is extremely logical, they look at the increased responsibility; the de-facto situation of the young person in this modern, complicated society. They stare in wonder at the change of society as every newer and closer (to them) generation states responsibility and they wonder why they are excluded. Is the age of knighthood, "21" an extremely arbitrary determination, to remain the institution it is? Will those who ask for a change be successful in persuading a majority of the electorate that it will be a competent and equitable change or will we force them to the streets.

⁴A George Gallup poll revealed the following breakdown:

George Gallup poll
[In percent]

21-29 years:		
Republicans	-----	22
Democrats	-----	38
Independents	-----	40
29-49 years:		
Republicans	-----	25
Democrats	-----	44
Independents	-----	31
50 and older:		
Republicans	-----	30
Democrats	-----	46
Independents	-----	24

An examination of the results by other groups among those 21 to 29 shows the democratic party with an advantage in each case except among persons with a college background, where party allegiance is evenly divided.

Independents among young voters are found more frequently among men than women, white persons than Negroes, and the college-trained than persons with less formal education. The political affiliation of persons in their early twenties (21 through 24) closely parallels the results for persons in their late twenties (25-29), although the proportion of Independents is slightly lower among the older group.

THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION MEMORANDUM

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the American Hungarian Federation recently circularized a memorandum to some of us in which this time-honored organization of Americans of Hungarian descent, uniting in its ranks most American Hungarian churches and associations, called for a restoration of voluntary prayers in public schools.

Several of my colleagues led by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LUKENS) discussed both the memorandum and the various constitutional amendments pending before the House Judiciary Committee on this subject in the form of a special order last Monday.

In the meantime the American Hungarian Federation also sent me an article written by its chairman of the board of directors, Rt. Rev. Zoltan Beky, D.D. some years ago on the regents case in the New York State Court of Appeals, insofar as the issue which appeared in the July 30, 1962 issue of American Hungarian People's Voice—New York—was the same than in the later Board of Education against Schempp and Murray against Curlett, 1963, cases of the Supreme Court and the author at that time was the bishop of the Hungarian Reformed Church of America. I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

PRAYERS AND THE DECISION OF THE HIGHEST U.S. COURT

(By Bishop Dr. Zoltan Beky)

The Supreme Court of the United States decided by majority vote that prayers used in the elementary and high schools in the State of New York for commencing the school day is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. This court decision shocked many million American citizens and many, including two former Presidents, numerous Senators and Representatives and countless ecclesiastical leaders raised their voices in opposition to the decision. Though this decision will probably be followed by others by the Supreme Court, we must still analyze: what does the separation of church and state, guaranteed by the Constitution mean in the American society of the Twentieth Century?

Those Protestants in favor of the decision of the Supreme Court point out that the prayer used in the State of New York was not a definitely Christian prayer and that the decision only bars the state educational authorities from prescribing to the public schools prayers which must be said by the students.

This view cannot be shared by us, Reformed Christians, but it is also impossible for us as American citizens, to share it as an interpretation of the United States Constitution, for it is not based on valid arguments either in practice, or in the light of history. The constitutional provision expressed in the First Amendment was written in an age where eight of the thirteen original states had an "established" religion which had the characteristics of a "state religion" vis-a-vis the other existing religions. The state was supporting this denomination financially, guaranteed its rights by state legislation. The other Christian churches were allowed to function but without the above

rights, support and advantages. At the end of the 18th century state churches were common in Europe and the minority churches were either tolerated, repressed and in some cases, even eradicated. In order to avoid any such abuses the United States Constitution wanted to guarantee the freedom of all churches.

We must state clearly that in light of this historical development the recent Supreme Court decision violates the true meaning of the Constitution by giving preference to the followers of secularism (agnosticism), a minority in the American nation and society as against the followers of Christianity, Judaism and Islam.

In practice, too, the new dictum of the Court is incorrect. For every area of life which will play a decisive influence in the life of the coming generation must form an organic part of the instruction material of the schools. Church, religion and ethics form such an extensive area in the culture of humanity that they cannot be written off as unconstitutional instruction material at the expense of the coming generation in America.

As Reformed Christians we cannot admit that the state can live without recognizing God. Faith is not a private matter as disbelief and free thoughts are not private matters either as it was proven by the example of those few families in New York who fought their way successfully to the Supreme Court against the prayers to be recited in state schools. If, however, the state expresses its disinterest in God, and in public schools no prayers may be said to the Creator, it will soon become a problem of conscience for Reformed Christian parents: in what kind of school should he send his children?

MAN AND HIS ENVIRONMENT: FROM HERO TO MONSTER

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and coconservationist from the State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, recently echoed my sentiments and concern over the problems of water pollution before the Pennsylvania Governor's Conference on Water Pollution Control held in Harrisburg, Pa. In a speech before the conferees, Representative SAYLOR pointed out that man in his heroic role as the conqueror of nature, has also become a monster as the great polluter of the environment.

There are many examples of man's monstrous use of his environment, but the three which our colleague picked out to emphasize with respect to the Nation's water supply are of particular concern to us in the Congress because we can do something about reversing the pollution buildup from these causes. Congressman SAYLOR called attention to the pollution resulting from highway and road construction, from the increased use of waterways by commercial and recreational vessels, and from agricultural uses. In a short speech, he has outlined the magnitude of the problems we face and pointed the way we should take to begin the cleanup job.

I highly recommend that all Members concerned with the problems of water pollution give this speech close attention.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. SAYLOR

It is hard to believe that anyone reasonably aware of the world about him is not also aware of the growing menace to the Nation's health and welfare caused by the pollution of the great natural resources of air, land and water.

Here on this continent man has been the conqueror and adapter—utilizing an ever more complex technology to develop a rich and comfortably affluent economy.

But almost unwittingly man has made the transition from conquering hero to monster. The very technology which has created so much of material good, is also destroying the natural environment.

Man has interfered with the balance of nature, his waste products have become a threat to the capability of this planet to support life, not only of man, but all life. The pressure of world population growth is a major part of the current ecological crisis.

It has reached the stage where it is a question of whether we can survive in the unstable environment we have created. We must rid ourselves of the belief that we can arbitrarily change nature—without accepting some unusual, unwanted, unexpected, and unexplainable consequences.

Water of at least reasonably good quality is essential for almost every necessary use, but is becoming increasingly difficult to secure. If we are to survive, the quality of the Nation's water resources must be protected and improved.

Municipal and industrial sewage and other wastes polluting the Nation's waters have become so obvious that they have received the attention of Federal, State and local governments. The effect of this combined effort is that at least a start has been made at controlling this menace to the environment.

However, there are less obvious sources of pollution potentials of equal importance to the deterioration of the quality of the Nation's water resources. I would like to discuss a few of them and consider what must be done about them.

A major problem affecting the quality of water today is silt and sediment being deposited in the Nation's waterways as the result of earthmoving activities of the construction industry, in particular highways and building construction.

In most instances the natural vegetative cover is completely removed or altered and bare earth is left for extended periods of time. Consequently precipitation washes loose soil, debris, and rocks into streams. These substances cause turbidity and vastly increase the problems of water users downstream in addition to causing undesirable deposits of sediment and silt. Treatment for domestic and municipal use is more complex, costly and variable.

There are 3.7 million miles of highways in the nation of which fourteen percent are urban, twenty-four percent primary and sixty-two percent are secondary and rural roads. It is this latter category which poses the major pollution problem. Much of the suburban community is included.

Excavations and fills in highway construction alter the natural drainage patterns. In many cases the water table or aquifers are penetrated or exposed. At road construction sites it has been found that during a rainstorm, sediment yield is ten times that of cultivated and, two hundred times that of grassland and two thousand times that of forested lands.

It is imperative that erosion control measures be provided at road construction sites and provision be made for future run-off.

The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads can play an important part in this by its administration of the Federal highway program. For lesser highways it is up to State and local

road construction agencies together with planning and zoning bodies to cope with this prolific source of pollution. The Bureau of Public Roads and Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are engaged in research on the problem and developing guidelines for use in designing and constructing highways. Much remains to be done in this connection.

For example, only one State now has water quality standards for temporary turbidity which could be used as a basis for enforcement under the Federal Water Quality Act.

Urban area construction is an equally important contribution of pollution in the form of sediment and silt. In building construction the necessary excavations leave the surrounding surfaces bare of vegetation and normal drainage patterns are altered. The large areas paved for parking lots and new streets also tend to aggravate the situation. They prevent natural percolation of moisture and cause concentration many times in natural drainage areas far in excess of their capacity.

Planning and zoning bodies should be on the alert and require adequate preventive measures, so as to prevent these overloads, on drainage ways and on the local sewer system.

It is estimated that on at least three hundred thousand miles of the Nation's waterways, erosion is a serious problem—contributing to a deterioration of water quality.

The watershed protection program of the Department of Agriculture—Public Law 83-566—is directed to minimizing erosion of agricultural lands. This program is inestimable value in preserving farmland and in controlling sedimentation and should be accelerated to the point of complete coverage. Landowners' consent and cooperation are required for this to be effective. To be truly effective all land should be included in a nationwide program.

Sediment in water increases the cost of making it usable, it also has a damaging effect on aquatic life such as gamefish and shellfish, a serious economic loss.

Sediment also accelerates eutrophication by serving as the vehicle for harmful chemicals and minerals and by hindering the oxidation of organic pollutants. Ironically, however, turbidity may actually decrease algae growth by preventing the penetration of sunlight into the stream. This is a small gratification in comparison to the total harm done.

Silt deposited in rivers, lakes and reservoirs is a costly polluting agent. It has been estimated that the annual reduction in reservoir capacity can be evaluated at approximately one hundred million dollars annually and that silt in estuaries, harbors and navigation channels must be removed at an annual cost of one hundred and twenty-five million dollars.

Greater attention should be given to correction of the causes of erosion. Preventive measures to be developed by cooperation of Federal, State and local agencies should be stimulated to protect our vital water resources as well as to preserve land resources.

My next example is that of pollution from watercraft.

There are forty-six thousand federally registered commercial vessels, sixty-five thousand unregistered commercial fishing vessels, sixteen thousand federally owned vessels and eight million recreational watercraft using the navigable waters of the United States.

At the present time forty vessels operating on the Great Lakes, a hundred Coast Guard vessels and a slowly growing number of Corps of Engineers vessels are equipped with sewage treatment devices. Only a very small number of ocean going ships which use these waters treat their sewage prior to discharge. The remaining great majority of vessels have no means of treating sewage.

Besides the sewage, since practically all vessels are fueled by oil, there is the ever-present danger of oil leakage or breakage or emptying of bilge water or ballast tanks.

At the present time this potentially prolific and growing source of pollution is subject to almost no control whatsoever.

The estimated impact of the untreated sewage of five hundred thousand people derived from these sources is destined to grow as the use of waterways for recreation as well as commerce increases.

Few states have any control programs in effect. Many are holding legislation in abeyance until more uniform standards for equipment approval are available or more acceptable methods of disposal or treatment are developed. Meanwhile pollution from these sources is growing explosively.

Legislation is at present before the Congress to make a start controlling this source of pollution. Within a stated period of time all newly constructed vessels would be required to provide sewage treatment equipment and in a slightly longer period existing vessels would be required to install such equipment.

Standards and specifications would be subject to approval by Federal Agencies in cooperation.

Cost of such a program is subject to wide variation with estimates ranging between a half and one billion dollars over a period of several years; from one hundred dollars for small recreational vessels to sizeable amounts for large commercial ships. Nevertheless the caliber of the problem, and the damage to the nation's water resources which would be averted, make this a small burden to be willingly borne.

My next example is pollution from agriculture.

As technology applied to the nation's agriculture becomes more sophisticated and efficient it is unfortunate that an important by-product is a threat to our water resources. This is the pollution derived from the agricultural process, not only from soil erosion caused by faulty procedures but from fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, animal wastes, inorganic salts and minerals and forest and crop residues which are in the run-off from the land into the nation's water courses.

An estimated 1.7 billion tons of waste results from livestock and poultry production. Until the recent development of corporation type concentrated farming, animal wastes were usually returned to the soil of the same farm. Now feed lots and poultry farms may be located far from grain fields so that the historical disposal methods are not practical.

The highly concentrated nature of these activities permits greater efficiency of production but results in a need for a new technology in handling and disposing of wastes in a manner that is compatible with public restrictions set up to avoid pollution.

Animal wastes are prolific sources of matter causing eutrophication of lakes, fish kills, nitrate contamination of soil and aquifers, annoying odors and dusts, depreciation of recreational values of rural land and streams, proliferation of insect pests and dissemination of agents infectious to animals and man.

Existing technology for control of animal wastes must be improved and new methods be developed. Establishment and enforcement of standards and criteria for land use planning must be developed to minimize the impact of pollution from this source.

Processing raw agricultural products to food, leather, pulp, paper, wood products and industrial chemicals results in inevitable losses of organic and inorganic matter, ranging up to twenty-five or even fifty percent of the raw material entering the plant.

Total pollutants resulting from the activities of these many thousands of processors have been estimated to equal the sewage load

caused by a population of one hundred and sixty-eight million people, almost our entire country.

Farm products are processed by some eighteen thousand establishments. The pulp and paper industry is a large one and individual plants are themselves large and prolific sources of damaging pollution, difficult to cope with. Other major pollutant sources from agricultural-based industries are cotton and wool processing, leather and soap manufactures, and production of industrial chemicals from farm and forest products and by-products.

Pollution from these sources is of such major proportions that immediate and forceful procedures are called for. These must take the form of modernization of harvesting and processing to minimize waste in initial stages; more efficient recovery and utilization of by-products; treatment and disposal of processing plant wastes and changes to make agricultural raw materials more readily processed.

In a recent year it was estimated that thirty-nine million tons of chemical fertilizers were applied in the United States to supply nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium needed for the growing process. Too copious or inefficient application of these substances has resulted in deposition in surface waters of such quantities as to encourage excessive growth of algae and other aquatic plants, adversely affecting water quality for fish, recreational use and even human consumption. Some forms of nitrogen are highly mobile and contaminate ground as well as surface waters. Eroded material containing phosphorous and potassium is deposited in streams and surface water systems.

Control of these sources of pollution is mandatory. In order to accomplish this it will be necessary to develop programs of research and demonstration of the behavior and fate of applications of fertilizers, minimization of run-off and percolation of nutrients by more effective and efficient application. Excess plant nutrients must be controlled or removed from a surface or sub-surface drainage to maintain the desired quality of receiving waters. Better knowledge should be developed on the effects of nutrients on algae and other noxious aquatic plants. Another possibility would be to develop some use for algae and other water plants.

Residues from forests and crops are also major sources of pollution in the form of plant diseases, insects and rodents. They are the result of harvesting operations and pest damage or natural deterioration. They are dangerous also because of fire hazards and as hosts for diseases and insects.

These sources are widespread and numerous and constitute major sources of pollution of air, soil and water, our most vital natural resources.

Control of this type of pollution requires minimizing production of undesirable crop and forest wastes, improved utilization of residues, treatment or removal of hazardous or excessive residues from the environment and the development of guidelines for local programs of control and disposal of these residues.

All streams contain some dissolved inorganic salts and minerals. Water diverted for irrigation and containing these substances is subject to concentration by evapotranspiration and either accumulates in the soil or returns to the stream in concentrated form. This has become a problem of major proportions throughout the vast irrigated areas of the West and Southwest.

A great deal of work must be done to minimize this problem. Programs must be undertaken or stimulated to reduce the salt concentration of irrigation water supplies, improve irrigation and drainage practices to

minimize the effects of salts and minerals on soils and quality of returning water; possibly by treatment of return flows to remove salts and minerals and also by improvement of plant tolerance and utilization of salts and minerals.

Little is known of the nature and effect of many substances used as pesticides and herbicides. There are some such as DDT and dieldrin which are persistent and accumulate in the environment, be it soil, air, water or animal tissue. Some, after accomplishing their purpose or failing to do so, remain in the environment.

The actual effect of these substances still remains much of a mystery but they are justifiably believed to have a long range deleterious effect on some or all forms of life when in sufficient concentration or in accumulation.

Full cooperation of the best efforts of a number of Federal agencies as well as other entities should be directed to a concentrated effort to evaluate the nature, extent, significance and impact of pesticides in the ecosystem. This should be aimed at reducing the amount of hazardous or persistent pesticides, in the environment, at treating, controlling, or removing pesticides from soil, air and receiving waters. Pesticide wastes should be disposed of in a manner least detrimental to the environment. Finally uniform effective pesticide regulatory programs should be established.

Agricultural activities are prolific sources of water pollution and full recognition of this state of affairs must precede any effective means of control.

Some sources lend themselves to legislative control only to a limited degree. Primarily control would proceed from a concentrated program of research and establishment of guidelines, to be followed by a strong enforcement program.

Initially the Federal Government could expand its research program and in cooperation with State and local governments develop controls which will minimize if not eliminate many of these sources of pollution.

I realize that the picture I have presented is not a pretty one—but it is a factual one—one that must be forcibly brought to the attention of the public. The public must be made conscious of the threat—not to their children and grandchildren, but to the present generation.

The problems are present and the solutions are attainable—solutions which will be arduous and costly but if man is to retain his place in the eternal scheme they must be fulfilled.

PROFESSIONAL WOMEN

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, we are now celebrating National Business Women's Week and I am privileged to join with my colleagues in saluting the working women of America. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs—which annually sponsors this special week of tribute—has for over 50 years given encouragement to women seeking a role in the professional, academic, and economic life of this Nation.

The State of Alabama is fortunate in having over 100 affiliated clubs with a total membership in excess of 4,000.

Many of these clubs are located in the Fifth Congressional District and we are especially honored that Dr. Minnie Miles, professor of management at the University of Alabama, has served as past president of the National Federation.

The Business and Professional Women's Clubs that are located in the Fifth District of Alabama are as follows: Linden, Verbena, Tuscaloosa, Queen City, Northport, York, Chilton County, Aliceville, Bibb County, Marion, Montevallo, Moundville, Pickens County, Bessemer, Fairfield, and Hueytown.

It is indeed fitting that we should pause and pay tribute to the accomplishments of our business and professional women, for they are now more than 29 million strong, or one-third of this Nation's total work force.

COTTON PAYMENTS IN 1970

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in U.S. Department of Agriculture press released 1352, issued October 15, Secretary Hardin increased the 1970 national cotton acreage allotment 1 million acres. This is an increase of more than 6 percent.

Under existing legislation, this announcement increases the 1970 cotton subsidy payments at the same time that it increases cotton acreage allotments. The domestic cotton allotment for each producer is set at 65 percent of his farm allotment and is increased by the October 15 announcement. Furthermore, the Secretary is required to support the price of cotton on the domestic allotment at 65 percent of parity.

Thus, cotton producers are being given larger allotments and larger payments in 1970. This might be considered fair and equitable for many small producers who have suffered a series of bad crops in the past three years.

Approximately a third of the cotton, however, is produced by 7,000 producers, who receive over \$20,000 each in Government payments, with acreage allotments averaging several hundred acres per producer.

These 7,000 producers received approximately a third of the cotton subsidies totaling over \$800 million in 1969. They will be permitted to grow more cotton per producer next year, at the same time that their payments are increased from an average of \$34,000 in 1968 to \$37,000 or \$38,000 in 1970.

The extra bonus to the very large cotton producers is even more striking. Over 900 cotton producers received payments of \$50,000 or more under the cotton program in 1968.

The October 15 announcement increases each of their 1970 cotton acreage allotments which already are several hundred acres per producer and increases their total payments several thousand dollars.

This is outrageous. I have written Secretary Hardin that this would be irresponsible administration of outdated legislation. I have called on him to propose emergency changes in the cotton legislation which will permit him to increase the 1970 cotton acreage allotment without at the same time increasing the subsidies to the large producers.

My letter to Secretary Hardin follows:

OCTOBER 21, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HARDIN: May I call your attention to the payment implications of your press release 3215 of October 15, 1969, increasing the 1970 national cotton acreage allotment by one million acres.

On the basis of your analysis of 1968 farm program payment data, some 7,000 cotton producers, who would have been affected by a \$20,000 payment limitation, produced about a third of the cotton with acreage allotments averaging near 300 acres per producer. In addition to the market income from their cotton production, these 7,000 producers received government payments averaging about \$34,000. As you know, several corporations received over \$1 million in payments in 1967 and 1968 and are expected to again receive over \$1 million each in 1969.

Taking into account the increase in the minimum price support level occasioned by the increase in the parity price and your announced increase in the domestic allotment, legislatively set at 65 percent of the farm allotment, these large corporations and other large producers will receive about a third of the increase in the national acreage allotment plus an increase in payments of 10 percent or more.

Except for the reduction in estimated yield per acre from 545 pounds in 1969 to 500 pounds in 1970, the increase in 1970 payments would have been even greater.

It appears that the 1970 cotton program, on the basis of your October 15 press release will permit the 7,000 largest producers to increase their production of cotton and they also will have their payments increased from an average of \$34,000 in 1968 to \$37,000 or \$38,000. About 1,000 of the largest producers, most of which are corporations, who received over \$50,000 in cotton program payments in 1968 will have their acreage allotments increased and their payments increased by more than \$5,000 by your October 15 increase in the national allotment.

This is outrageous. It would be irresponsible administration of outdated legislation.

You opposed my amendment limiting 1970 farm program payments to an individual producer to \$20,000. I now call on you to propose emergency changes in the cotton program legislation which will permit you to increase the 1970 national cotton acreage allotment without this built-in increase in subsidies to the large producers.

Perhaps this could be done most easily by amending section 350 of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1350) by striking the second to the last sentence "Provided, that no farm domestic allotment shall be less than 65 percent of such farm allotment" and inserting "Provided, that no farm domestic allotment shall be less than 65 percent of such farm allotment set on the basis of a national allotment of 16,000,000 acres."

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives before it acts on the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1970 and would appreciate an early reply.

With all my best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

MRS. BENTLEY: WHEN AMERICAN
TRADE FLOURISHES, EVERYONE
WINS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today the President of the United States has announced his commitment to the challenge of rebuilding and expanding the U.S. merchant marine so that the American flag may again fly proudly in the shipping lanes of the world and so that the shipbuilding and ship operating industries may again achieve a vitality that will contribute to the industrial growth and the strength of this Nation.

His message to the Congress echoes the philosophy and the thinking of the new chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, who stated her allegiance to this same cause in an address to the National Press Club on October 17, 1969. Mrs. Bentley's dedication to the cause of a strong merchant marine was evidenced time and time again in her writing for the Baltimore Sun during the years when she was probably the Nation's best-known, and only woman maritime editor for a great metropolitan newspaper.

Her statement to the National Press Club that "when America trade flourishes, everyone wins," is a clear expression of the course she has chartered to renew the merchant marine. I am proud to have played a part in urging President Nixon to appoint her as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, where she can be instrumental in achieving this desirable objective.

Mrs. Bentley's speech, which I submit for the RECORD, is a strong statement of the need for a revitalized shipping industry under the American flag. I urge my colleagues to read it:

REMARKS OF MRS. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,
OCTOBER 17, 1969

Mr. President, Members of the Board of Governors, Chairmen and Members of the various Committees, resident and non-resident members and associate members of the National Press Club wherever you are chasing news, uncovering malfeasance, misfeasance and nonfeasance throughout the world—I bring you greetings from your sisters down the elevator shaft on the fifth floor of the National Press Building, the Women's National Press Club.

I bring you greetings, too, from your counterparts in the American Newspaper Women's Club, and all other similar distaff organizations.

I must admit that I have no authorization to do so, but I think it nice to start off offering the olive branch of peace in a divided newsworld. I am not, however, taking a George McGovern or a McCarthy approach toward the settlement of the internecine war. I do not favor a cessation of all resistance on the part of newsmen in the face of imperialist aggression of newshawks. I favor no unilateral action on our part looking toward the cessation of this class struggle in which your majority discriminates against our minority.

On the other hand, I do not hold, as some do, that there is no good in any newspaper-

man. I am sure there must be, if we could only find it. Nor do I believe that all newspaperwomen are good through and through, and even though we have not been able to uncover it yet, I say there must be some flaw in one of us.

In similar fashion, I know that there must be many fine, discriminating, distinguished, wise, knowledgeable, gentle men among you besides those few I know, the kind and thoughtful men who inhabit the Washington Bureau of the Baltimore Sunpapers. How it tears my heart to leave them, to know no more of their courtly ways, their stepping back from the water-fountain—I don't require that, but they insist—should I want a sip of water, and the dear fellows holding the door for us women members of the Sun staff to pass through, or doffing their hats in the elevators, undoubtedly the results of their early training in the City Room in Baltimore. How I shall miss it and them. How I shall miss the loud cry of "Copy" as some raucous male voice two feet away splits my eardrums.

I shall miss—if only for a period of time—being a member of the Fourth Estate.

Say what one will, damn it as our critics may, when they are caught in their own maneuverings and machinations by some alert newsmen or newswoman, the news media of this Nation and those who comprise it serve our country and our society on a scale and on a depth and breadth of front unequalled by any other private industry or profession.

True, we are often the accuser, sometimes the defense attorney, too often the judge and jury, but most often the ombudsman, the conscience, of our people. We are a force for honesty, we are a form of social conscience, we are a means by which to attain justice and oppose injustice.

On the whole and by and large, we develop our stories from the facts, and stick to facts. There are always some, as in any profession, who do not let the facts stand in the way of a story, who substitute innuendo for proof, rumor for certainty, but they are few.

Newsmen or newswomen, by far the vast majority of us are high practitioners of the ethics of our profession. Oh, of course, there are accepted areas of open hunting—government officials—particularly newly appointed ones—are always fair game, as are all things having to do with the government at any level, be it national, state, or local. And, we newspaper people have our "hang-ups", each of his own kind, but we handle them, or try to, in such manner that the columns of our papers, pages of our magazines, our TV screens or our radio sets do give fair and honest coverage. I am sure you will agree that for most of us journalism is more than a business, a profession, a means of livelihood. If we would admit it, for most it is a love, a passion.

For me, it will not be easy to think of myself as being dubbed a "news source," rather than "Press." And I have already found that it is easier to make and throw balls than to have them coming at you. I already know that to the Press "the other side of the street" of Government is in reality "the other side of the tracks." I hope my newspaper experience will help me in the dealings with the Press on my new job. I must be even more like Caesar's wife in dealing with you. Certainly there can be no excuse for me to fall into the trap of withholding at the Federal Maritime Commission that which is in the public domain and that which the American public has a right to know. As the FMC's Chairman, I can promise you that in such areas the Press will find the Federal Maritime Commission will exist in a goldfish bowl.

As I look forward to my new job and its opportunity for accomplishment, I cannot help looking back over my shoulder at the world of the Press I leave.

You can understand this since my last major assignment was aboard the SS *Manhattan* trekking through the Northwest Passage. I am not going to say anything about the plug being pulled on communications because of four-letter words because I understand you have a question-and-answer period and that nobody worries about the questions being embarrassing.

The accomplishment of this newest and largest icebreaking tanker which crunched through more severe ice than any other vessel in history, will be recorded in the archives of history because the *Manhattan* opened the forbidden and awesome Northwest Passage to commercial operations and thus the door for real development of the mineral rich but frozen arctic areas of the North American Continent.

Roald Amundsen, the Norwegian explorer whose expedition in 1906 carved out its place in history by becoming the first to transmit the entire waterway east to west by ship—the 45-ton *Gjoa*—took three years to do so, by hugging the Canadian coastline along the mainland shore.

Sixty-three years later, the 155,000-displacement tonnage *Manhattan*, laden with modern technology and icebreaking assistance, plowed through ice floes ranging from four to fifty feet continuously and maintain a ten-day schedule for transiting the formidable passage between Baffin Bay and Amundsen Gulf, named after the famous explorer. The ten-day timing had been established many weeks before in conjunction with the \$40 million over-all experiment arranged by Humble Oil and Refining Company.

Shortly before the 1005-foot long mass of steel entered Amundsen Gulf, the location where Roald Amundsen holed up for 18 months while also striving to locate the precise site of the magnetic North Pole, glasses of champagne were drunk aboard the *Manhattan*—on schedule.

The achievement is monumental. At this point, the feat indicates positively that the modern technology built into ships will permit the waterway to be used more economically than any other form of transport to haul out the untold billions in wealth of oil, copper, iron ore, zinc, tin, and other minerals of the Canadian Archipelago and Alaska's frozen north.

When one considers the many months it took the explorers of old to struggle even a nautical mile in their wooden-hulled ships fighting the elements of the treacherous waterway, the 10-day passage of the *Manhattan*, right on schedule, is a modern miracle, and recalls much of the old aura of romance and adventure of the sea, so much missing in our modern life.

But looking forward, there is a much more important matter for me to deal with than the nostalgic thoughts of a newspaperwoman.

Now, I know that in my new position I am not the Nation's shipping promoter but rather one of that industry's regulators.

To me, this opportunity to speak at the National Press Club offers the very thing I seek in joining the official family of President Nixon's Administration. That is, to focus attention on the American Merchant Marine, to alert the American public to the straits in which we find our shipping—half afloat on a sea of public indifference. If I can bring home to you—the Press—the bitter truths, the present and future dangers that exist for us as a Nation in letting our merchant fleet go down the drain, then I will have served my major purpose at the very beginning of my term of office. I ask you, then, to bear with me for a few more minutes while I spell out some of the cold, hard facts of life in an area of which I do have specific knowledge of shipping and its vital importance both to our country's commerce and its defense. If I can convince you that the con-

cern I feel is justified and warrants further delving on your part, then you in turn will alert the American people to the dangers they face.

Let me start by plagiarizing and paraphrasing a key phrase from another mode of transportation in its current massive promotional campaign. "Who Needs Ships? You Do!"

Why do you and I, and every other American need ships? The answer is simple—in raw materials we are a "have not" nation. Our whole economy, our prosperity, relies—and must continue to rely—on the raw materials we import from other nations, 96% of it aboard foreign ships. Our productive capacity, the jobs of tens of millions of our fellow Americans, are dependent upon the millions of tons of iron ore, bauxite, petroleum, manganese ore, tin, lead, copper, rubber, nickel, zinc and many other vital and strategic materials brought into this country annually to maintain our industrial output. Name any article in your everyday life—the aluminum chair on your patio, the electric light by which you read, your TV set and radio, the car in your garage—and the likelihood is that the imports of raw materials make them possible. Even much of the newspaper that goes into our daily papers is imported by ship. Our Astronauts could not have walked on the moon without these imports. Indeed, there would have been no space program. And, I have not even touched upon the essentiality of our import of raw materials to our defense industries.

The need for ships to maintain the flow of vital raw materials to our shores appears self-evident. What now of the need for ships in order to carry our exports, and to what extent are our exports important to us individually and collectively? Even apart from the defense aspects, I doubt that any would argue against the importance of our foreign trade to the peacetime economy of the Nation, or of its importance in linking the economies of other Free World nations with our own. The \$65 billions of goods we export and import appreciably add to our own gross national product. The goods we export provide the wherewithal by which we are able to purchase raw materials and the goods of other nations. They are the major means by which we maintain our balance-of-payments. And, the production of the goods we export contributes directly to millions of jobs for our fellow Americans. Our economic well-being as a people is irrevocably tied to our foreign commerce, a fact on which I am certain there can be no point of dispute. And for the export of vast quantities of goods, of millions upon millions of tons of cargo, there is no other means than by ship.

And so we come to a further question, a question for which I hope to be able to provide an answer sufficient to develop the same concern on your part as I feel in regard to the serious state of our shipping, and its possible effect on our economy and our security.

Simply put, the question would probably go like this: Granted our foreign trade is essential, and that ships are required to carry it, why must they be our own? Most of our trade is now carried in foreign-flag ships anyway, so why worry?

The question is a simple one, and unfortunately, over the period of years by its very simplicity it has evoked no concern in the nation that over 94% of our foreign commerce is carried by the ships of other nations, and less than 6% by our own.

There has been too little concern that in the area of raw materials, upon which we are completely dependent, we in turn are completely dependent upon the ships of other nations for transport.

If we could count upon the world remaining static, the interests and policies of all nations the same forever as they are today, then the answer might be an echo of the question—why worry? But you know, and I know, that nothing remains static, certainly

not the relationship between nations, nor their national interests.

Too often in the past we have been forced by harsh reality to recognize this fact where shipping is concerned. Even during this century we have had to resort to relying on our own shipping in more than one instance. Relying upon foreign ships to carry 90% of our commerce, we were caught short at the start of World War I. Our traditional carriers were the belligerents, and the belligerents withdrew their ships from our trade to serve their war efforts. The result was that shipping rates skyrocketed, and our economy wavered until we began producing war materials for the Allies. World War II was a repetition, except that we had wisely begun building ships a few years earlier, and our productive capacity had shifted early in the war to the production of materials of war for those opposing the Nazis. We were the arsenal of democracy before Pearl Harbor, and the builders of ships to replace the losses for the British and their allies. With Korea, we were fortunate, for we had the ships left over from World War II in reserve, and pulled out some 600 from lay-up to serve our troops in Asia and maintain our commerce. With Vietnam, we were also lucky, for we still had World War II ships that could limp into service to supply our military and essential civilian needs.

But let me note one fact, in regard to Vietnam. Our own aging ships have been impressed into serving our supply lines, while the ships of many of our friends go to Haiphong.

There have, in fact, been instances where ships of friendly nations have been denied us.

Just as we denied our ships the right to trade with belligerents prior to World War II, a Mexican ship was ordered by its government not to carry war supplies to South Vietnam.

In other instances, foreign-flag ships have been loaded with U.S. Defense supplies, and their crews have refused to sail them. And so, when the chips are down, upon whose ships can we be certain we can rely? Our own, with Americans crewing them. And to have them when you need them, you must build and crew them to serve your peacetime commerce, far in advance of any sudden national defense need.

Under President Kennedy and President Johnson, unfortunately the "Whiz Kids" reigned at the Pentagon. For some reason, they were turned off on seapower. They had persuaded Secretary of Defense McNamara that airlift was the future—that anything could be handled by air. The Air Force had a powerful lobby and a strong persuasive public relations program. They believed this. But when the Vietnam build-up began and McNamara turned around to ask about the airplanes and airlift capability, he learned to his horror it wasn't there. He was going to have to depend on seafight.

In the first two years of the build-up in Vietnam, more than two-thirds of the G.I.'s who were sent over were transported by ship. Some 98.6 per cent of the supplies were transported by the seas. Once the 500,000 basic troops were on hand in Vietnam, the military has been able to handle the replacements primarily by airlift because the numbers involved were only a hundred or two at a time.

More than 97 per cent of the supplies are still going by ship.

Apart from emergency need, however, a peacetime merchant marine composed of modern, productive ships of our own registry serves many purposes.

Among others, the carriage of our trade on our own ships enhances our balance-of-payments position. The British, for example, estimate that transportation of cargoes on their own ships constitutes the equivalent of 4% of their total exports, while the Russians speak glibly in capitalistic terms of the earn-

ings in foreign exchange of their hammer-and-sickle ships.

American merchant ships contribute to the national gross product, and provide jobs both in their building and operation for tens of thousands of Americans. They provide the Treasury with tax revenue, both corporate and personal income tax on employees' wages. And, our own ships constitute a major customer for American suppliers and the products of our farms. Not so with foreign-flag ships, who purchase little and pay the bulk of their taxes at home.

Our shipping companies aid our exporters to develop foreign markets, thus increasing our foreign trade.

Finally, U.S.-flag ships guarantee access to our foreign markets and—if we had them in sufficient numbers—could guarantee our access to the raw materials essential to our economy and defense.

I will not take much more of your time, but let me turn to two final facts I would like to develop.

The first is this—history has shown that no nation achieves greatness nor maintains it without also being a major maritime power. History also shows that from time immemorial right up to the present, seapower—including merchant shipping—is an instrument of national policy. History also shows that a nation pays to achieve and maintain its seapower—or it pays the penalty for not having it!

Now, what do we have in the way of a merchant marine?

About as poor an example of one as can be imagined for the world's greatest trading nation!

Over two-thirds of our privately-owned merchant ships are pushing or are over 25 years old. They are slow, they are inefficient, they are wearing out, and expensive in repairs to keep them sailing. In other words, Gentlemen, well over 600 of the 975 ships under the U.S. flag are heading straight for the shipbreakers. We now have about 15,000,000 tons of privately-owned merchant ships under the U.S. flag. If we do not act now, by 1975 we will be down to about 9,500,000 tons, all also growing older. As for the Government's reserve of World War II ships, by that time it is estimated that only some 135 or so will be available for any emergency need. Our merchant marine is on the skids, and the skids are greased. Why, even today we are fifth in tonnage among nations, with Liberia, Norway, United Kingdom, and Japan ahead of us; while in numbers of ships, we rank sixth behind those countries and Russia.

In the shipping industry, there is a great body of international opinion that looks upon American regulation as highly unnecessary and definitely troublesome. Much of this criticism stems from our foreign friendly trading Allies.

I believe I can say to them at this juncture, that if they will just keep their eyes and ears open and watch the game that I intend to play at the Federal Maritime Commission, their apprehension might well be alleviated. I can assure them that as an umpire in the regulatory affairs that are going to come before me, I intend to carefully avoid even the appearance of a troublemaker.

They can be assured that I am going to call them as I see them.

Oceanborne United States foreign trade and commerce is at present running somewhere over the 40-billion dollar mark. According to very carefully kept statistics, the American Merchant Marine is carrying somewhere in the neighborhood of 5.4% of that total commerce. This means, in plain language, that the vast remainder of that cargo goes in foreign bottoms.

Let me say, that all of us in the United States should be grateful that the foreign merchant marines have the capacity to service our essential commerce, because certainly,

nowhere in the near future could American-flag shipping hope to have the capacity to handle it all.

It is my hope that the foreign-flag shipping business community appreciates the opportunity to earn profits, at least to the same extent that we in America appreciate their service to our trade.

It strikes me that when the Congress of the United States drafts a law which grants foreign-flag enterprise the right to combine in a manner that might be improper under our anti-trust laws, and then Congress, through the Shipping Act of 1916, and through the Federal Maritime Commission, grants those foreign shipping lines immunity from our anti-trust laws, that everyone concerned should be grateful, and a great number of them are.

"Baiting" the Federal Maritime Commission has become sort of a fair game in foreign shipping circles, and has, in my belief, been costly and unrewarding to those who engage in it. As one of the umpires in this game of world trading, I believe it would profit us all to keep our eyes on the ball, and to ignore the heckling that arises on the coaching lines.

When American trade flourishes, everyone wins.

It is a paradox that this nation, once a major seapower, has turned from the sea; while Russia, traditionally a land power, has turned to the sea. Since the USSR is now our major competitor in the world for both the minds of men and their adherence to our economies and our divergent philosophies on freedom and the rights of the individual, a final look at our divergent attitudes toward a merchant marine will be of value.

One thing is certain, the Russians and ourselves are 180 degrees out of phase in regard to the importance we attach to a merchant marine. There is no in-between. Either they have been and are 100 per cent right, and we are 100 percent wrong, or we are right and they are wrong.

At the time of the Cuban confrontation, the Soviets paid through the nose for the lack of their own merchant ships, forced to charter the ships of other nations for their Cuban adventure. But, Cuba taught the Soviets a lesson, and from that day forward they have concentrated on building a merchant fleet second to none. Since that date, from about 5 million tons they have risen to 12 million, and they are continuing to build at the rate of one million tons a year. Russian officials themselves state—and I can show you the statements—that by 1975 they will have achieved 16.5 to 18 million tons of new merchant shipping. They speak of the profits made by their ships in trade with the world. They speak of the foreign exchange they make for "the motherland." They speak of the foreign ports they enter and boast of the fact that their seamen serve as ambassadors to the people of other countries, cementing friendship for Russia and advancing the Communist view among the people of foreign lands. They speak of the flag in world ports and the prestige it brings to the USSR. They speak of the use of their ships in developing trade ties with developing nations and others. What they do not speak of publicly, but what has become evident to maritime nations, is the extent to which they have now begun to undercut world shipping rates in competition with the ships of other nations. They have entered third-flag trade, their ships never touching Russian ports, between Japan and Canada, undercutting American-flag and other national shipping between Japan and the West Coast of the United States. In doing so, they provide a perfect example of what I mentioned earlier—the use of ships as an inherent instrument of national policy.

I now rest my case for the need for this

nation to immediately reverse its position on the need for an American Merchant Marine, and begin the long haul up toward attaining a merchant fleet equal and adequate to our national needs, before our own stupidity and the Russians bury us at sea! I ask you of the Press to consider what I have said, check the facts and if you are convinced, then tell the American public, "and tell it like it is!"

And, just in case anyone should question how valid the comparison between Russia's massive maritime buildup is in relation to our own lack of effort, and whether any real weight should be given to these recent Russian publications, provides the answer to the question "why worry?" They indicate that the USSR's intention is not one of peaceful coexistence with the U.S.A. They recognize our Nation as the single major roadblock to achieving their worldwide goals, and merchant shipping as one of the major weapons for conquering the globe.

Thank you for hearing me out, and thank you for having invited me to appear. It is an honor of which I am fully aware, for I realize that a few days ago I would have had to be quietly sitting up in the gallery, a newsdove watching the newshawks feasting!

THE NEW MORALITY—SODOM AND GOMORRAH II

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called to the attention of the House two recent issues of "the Herald of Freedom," published by Mr. Frank Capell—31144. These publications summarized in an exceptional manner the moral deterioration which is taking place in our country, and the role of so-called "sex education" in this national tragedy.

Mr. Capell's articles related the connection between SEICUS, the Elysium Research and Development Institute, and its parent Elysium, Inc., the Los Angeles publisher of pornography. All three of these operations are engaged in dispensing pornography in the guise of education.

Sex education means many different things to Americans. It may be something as simple as instruction in biology or physical hygiene—or it may encompass such certainly moral, ethical, or religious fields as contraception, promiscuity, and homosexuality. Whether or not the subject belongs in our elementary and secondary schools depends entirely on clearly defining its scope.

I include in my remarks Mr. Capell's October 3, 1969, edition, entitled "Sex and Subversion," together with a published discussion of the sex education envisioned by Elysium, Inc., taken from its current pornographic publication, *Nude Living*—which promotes the Elysium Institute and SEICUS in the same issue:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Oct. 3, 1969]

SEX AND SUBVERSION

Of concern to many Americans is the wave of illicit and degenerate sex promotion which engulfs the land and saps the moral strength of Americans young and old. Many oldsters are accepting the "new morality," while the youngsters will have "sex educa-

tion" forced upon them (if the "sexperts" have their way) and become well acquainted with sex long before they are old enough even to begin to think of marriage. If the older ones wish to become depraved, that is their own business except for the example they set for their children. Children, however, need to be protected from the forces which seek to destroy their self-respect and morality. Observers cannot fail to note that lack of morality and radical left-wing philosophy seem to go together. Love-ins have replaced love and protesters have replaced patriots, that is if you are in with the in-crowd.

A lost generation is being promoted and this is all that is necessary for the downfall of the United States. Congressman James Utt has stated:

"Leaders of the world-wide Communist conspiracy are too well aware of the great impetus given to their plans by the destruction of moral standards, and they have taken full advantage of it with amazing success in our country. . . .

"Pornography has been all but completely legalized and has pervaded every medium of communication. . . . Appealing to prurient interests is profitable, and pornography publishers are cashing in. What better . . . 'public relations' expenditures can they make than those which destroy moral values through the schools."

Rep. Utt links the promotion of "sex education" with Communism, stating:

"One of the basic activities of the Communists is their promotion of complete sex education in almost all school grades. . . .

"Throughout history, nations which deteriorated morally have experienced a simultaneous decline in economic and military strength. It is morality which elevates morale, which depends so much upon pride. Lacking moral discipline, one cannot have true pride in his accomplishments, nor can he have the altruistic motivations which combine with natural selfish incentives to render constructive progress possible."

"Anyone doubting the demoralizing effect of the degradation of ethical values need only consider that the Scandinavian countries have had compulsory sex education for two decades. A third of the brides in Denmark are pregnant at marriage. . . . Venereal diseases have reached catastrophic proportions. . . ."

The youth of America feels that it is being "liberated" and that it is building a brave new world which will arise from the ashes of the old one they seek to destroy. Testifying before the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee on the "Extent of Subversion in Campus Disorders," Ernesto E. Blanco, now an associate professor at Tufts University, formerly of Villanova University in Havana, Cuba, stated:

"As far as I can see, the influences I see active in the American universities are the ones I have presented here (in a chart outlining the Communist takeover of Havana University). The anarchists referred to in here involve some of the groups that are followers of Herbert Marcuse, professor of philosophy at the University of California, at San Diego . . . we have the intellectual leadership . . . composed of Fabian Socialists, Communists, and anarchists. The Fabian Socialists, as you probably know, are extremely active among intellectual groups in the United States, and they form that mass of the intellectual community which is inclined and sympathetic toward Marxist ideas, but they do not belong to the Communist Party. They pose themselves as 'progressive liberals,' and their ideas are to impose Marxism through nonrevolutionary methods. They feel that violent revolution could completely spoil the imposition of Marxism by creating a reaction; therefore, they try to intellectually subvert the population. That is, to

have them willfully accept Marxism by education, by influence through the mass media and by exercising what I call the influence multiplier which consists in influencing a very influential person, and when you do that, that influential person, either a newspaperman or a respected college professor, can influence thousands of people without even belonging to the party or being known as a Marxist. . . .

The second leadership group, the Communists and Marxist-Leninists, of course, we know much better because they are more outspoken.

"In the third group we have the anarchists. The anarchists are violent destroyers; they are nihilists. We can include in this group some of the black radicals, black extremists, and also in this group we have the followers of Marcuse, the existentialists, the drug pushers, and so on. . . .

"The theories of Marcuse are that the youth should liberate themselves from any moral codes, that they should do anything they like; that the unrestrained satisfaction of their bodily tendencies and pleasures are entirely acceptable, and that they should try to get the most satisfaction out of life by doing things that are known to be debasing and immoral, which he claims are not really immoral but serve to purify the future society. He is essentially trying to enhance and reorient the lowest of human tendencies and direct them toward the destruction of society. The drives and the immaturity of youth are being oriented toward the satisfaction of lowly bodily pleasures, and in so doing youngsters become the moral destroyers of our society. . . . (Marcuse) encourages promiscuity, intercourse with animals, absolutely anything that could destroy the fabric of morals and the dignity of the individual. The resulting moral anarchy fertilizes society for eventual totalitarianism."

J.G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Subcommittee interjected the following description of Marcuse:

"Marcuse preaches . . . that we must completely destroy the present society . . . he is a self-confessed anarchist and nihilist . . . He preaches that we must not have any goals, because the new society will shape itself on the basis of the conditions existing when this society is destroyed, and if we have any goals, we will be tempted to make compromises toward the attainment of those goals, and, therefore, our single goal must be the complete destruction of society . . . He also follows . . . what has been called the line of Freudian-Marxism that human drives originate in self-preservation and sex and have to be channeled in other directions in order for civilization to rise, and if we can channel those drives back into sex and violence, there will not be any drive left. We will have a generation that goes nowhere."

Anyone, looking at today's college campuses and the meadows full of freaked-out, dropped-out hippies and yuppies turning on with pot and pop-music, who would place much of a bet on our country's chances for survival when it is up to such as these to guide it would be betting against very great odds, indeed. Pornography, pacifism, pot and promiscuity cannot nourish leaders with strength and integrity. When young America's idols are the Beatles and Andy Warhol, and books like "Portnoy's Complaint" can find publishers, much less become best sellers, things are really bad. Today's youth is not just "letting off steam," it is actually injuring itself irreparably. Drugs permanently damage minds and bodies as well as leave criminal records; promiscuous sex can also injure minds and bodies. Males are unmanly and females are unwomanly and they are getting harder and harder to tell apart. Advice and help of parents are spurned by children who believe the "generation gap" propaganda which alienates them.

When hearings on pornographic literature were held in California ten years ago, evidence revealed that the sale of sexy and "girlie" magazines constituted a multimillion dollar business; that in California alone some \$500 million was spent for such material each year and that 75 percent of some 15,000,000 issues each month fell into the hands of teenagers. Efforts to stop such publications have not been fruitful, with the courts becoming more and more lenient with pornographers. In fact, the courts are deliberately challenged so that precedents may be set and, when action is taken against pornographers, powerful forces rush to the rescue. In the forefront of the defense of pornography and subversion is the American Civil Liberties Union. An article signed by clergymen of four religions who cooperated in an anti-pornography organization called Operation Yorkville, stated:

"In the area of pornography . . . which is recognizedly having a degenerative effect upon the mental and moral health of American children, the ACLU has consistently defended the pornographers' rights under the first amendment, ignoring the rights and liberties of children and their parents. The director of the New York Civil Liberties Union admitted that the \$2 billion traffic in pornography could not exist without the union's defense of pornographers."

Another successful challenger of anti-pornography laws is publisher Barret Lee (Barney) Rosset of Grove Press. In a non-critical article by Albert Goldman, we are told:

"That's Barney Rosset, 'Grove Press' Rosset, the old smut peddler himself, turning his dubious attentions to home movies and the debauching of the American family. Good old Barney, always gnawing away at the props of middle-class morality. . . . First he changes the rules of the publishing game by winning the right to print Lady Chatterley's Lover. . . . Then he dips into real filth with . . . 120 Days of Sodom. . . . Finally he pollutes the very shrine of American culture by smearing the silver screen with the meat-rack obscenities of I Am Curious (Yellow)."

Barney Rosset has made millions from his pornographic publications and has plans for bringing pornography into the home through cassettes, operating through TV sets. Rosset is the son of a Jewish banker father and an Irish Catholic mother and the product of permissive, progressive education. He became a millionaire when his father died and found his niche in life when he bought Grove Press and proceeded to publish and peddle pornography which was formerly unobtainable legally. He was the first to breach the censorship code with a "carefully planned and skillfully executed court battle."

Barney Rosset paid \$25,000 to a Swedish firm for sole American rights to the pornographic movie, I Am Curious (Yellow) and his profits on this venture are expected to amount to \$3 to 4 million. He actually has an empire of enterprises which consists of publishing books written by Communists and revolutionaries, and filthy sex books; distributing obscene type movies; operating a movie theatre; publishing a magazine and even college textbooks. Rosset has been described as "an enigma" and spent many years in psychoanalysis. He destroys his publicity man's efforts to make him appear to be a "solid businessman" by talking too freely about sex, drugs and political revolution, his interest in this being long-standing as shown by his having written a paper called "SOCOM" (Socialist-Communist) during his early school years. Continuing into the present, a recently published photograph of the Grove Press office shows Russian Communist posters on the walls.

Among the pro-Communist books Rosset has published are the reminiscences of Che Guevara, Edgar Snows; "Red Star Over

China" and Soviet spy Kim Philby's "My Silent War." He has also published books by Bishop James Pike, Dr. Joseph Fletcher (Situation Ethics) and Dr. Albert Ellis. The Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS) lists Barney Rosset as a source of information. This is the organization which is leading the fight to introduce sex education courses into grammar schools across the country. They are also supplying the material to be used.

Phoebe Courtney states in her expose, *The Sex Education Racket* (Pornography in the Schools): "A large portion of the teaching materials presented to America's children in the schools today under the guise of sex education, is too disgusting to be reprinted in a book such as this. 'Pornographic' is the only adjective that can properly be applied to some aspects of the so-called sex education programs." Mrs. Courtney in her chapter on "The Communists' Stake in Sex Education" quotes many sources to show that there is a close tie-in between Communism and the present-day efforts to destroy morality in the United States. She states, "The similarity between the philosophy of Communist (William Z.) Foster and that being pushed by the sexologists in the schools, is not mere coincidence."

In the person of Isadore Rubin, Communism, pornography and sex-education are all tied up in one package. Rubin, an identified Communist, is editor of the pornographic magazine *Sexology* and, from its inception until unfavorable publicity forced him out, was treasurer of SIECUS. *Sexology* has started publishing a "plain-cover" edition, concealing its content formerly luridly advertised on the cover. Rubin is the champion of the homosexual and speaks annually at the New York Mattachine Society, a homophile organization. He has been active in trying to "liberalize public attitudes on homosexuality" and has been quoted as stating: "For some men it is the only way they can have any emotional life at all. . . . We have no evidence whatever that homosexuality is an illness. We do a great disservice to these people by talking of curing them and implying they are sick."

The interest of the Communist Party in pushing pornography was shown when one of the most important pornographic publishers in the United States, Samuel Roth, was indicted by a Federal Grand Jury in New York in July 1955. The indictment read: "1. That from in or about March 1951, and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the southern district of New York and elsewhere; Samuel Roth, the defendant herein, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with Chief Miller G.I. Distributors, Inc., Morris Sorkin, Philip F. Foner, Remainder Book Co., Abraham Lieberman, Book Sales, Inc., and diverse other persons to the grand jury unknown, to commit offenses against the United States in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1461.

"2. It was part of said conspiracy that said defendant and co-conspirators would publish, print, distribute, deposit, and cause to be deposited for mailing and delivery obscene, lewd, lascivious, and filthy books, pamphlets, pictures, papers, letters, writings, prints, packets, packages, articles, and other publications and things of an indecent character."

Roth was convicted and jailed. Foner and Sorkin were partners in the ownership of Remainder Book Co. and Foner was an identified Communist who was also associated with Sorkin in the Citadel Press which published books by such Communists as John Howard Lawson and Herbert Aptheker. As an indoctrinated Communist, Foner would not be likely to do anything not ordered by the Communist Party.

The latest New York City telephone book

still lists Foner's Citadel Press and Remainder Book Co. at 222 Park Avenue South, New York City. It also lists Samuel Roth and Seven Sirens Press, Book Awards, Bridgehead Books and Continental Books at 458 Broadway in New York. The old pornographers go on and on and the not-so-old ones do likewise. An example of the latter is Ralph Ginzburg who has progressed from publishing *Eros* and *Fact* to his newest effort, *Avant Garde*. Although Ginzburg was convicted on obscenity charges in 1963 he has yet to serve his first day in jail because of it. The conviction was upheld by the Supreme Court in March, 1966 but legal maneuvering allows Ginzburg to continue operating his pornography business.

Legal moves have been made to have the five year sentence suspended with judges being shifted around and one judge even testifying in Ginzburg's behalf. Civil Court Judge Irving Younger appeared as a witness in Ginzburg's behalf at a hearing in Philadelphia on April 9, 1969, praising Ginzburg's "exemplary" moral character. Judge Younger was well acquainted with Ginzburg, having been corporate counsel to *Fact* and *Avant Garde* and ceasing his representation of Ginzburg only after ascending the bench in January, 1969.

It is obvious that Ginzburg is a big time operator and has important friends. In promoting his pornographic publication *Eros* he sent out nine million pieces of advertising which resulted in 150,000 subscribers and \$3 million in revenue. His magazine *Fact* published a libelous article on Sen. Barry Goldwater at the time he was the Republican nominee for president of the U.S. Senator Goldwater sued and obtained a libel judgment against Ginzburg for the article which questioned Goldwater's sanity and undoubtedly had a disastrous effect upon his election campaign. Ginzburg is much in evidence with the "kids" of the "New Left" and his *Avant Garde* is an expensively and elegantly produced "underground press" type magazine. Drawings by the same artist, Ron Cobb, appear in *Avant Garde* and the cheap shoddy underground papers. Ginzburg gives his writers an opportunity to promote anti-American and atheistic propaganda.

In an uphill fight to protect the youth of America an anti-smut law was finally allowed to stand by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1968. This New York law has encouraged other efforts and at present there are 187 bills pending in Congress to control the tidal wave of pornography. For the first time since the Warren Court began "liberalizing" the obscenity laws in the early 1950's, there reportedly is hope of passing legislation which the Supreme Court will approve. The bill which has the most support is that of Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D., Fla.) who describes it as follows: "It would be a violation of federal law to knowingly sell, offer for sale, loan, deliver, distribute or provide to a minor in interstate commerce or through the mails material which is defined as 'harmful to minors' under the bill." The same test would be applied to movies and the graphic arts. He stated that "the spread of smut literature and other materials through the mail, on newsstands and other places is a great national problem." The American Civil Liberties Union is expected to testify against all the bills.

Pornography is big business and a big problem. There is in existence an 18-member commission established by Congress (the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography) which has been investigating the situation since 1967 and has come up with no results as yet. It is scheduled to report its findings next summer but dissent, reportedly, has made progress almost impossible. One of their major points of disagreement is the effect of pornography on conduct. Concerning this J. Edgar Hoover has stated: "The increasing number of sex crimes is due pre-

cisely to sex literature presented in certain magazines." Postal authorities received 167,792 complaints concerning pornographic material in the mails during 1968, and 234,072 during the fiscal year 1969.

The effect of the constant preoccupation with sex which today's youth cannot escape is not only dangerous, it is sad. They are missing out on the happiness which can come from love and marriage now that sex has become the scientific satisfaction of physical needs, rather than the climax of love. Dr. E. Merrill Root in his article in *American Opinion* magazine, entitled "On Love," states:

"Ours is not an age of the liberation of sex; it is the age of the destruction of the sexes. . . . We (who oppose the sex-mongers) would save the rapture and the bliss from being made cheap and promiscuous and slight and easy and vulgar and crass, we would save its quality and value by seeing it not as fireworks-in-the-glands, but as a fugue of Bach's or a symphony of Beethoven's."

NUDE LIVING No. 54, VOLUME 9, NUMBER 2

ARTICLES

Schools for Sex: Iris Bancroft.
The Basic Training Manual for Lovers: Marion Radde.

Vive la Difference: Tommy Dee.

FEATURES

The Publisher's Page.
These Curious Times.
Elysium Institute Directory.

STAFF

Publisher & Editorial Director, Ed Lange.
Executive Editor, Norman Winski.
Editor, Michael Selber.
Production Manager, Diane Diamond.
Art Direction, Rene Moncada.
Production, Gilbert Luna.

Cover by Bill Rotsler. Other photographs by ASAPm, Iris Bancroft, Walter Chappell, Klaus Ender, Ralph Hampton, Lelf Hellberg, Image Four, Ed Lange, Orman Longstreet, Harrison Marks, Richard Page, Jon Patten, Ron Raffaelli, Bill Rotsler, Jack Savell, Joe Tiffenbach.

(Nude Living, published bimonthly by Elysium Inc., 5436 Fernwood Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90027, is a cultural, scientific, educational, sociological publication produced and distributed to illuminate the conviction that the human body is clean and wholesome, and that increased public understanding of that basic nudist viewpoint will contribute materially to the advancement and well-being of all people, whether or not practicing nudists, as well as to the cultural heritage of a free press. Except where specifically stated to the contrary, the textual and pictorial content of this publication are independent of one another, and no interrelation of the two should be inferred.)

SCHOOLS FOR SEX: A PSYCHOLOGICAL NECESSITY

(By Iris Bancroft)

Webster defines education as "the action or process of educating or of being educated." Hardly much help. It isn't until we reach the word teach that we find a definition that gets to the heart of the matter. Here Webster is most definite. Teach is defined as meaning: "To instruct by precept, example, or experience." Most good educators will accept that definition as adequate, and will attempt to act upon it in a teaching situation. They will be especially careful to provide opportunities for experience.

This emphasis on practice has been proven pedagogically sound, and good schools provide opportunities for the learning individual to experience a skill to be learned. Educators insist that this is necessary. That is, they insist until the act to be learned becomes sexual in nature. Then, suddenly,

great resistance develops against any form of personal practice at all! It is as if a growing human is expected to learn this most important function subliminally.

It is unnecessary to explore in depth the reasons for this illogical attitude. All of us are aware of the taboos and regulations that, in our society, surround the entire sex act. We know the religious, the "moral," the conditioned emotional reactions that are evoked when the subject arises. Unfortunately, many of us are willing to accept these controls without question. We simply accept the "fact" that sex is different. It "cannot" be taught by educator-approved methods. We "must" leave it to the grey area of "by-gosh-and-by-golly."

It is my contention that this timidity and foolishness is the cause of many of the personal emotional problems that we face today. It also is my contention that, until we face up to the situation, we will not appreciably improve the mental health of our people.

Let us look at the problem as dispassionately as we can. Ideal learning and teaching conditions require that instruction be given by skilled persons, and that practice be permitted on the part of the students until they master the subject involved. Daily, we see the effects of following such procedures—in the fields of music arts, graphic arts, reading, writing, athletics—in fact, in all of the areas of living that people encounter—except in that of sex.

Daughters learn to cook by helping their mothers until they are capable of doing it alone. Then mothers step aside and watch while the daughters practice. The same procedure is used when a son learns to repair a car, cut a lawn, build a set of shelves—literally everything he ever will have to do as a grown man. Everything, we must reiterate, except the sex act. Then no one instructs, no one permits practice, no one watches and corrects as the practice takes place. The children who are so carefully tutored in general housekeeping chores are never taught how to perform with competence the most vital act of marriage.

The results of this one-sided instruction are myriad. Women who are considered to be "good wives" are divorced or abandoned by husbands starved for sex. Men who are "excellent providers" lose their wives to more exciting men who promise sexual pleasures. Millions of others live lives of dull boredom. And the terrible fact is that few people even dare to admit that such problems exist.

That, of course, isn't literally true. Society has reached the point where most people acknowledge that married couples should be helped. "Marriage clinics" and "marriage counselors" are available, so that couples can discuss their problems. This is some improvement over the past, when no one would admit that there were problems to be solved. But it still is a most unbalanced situation. Compare it with the following:

What would be thought of an orchestra director who hired 100 men and women to form an orchestra but did not concern himself with their performing skills? Instead of seeking polished musicians, this imaginary director would hire all who applied, set them down before music stands, put instruments into their hands, and then—only then—begin to "discuss" the techniques of playing the various instruments and producing the desired ensemble effects. What's more, he would do this experimentation on stage before a full house, and with an assortment of music that would challenge polished musicians!

Insane? I'm sure you would agree that such a conductor would have to be! The audience would laugh him off the stage. And if some leader in the community insisted that it was "morally wrong" to teach music

skills to musicians before they gathered on stage for a performance, he would be considered a raving fool!

But change the circumstances: Limit the "performers" to two and put them in a marriage bed and, somehow, the whole situation becomes distorted. Now we are willing to accept all these impossible requirements, and to agree that it would be "morally wrong" to prepare the two young people for the vital activity. We accept without question a decision that it would be "bad" to provide the "performers" with adequate training and instruction. This, too, is in every sense of the word, ridiculous!

Such a situation must be corrected! We have no right to deny instruction in sex to our children, when sexual pleasure and sexual ability are so vital to happiness and successful living. And vital they are. For a man or a woman who feels incapable or "cheated" sexually is bitter, unhappy, and basically maladjusted.

A possible solution is presented in the works of some modern anthropologists. They have discovered communities of people for whom sex instruction, in the best sense of the word, is an accepted practice. The Samoans, natives of New Guinea, are such a group. In their society, sex education begins with puberty, when the child is taken in hand by one of the older relatives of the opposite sex. He is carefully instructed, through actual doing, in the sex act. These are not lessons in words only—nor are they vague "birds and bees" tales. The child learns through practice, guided by an experienced, mature teacher. Only when the lessons are mastered is the teen-ager ready to marry and to thereby establish sexual relations with his peers.

I propose that this is the form of procedure that we must follow. Obviously, because we are not a simple primitive society, we will have to alter the details. For one thing, until some time has passed, we cannot assume that immediate relatives are equipped to serve as teachers. We will have to look elsewhere for the skilled instructors.

For this reason and, because it fits in with our established behavior patterns, I suggest that we establish "schools for sex." Many of the teachers would have to be accepted on the recommendation of others—until we could establish some standards. But such "good lovers" would be likely to be superior teachers.

I recognize that, to our prudish ears, such a system of sex instruction sounds strange. It certainly lacks the intimacy that surrounds sex education in Samoa. But it is in keeping with our general societal standards. We don't permit parents to instruct in subjects in which they are not qualified. The child learns from specially-prepared instructors who have mastered the subjects to be taught and who are acquainted with the most approved teaching techniques. Why not include sex in the list of important subjects to be learned? Why leave sex to chance?

Because this formal establishment would be difficult to start, I propose that we permit sex schools to be started as were our "regular" schools. As soon as possible, we should permit individuals to open tutoring establishments in sex. Naturally, for health reasons, they should be required to be examined regularly, as should the students who enroll. In fact, it might be wise to require that pupils refrain from all outside experimentation for the duration of the lessons, in order to protect the teachers.

Certainly important changes would occur were such a step to be taken. Those persons who graduated would be capable of teaching their chosen mates—if they wished to—though they probably would choose to marry other graduates. As more people became skilled, more elaborate schools could be set up. It probably would be advisable to limit the age of teachers to between 30 and 50,

in order that advanced age or extreme youth would not interfere with proper instruction procedures.

It is obvious that such a drastic change in social behavior would not be simple to effect. There would be some people who, due to archaic morality, would object to such instruction for themselves or for their children. But there are already established channels for handling such situations. Educational hold-outs are around today.

I do not deny that sex instruction would be better administered on the personal level found in Samoa. But this, we must admit, is not possible here. We cannot permit the blind to lead the blind. And, at present, it is the abysmal ignorance of the adult population that has precipitated our problems.

I can hear critics of this proposal now: "What she's talking about is pure-and-simple legalized prostitution!" But this just is not so. A prostitute considers it her job to behave in a manner that satisfies the desires of her customer. She is there to please him, not to educate. The teachers I propose would instruct, conveying knowledge and skill to their pupils.

Such instruction, in which actual practice would be possible would produce graduates better able to act successfully in the area of sex than before they entered the school. A learning situation would have been in effect. This is no more prostitution of the body of the instructor in sex than a standard classroom is prostitution of the mental capacities of an instructor in music.

A wild dream? Possibly. But one which, if realized, would result in a society free from many of the sexual hangups and fears that now shroud our minds and inhibit our living as joyful members of a successful human society.

THE PSEUDO MAJORITY: THE TYRANNY OF THE LOUDEST VOICE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the recurring chant of "Peace Now" echoed across the Nation last Wednesday, moratorium day. The moratorium was intended to demonstrate in the words of Nicholas von Hoffman of the Washington Post, that the American people do not care whether we "bug out, run out, march out, stumble out, crawl out, or fade out of South Vietnam."

There are undoubtedly some Americans who do indeed feel this way. However, I would seriously contest any assertion that they are anywhere near a majority, even though they shout the loudest.

And the shouting is what I fear, what we—the representatives of all the American people—must fear. We must not let those who shout the loudest become a pseudo majority. We must beware of the tyranny of the loudest voice.

Even more importantly, with respect to the war in Vietnam, we must not be moved to act irrationally in response to the irrational, emotional cries of "Peace Now."

Instead, we must maintain a rational perspective. Such a perspective was shown in an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post as a rebuttal to Mr. von Hoffman's article on the moratorium.

The article, entitled "A Rebuttal," was written by Mr. Ward Just, an editorial writer for the Post. Mr. Just covered the war in Vietnam for 2 years as a correspondent for the Post. Because he exhibits both historical insights and a responsible position, I submit his article to the attention of my colleagues and recommend it to their careful reading:

A REBUTTAL
(By Ward Just)

I suspect that Nicholas von Hoffman is right when he says that people in their heart of hearts don't care whether we bug out, run out, march out, stumble out, crawl out or fade out of South Vietnam. Who wants to negotiate about cancer? He is talking about a substantial minority in this country, people who have had it, as the President once said in another connection, up to here; thus frustrated, convinced the nation is acting immorally, they want to quit.

It would not be difficult to do, and sure as shooting there is a paper in the White House describing the scenario, how Kennedy and Johnson were responsible for the war, how Nixon, Kissinger and Company gave it the good college try but saddled with an impossible Saigon government and an intransigent and seemingly inexhaustible enemy, had concluded, for the good of the country, that losses must be cut. Add a few juicy charges of past mismanagement of the war (God knows there is enough evidence of it), and conclude that the South Vietnamese must now proceed on their own. America has done all it could, and Godspeed to the survivors. And the kids and their parents are pacified. They won't have to go to war in South Vietnam.

It is a pointless exercise to argue the politics of it, whether or not the loss of Vietnam will lead to the loss of Waikiki or even of Bangkok. Even so, that's a detail—arguable either way with most thoughtful men probably believing that yes, a loss in Vietnam probably means the "loss" of Southeast Asia, but if it did, which it might, so what. Southeast Asia, like China, is not ours to lose. "In the last analysis it's their war," President Kennedy said, blah blah blah. So it is necessary to set up the argument another way, to make it relevant, as they say, to what's happening now. This is to speak of the war in terms of its morals, and to do that is to examine it from the perspective of the Vietnamese.

Many of the Americans who so vehemently oppose the war do so from the position that the United States has virtually destroyed what it has tried to save. It is a fair point and an accurate one, far fairer and more accurate than they might suspect.

The Vietcong had all but won the war in early 1965, before the introduction of American combat troops. The test of strength was decently fair, with the indigenous Southern army with American support fighting the indigenous Southern guerrillas with North Vietnamese support. It seemed clear then that the Communists had the support of the people of South Vietnam. Theirs was the strong tide, and in that Buddhist nation, a nation with an ear tuned to the flow of history (in American political argot it means riding with the winner), the strong tide was the one that would win. The ordinary citizen, not wishing to be out of harmony, would go along; to refuse was to commit an unusual act of defiance. Defiance in that sense is not the Vietnamese way. So in 1965 the Saigon government was playing out a very weak hand, with little support in the country.

The Americans changed all that, first with the money and the men and then, in 1966, by taking charge of the prosecution of the war. What that did was free the South Vietnamese from the necessity for choice. The Americans

ran the war now, and the South Vietnamese were obliged to go along with it—whether they wanted to or not. Many of them did. Others did not. Some of those who had managed to sit on the razor's edge were now forced to ante in with the allies. In a society as astoundingly resilient as South Vietnam's, many more continued to play both ends. But it became increasingly more difficult as 100,000 men became 200,000 men and finally half a million and \$30 billion a year. What this means is very simple. It is that the responsibility for prolonging the war is this country's, not Saigon's nor Hanoi's.

The problem is that the tragedy is much, much deeper than Nicholas von Hoffman and others would have it. It would be wonderful if we could just walk away from it, pull the boats up to Camranh Bay and steal away into the night, leaving Saigon and Hanoi to work things out their own way. But if you did that you would want the journalists to leave along with the soldiers because the stories that would come with the Communist victory would be pretty grim stories, 20 years of scores to settle.

Our responsibility is not to Thieu or Ky or any of the other generals or merchants, nor is it to the South Vietnamese constitution nor to Freedom, nor even to the Americans who have died there, almost 40,000 now and 250,000 wounded. The responsibility is to those South Vietnamese who have been obliged to fight or otherwise resist the Communists because the Americans disturbed the normal course of events and changed the war. That is why the responsibility goes so deep, and it is a responsibility that will not be discharged by importing three million Vietnamese and parking them in the middle of Utah. But it is either that or stand by and watch the slaughter. Of course there may be no slaughter. Possibly not, but I know of no one who would make a bet on that. Twenty years of scores to settle.

That is not an argument bound to find much favor anywhere, because the Vietnamese are not nature's noblemen and we have had them around our necks for too long. For God's sake, for how much longer are we going to pick up the morning paper and find Vietnam all over page one? Whoever heard of Danang before 1965? The bitterness and anger sifts down and finally people say the hell with it. Get out, get out; get out, and we don't care how; get out, and get out right now; get out, or we'll blow the house down. And we don't care what happens later. What happens in the future doesn't matter, because nothing could be worse than the present.

But huh uh, kiddies; it won't work. This particular tragedy isn't going to go away because American college students are excused from duty in the rice fields. It's there with us now, and is going to be there for a generation and the question the moralists ought to ask themselves is where they intend to assign the responsibility for the blood left in the wake of the American boats, pulled up there in such haste at Camranh Bay. When the newspaper displays the photographs of those killed, what do we do then? Avert our eyes? Blame Lyndon Johnson? Perhaps pretend it isn't as bad as it looks, that the victims are war profiteers, or corrupt generals, or pimps or double agents. To the neurotic young it won't matter; American imperialism will be to blame, and that will be that. But what of the rest of us?

All we can do now is play out the tragedy, and try to learn the right lessons. On the ground in South Vietnam, revise the rules of engagement, initiate a cease-fire, keep withdrawing troops, but keep security as well; try to keep people alive, ours and theirs; wind all of it down, but in the winding be mindful that there are people whose lives are at the mercy of the Americans. What is entirely misunderstood in the cur-

rent flight from reality is that this war is not Kennedy's war or Johnson's war or Nixon's war, it's America's war and we all bear some responsibility for it, and for its decent resolution. And the heroes of it are not in Sweden. The heroes are dead.

Our accountability to the South Vietnamese is not without end, but it is there for the immediate future. That is the price you pay for undertaking the direction of someone else's life. What extraordinary courage and toughness it will take now for Americans to be decent.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S
WEEK

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a most distinguished organization, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, is focusing attention on woman's role in today's world through the observance of National Business Women's Week, October 19 through 25.

Since its founding in 1919, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has played a leading role in seeking to advance women's rights and secure fair and equal treatment for men and women alike in various fields of employment. Further, it has worked for beneficial legislation to advance these causes. In addition, aware of its responsibilities to improve or assist in improving world conditions and conditions of our society, the federation has worked on behalf of significant international and national causes.

At its national convention last July in St. Louis, the federation stated as policy its support for measures within the framework of the Constitution of the United States which will promote peace, strengthen national security, and make more effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant, without relinquishment of our basic freedoms.

It adopted a strong legislative program which seeks to end discrimination against working women and to advance efforts to bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

Copies of the federation's legislative platform have been sent to each Member of Congress. I would strongly urge each Member, as I will, to carefully review and consider the recommendations proposed by the legislative platform so that many of these just and reasonable proposals may soon be translated into law.

In my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the 10th Congressional District which I represent, I have long been aware of the leadership exerted by local federation groups. I commend National President Myra Ruth Harmon for her succinct and admirable statement of the federation's purposes:

Our members are imbued with the importance of an informed, active electorate; with the necessity for civic responsibility and service. Accordingly, our members endeavor to be knowledgeable about and to influence

legislation . . . We look to the Congress for leadership and support in our legislative aims.

National Business Women's Week is an appropriate time to consider the vast and unrealized potential which women can offer our society, given the opportunity, and to resolve to eradicate the unfortunate discrimination which has wasted this source of strength and leadership to our Nation's great disadvantage.

LEAD POISONING DRAFT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, lead poisoning is a serious problem in our Nation's cities.

This disease, the nature and effects of which were largely ignored until recently, plagues an estimated 25,000 to 30,000 children in New York City alone.

Children get lead poisoning by eating bits of old lead-based paint which falls off the interior surfaces in the substandard housing of our urban centers.

Often, the disease is not detected until it has reached its most serious stages. At this point, lead poisoning results in epilepsy, cerebral palsy, permanent mental retardation, and death.

I have introduced three bills, H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699, which are aimed at combating this silent epidemic. These bills were reintroduced in July with 18 cosponsors as H.R. 13256, H.R. 13254, and H.R. 13255.

I include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the October issue of *The Sciences*, published by the New York Academy of Sciences. The article was written by Estie Stoll and titled "Lead Poisoning: Price of Poverty?"

I urge my colleagues to read this article, and to support legislation which will combat and eradicate this unnecessary children's disease.

The article follows:

LEAD POISONING: PRICE OF POVERTY?

(By Estie Stoll)

For ghetto children, home may be more deathtrap than sanctuary. Largely unsupervised, with a high craving for non-foods, between 10 and 35 per cent of the East Coast slum children are estimated to have high blood levels of lead, caused by ingesting lead-based paint and plaster that flakes off the walls of their homes. Two to five per cent of these children develop symptomatic lead poisoning; a fourth of those who go on to develop lead encephalopathy suffer irreversible brain damage. (Medical Tribune, April 7, 1969.)

Permitting lead paint to constitute this health hazard in deprived areas "is a social crime and should be punishable as a crime," Dr. René J. Dubos told a Conference on Lead Poisoning at Rockefeller University. Professor of Environmental Medicine and Chairman of the Conference, Dr. Dubos insisted that a more concerned citizenry could force effective legislation to eliminate lead-poisoning just as it eliminated contamination of unpasteurized milk at the beginning of the century.

Lead paint is illegal in many cities, including New York, but the fines for failure to

remove old lead paint are sometimes less than the cost of removal. Although medically unsafe, partial paint removal is often legally acceptable. The primary obstacle to successful treatment of plumbism is re-exposure to a lead-filled environment, Dr. J. Julian Chisholm, Jr., Associate Professor of Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins University, told the Conference. For surviving encephalopathy patients return to a high-lead environment, the chance of permanent brain damage increases from 25 to 100 per cent, he estimated. In Baltimore, a highly successful program against lead poisoning resulted from the combined efforts of physicians and city agencies to seek out patients for treatment and prevent their re-entry into unsafe homes. After in-hospital therapy is completed, a patient goes to a convalescent home while lead paint is removed from his old home, or new housing is found for the family. "Fifteen years ago, before the program began, most of our cases of lead intoxication were at the encephalopathy stage before the time of hospitalization," Dr. Chisholm said. "Now most are asymptomatic, and we see only two or three encephalopathy cases a year."

Other cities have been less successful in solving the lead poisoning problem. In New York's major lead belts—the South Bronx and Brooklyn—400 to 700 people per 100,000 are affected each year. Of these, about 500 are hospitalized yearly, and 30 to 60 of them already have encephalopathy, according to Dr. Joseph A. Cimino, Medical Director of the Department of Health's Poison Control Center. Returned to an unaltered situation, Dr. Cimino estimates, these children have a 10 per cent chance of being poisoned again.

Because the pocketbook is often more vulnerable than the conscience, Dr. Chisholm points out that prevention of lead poisoning is cheaper than victim care. In Baltimore, more than \$220,000 is needed to treat each permanently brain-damaged individual; estimated costs for paint removal, or door and window replacement, are only \$300 and \$600—\$1,200, respectively. Where prevention is not possible, a new urinalysis technique being tested in New York which measures δ -aminolevulinic concentration may help screen asymptomatic victims before they progress to more acute stages.

CALL TO ACTION BY DR. DUBOS

A Congressional bill for a national program to assist cities in eliminating lead paint in inner-city housing, and to treat patients, has already been introduced by Rep. William F. Ryan, New York Democrat. A bill pending in the New York State legislature would allocate funds to detect asymptomatic children. "If we do not act ruthlessly to control this simple problem," says Dr. Dubos, "it is an admission that our society is socially and intellectually dishonest, and it will deserve all the disaster that will come to it."

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Hillsdale, Mich., News and the Midland, Mich., News of August 13 and September 12, 1969, in the State of Michigan. The editorials follow:

[From the Hillsdale (Mich.) News, July 28, 1969]

BIG ENOUGH NOW

Public opinion last year set up a roadblock against a Senate-passed bill permitting states

to increase the weight and width of buses and trucks operating on the interstate highway system.

Now the bill has turned up again in the House public works subcommittee on roads, and trucking and bus interests are attempting to get a favorable recommendation.

The Senate-approved bill would allow states to increase the maximum weight of single-axle trucks from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds; of tandem-axle trucks from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds; and to replace the existing gross weight limit of 73,280 pounds with a sliding scale formula based on the distance between the front and rear axles and the number of axles on the vehicle. The maximum width would be increased from 96 to 102 inches.

The American Automobile Association has charged that the 1968 legislation would open the door to triple-trailer trucks on the interstate system. Motorists who find it difficult to pass the mammoth trucks on highways today would be up in arms if triple-trailer trucks were permitted.

Even a six-inch increase in the width of trucks would increase the safety hazard. The problem exists mainly on highways and streets removed from the interstate system. Drivers of many of the huge trucks already find it difficult to make turns at right-angle intersections.

Even though the federal legislation permits states to raise the limits, the bill should be blocked in the House. Citizens are all too familiar with the success of the trucking lobby in heading off increases in license fees and in diesel fuel taxes, and getting its way on other legislation.

[From the Midland (Mich.) News, Aug. 13, 1969]

TRUCK "SAFETY" NEEDS SCRUTINY

When the trucking industry talks about "safety" and "economy," the words mean something quite different than they do to the general public. The industry is talking about trucks, not about the rest of the traffic.

In testimony before the House public works committee, William A. Bresnahan, managing director of the American Trucking Association, said that permitting longer (70 feet), wider (8½ feet), heavier (a ton more per axle) trucks would "provide a family of trucks which would be safer than the existing units."

The story goes that wider trucks could have more adequate tires, more space between tires, for cooler running and use of chains, more adequate springs and bigger brakes. The proposed length—which states would be empowered to adopt, and Wisconsin's limit now is 55 feet—would permit greater cubic and weight capacity "without any additional stress on roads and bridges," the spokesman went on.

Fogging up the safety issue further was the association's research counsel, Edward V. Kiley, who cited Bureau of Public Roads figures to show 26.8 passenger cars are involved in accidents each million miles of travel, compared to only 3.23 trucks. How this speaks for bigger trucks was not explained.

A private study done for the Automobile Manufacturers Association shows 3 fatalities per hundred persons in collisions of passenger cars and pickup trucks, 7.1 in collisions of cars and tractor-trailer combinations and 13.3 in tractor-two-trailer combinations, the so-called double bottoms encouraged by the bill.

The American Automobile Association, which introduced the latter statistics to the committee, noted that, when a truck collides with a car, those in the smaller vehicle are more liable to injury or death.

The truckers' statements on road and bridge wear also can stand no close scrutiny. The American Association of State Highway

Officials has reported that increasing single axle loads by 2,000 pounds adds the effect of 1.6 applications of the present 18,000 pound limit and cuts remaining life of pavement 25 to 40 percent. If tandem axles were increased from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds, federal highway maintenance might jump \$1.6 billion, and the "overstress" in bridges would increase.

The kind of "safety" and "economy" the trucking industry is talking about we can do without.

DO THE BIG TRUCKS PAY ENOUGH?

Whether the biggest trucks put as much into highway taxes as they add to the cost of road building continues to be a lively question.

It has been asked for years without an answer that ends the questioning. For lack of convincing proof it is still a drag on those who lobby for bigger trucks.

They were shouted down by letters from the public to members of Congress a year ago, but the big-truck interests are trying again.

The question is back in this year's record. The authoritative voice of Douglas B. Fugate, first vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, was heard by the House subcommittee on public works.

He said larger trucks already on the roads pay less than their share of highway costs. Mr. Fugate said that studies made by these men who build and maintain the highways show that allowing axle weights to increase only one ton from the present nine-ton limit would reduce the life of pavement 25 to 40 per cent.

This is a fresh statement from an engineering viewpoint of an attitude that has been around continuously since the interstate system was begun.

In the discussion preceding adoption of the law in 1956, there was a House Ways and Means * * * J. S. Giles, chairman of the highway committee of the American Automobile Association said heavy trucks then were paying less than "an equitable share of Federal-aid highway costs."

One of the compromises was that the interstate program was to be started while the heavy truck portion of the taxes was still undetermined.

Millions of dollars were used for a pavement-testing program at Ottawa, Ill. Technically, it was a "highway cost allocation study."

After many months of intense interest on the part of truck fleet owners, a voluminous report was issued. It said: "There is a definite indication . . . that the heavier trucks and combinations (particularly the latter) should be paying considerably more, in relation to the payments by the lighter vehicle groups, than they do now."

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs was formed, which has become one of the largest and most outstanding organizations in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, with a membership of 180,000.

During the week of October 19-25, they are observing National Business Women's

Week in recognition of the innumerable contributions made by the professional and business women of this country and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor these ladies who from all walks of life have contributed so much in all fields of human endeavor. I have stated before this House the fact that exclusion of women from responsible positions, jobs with good pay and good prospects can be traced largely to myths and generalizations about women as a class. For that reason I introduced House Joint Resolution 801 which would permit a constitutional amendment to provide equal rights for women in America.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been a most forceful step in the direction of securing equal rights for women, but the realities of sex discrimination still exist in many facets of our society. The national federation has done an outstanding job in removing many of the barriers in our society by providing leadership, guidance, and inspiration.

I would like especially to pay tribute to the Jefferson-Norwood Business and Professional Women's Club in my district, which has just celebrated their 10th year as a member club of the national federation.

Jefferson-Norwood BPW Club has diligently pursued the objectives set forth by the federation, to elevate standards for women in the professions and business, to promote women in business and professions through scientific, industrial, and educational opportunities; several scholarships have been awarded to female students of the junior level in college who are top-grade students in need of financial support. A foster girl-child has been supported in Hong Kong, through PLAN. The support of Chinese Nurses Home in Formosa and the Ramallah School for Girls in Jordan have been projects of the club as well as support of the national federation foundation and the Illinois State headquarters building. Other charitable projects have included contributions to the Klingberg School of Mentally Retarded and the New Horizons Retarded Foundation.

This club can quite properly boast of its many outstanding career women, one of whom is the current president, Miss Lois Altmann, who held the same position in 1966-67.

Another outstanding career woman is Dr. Fonda Stewart, a Naprapath, and a past president of the club. Dr. Stewart is in her second 2-year term as president of the Illinois Naprapathic Association and a director of the American Naprapathic Association. She is a faculty member of the profession's college, chief librarian of the college and cochairman of the department of naprapathy of the college, and holds the distinction of being the first woman to have held the office of president of her professional association. Dr. Stewart has served in many community projects and is presently serving as recording secretary and legislation chairman of the BPW Club, and has been a delegate to all National and State BPW conventions.

Many professions are represented in the Jefferson-Norwood BPW Club, including law, education, nursing, dental

technicians, natural healing arts, and engineering; salaried accountants, secretaries, bookkeepers, and personnel workers, owners of secretarial services, beauty shops, realty and insurance firms, and gift shops.

I take great pride, Mr. Speaker, in saluting these wonderful and outstanding women.

NEWSPAPER FAVORS FEDERAL PAY BILL

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the October 29 edition of the Federal Times there appeared an editorial supporting the House of Representatives' recent action in passing H.R. 13000. This editorial correctly noted that Federal employees are the victims of inflation rather than the cause of it. In order to share this with my colleagues, I insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PAY BILL

The threat of a Presidential veto has failed to deter the House of Representatives from passing a pay raise bill for federal employees.

Whether the threat will be carried out or not remains to be seen.

In an obvious last-minute effort to block passage of the bill the President has warned that it would create the need for cuts in personnel and services.

We can sympathize with his concern over inflation. We can agree that the raise will add to the inflationary pressures in the country.

But, we fail to see why the government workers always are elected to be the ones to make the sacrifice.

The same considerations should have prevailed when the Congress voted its own huge pay raise; but they were strangely lacking.

A few years ago an experiment was conducted in the use of wage guidelines. Government employee organizations went along with the test and settled for a smaller raise than they would have sought normally.

They got the smaller raise. But, industry ignored the guidelines and the comparability gap grew larger.

This is a year in which we have seen workers in some crafts granted wage increases which are truly inflationary. In the meantime, living costs have continued to rise.

Yet, once again, the government worker is asked to hold back and set the pattern for the rest of the nation. Of what use is a pattern if no one follows it?

The plea to help fight inflation is indiscriminately coupled with suggestions that there is laxity and much "fat" to be cut from government.

If there is, in fact, undue waste in government, then this should be stopped. If this makes possible a cut in the size of the work force—without dropping essential services—then the cut should be made. If inefficiency is rampant, then it should be corrected.

The poorest way to handle the wage increase request is to tell the government worker he risks cutbacks or other reprisals if he seeks a fair return for his efforts.

That there is room for increased economy in government is no secret. That there are other ways to achieve it besides threatening cuts in service and personnel also is no secret.

The biggest need right now is for the government to stop using the federal employee payroll as a political football.

Honest dealing with the problem, instead

of the constant maneuvering for political advantage would be a far better solution.

Threats, even against children, soon lose their value. They are neither an effective motivator for good nor a long-range deterrent to evil.

We have said repeatedly that we believe the people of the United States can afford and are willing to pay for good government.

It is time to stop treating the government employee like a child and afford him the same status he could expect working in industry.

WASHINGTON STATE REPUBLICANS SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S PEACE EFFORTS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the King County Republican Central Committee has adopted a resolution in support of President Nixon's efforts to reach a conclusion of the Vietnam war. This resolution was passed by the more than 500 precinct committeemen in a special meeting October 16, 1969, in Seattle.

Under unanimous consent I include this resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

We, citizens of the State of Washington and these United States in public assembly on this 16th day of October, 1969, having a great concern for the security of our nation and the welfare of our people, do hereby declare the following to be the expression of our disposition toward the conduct of our public affairs by the leaders of this Republic.

We take note that in the course of the affairs of man and nations there occur crises which can neither be evaded nor avoided and we understand that we are now living in such a period and as a people and as a nation are confronted by just such a crisis.

We understand this crisis to be one of the spirit and of the will which is now testing our resolution as a people and a nation to defend and preserve those principles of self-government upon which this nation was founded.

We accept that this nation and its institutions are under attack by a militant enemy both foreign and domestic and we here declare that it is our considered and deliberate intention to resist these attacks with all the strength and resources at our command.

We have just witnessed within the preceding 48 hours, demonstrations which, in their effect if not in their intent, have served the cause of those forces which would destroy our nation, its institutions and the liberty of its people.

We here express ourselves in full and complete disapproval of the actions of our fellow citizens who would have us desert our allies in battle, repudiate our national commitments or withdraw into the illusory world of isolation. We will not allow the world to fall prey to the predatory forces of international communism, despotism or reaction.

We declare our full and complete confidence in President Nixon, our nation's leaders, and our gallant fighting men to bring this engagement in Vietnam to a successful conclusion; a conclusion which will strengthen and preserve the interests of this nation and the forces of liberty for all mankind.

We congratulate President Nixon on his demonstrated determination to resolve this painful conflict in Vietnam on an honorable

and reasonable basis. We declare our confidence in him and his policies. We know that peace in this hostile world will come and be kept when the forces of freedom are strong and when those who command have the will to use that strength.

We ask God to strengthen and guide us all through these perils of our times.

AMERICA'S YOUTH—STILL THE SPEARHEAD OF CHANGE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week we witnessed one of the most impressive and peaceful demonstrations in this great Nation's history. Moratorium Day was a nationwide outpouring of dissent in the best tradition of democracy and it was led by thousands of our young men and women.

On October 14, the day previous to this thoughtful and constructive event, Ambassador George Feldman delivered a speech at the National Industry Leader Award Dinner of B'nai B'rith. He took this occasion to speak about America's youth—their sometimes violent dissent, which, as he pointed out is the expression of a small minority and their great promise to the Nation and the world.

George Feldman has served the United States as Ambassador to the great and sovereign nations of Malta and Luxembourg. He is a brilliant attorney whose work with the House Subcommittee on Space and the Federal Trade Commission was innovative and outstanding. He has a beautiful and loving family which is a pride to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Ambassador Feldman's speech so that you and my colleagues in the House may benefit from his wise and cogent ideas on "America's Youth—Still the Spearhead of Change":

AMERICA'S YOUTH—STILL THE SPEARHEAD OF CHANGE

(Address by the Honorable George J. Feldman)

I am honored by the opportunity to take part in this tribute to a great industrial statesman. Individual enterprise and private industry are under constant attack today, even in this highly developed nation of ours. The contributions of corporate enterprise to our economy in terms of employment, taxes and goods and services must be supplemented with a direct concern for the problems that beset our society.

Kendrick Wilson, whom it has been my pleasure to know for many years, typifies that kind of corporate responsibility. In his personal life as well as in his business leadership, his genial manner is matched by an awareness of key problems and a strong will in finding solutions.

He symbolizes the enlightened outlook of the corporation he heads, a company that has been in the forefront of corporate efforts to train and bring job opportunities to the seriously disadvantaged people in our society. In conducting Avco Corporation's business affairs and in leading its enlightened, businesslike programs in the areas of human and urban problems, Mr. Wilson measures up to every criterion for statesmanlike industrial leadership.

His career typifies the best qualities of the leaders of our generation. If our nation can continue to produce men and women of Kendrick Wilson's calibre, its future will be in good hands. In view of some of the activities of today's young generation, many people are worried that that may not be the case.

American youth, they say, want either to drop out of our society or to tear it down. Since my return to the United States I have been troubled by the alarmist nature of our concern over youthful unrest. An excerpt from one angry letter to an editor especially stays in my mind. Quote:

"A great many of the students of today are the most self-centered, self-pitying, confused generation of parasites in history." Unquote. When we ponder the destruction of college offices, the shrilling of "non-negotiable demands," the chanted obscenities and the evidence of drug use, it is easy to nod our heads in sad agreement.

And so the stereotype is hardened. "The new generation is decadent; they can't pick up the torch," we lament, as we repeat a cry that has rung down the ages.

We do have many self-centered young people today. Many are confused. Many are indeed parasites. But how many are many? Can we generalize, can we sustain that stereotype about 23 million young men and women in this complex country of ours?

What does the boy from a Scarsdale mansion have in common with the son of a jobless ghetto family? Does either of them share in any common outlooks with the lower-middle class workingman's son? Being young, they share in the desire for change, but not always the same kinds of change.

I think that in talking about America's young people we can use the old analogy of the iceberg, with nine-tenths of its mass invisible from the surface. The vast majority of American youth may not be totally content with our society—I hope they are not—but their desire for change does not lead to loud demonstrations, destruction or bizarre modes of living.

That's why they don't catch our eye. Conflict and noise get news coverage, make headlines and earn appearances on the nightly TV newscasts.

But the national meeting of the moderate, rational Association of Student Governments in Washington, D.C. went relatively unnoticed in the press, even though their leaders met with President Nixon. I did see an editorial on that convention in *The New York Times* and I warmly concur with its conclusion about the basic soundness of America's college students. It said, and I quote:

"The majority is neither revolutionary nor contemptuous of American institutions, on and off campus. Only a lunatic fringe has embraced nihilist chaos or hedonistic escapism." End of quote.

But is it merely wishful thinking to say that moderate, sensible students comprise the relatively invisible nine-tenths of our iceberg? Am I whistling in the dark because I don't want to believe what I have seen and read since my return from Europe?

No, my friends. We in this country have a passion for facts. We do research to find out what a problem really looks like. The major American opinion research firms have been hard at work interviewing college students and other young people all over America. Thorough studies have been made. And here is one of the principal conclusions: True revolutionaries and violence-prone youth on campus comprise no more than three to five percent. American youth remains basically reformist rather than revolutionary. After studying survey results, *Fortune* magazine commented that, "Eighty-eight percent of young adults agree . . . that there are legitimate channels for reform . . ."

Don't think for one moment that I am saying everything is just fine. We all know that it is not. Dissidence is growing and it is spreading beyond the campus. But is that really so surprising? Our society is not perfect. We have been patching and reworking and adapting it to change since 1791, when the first ten amendments to our Constitution took force.

In the mid-1960's the time was ripe for a big change. Societies adjust themselves in spurts and cycles to relieve stresses that build up gradually, like the sporadic movements of earth alongside a geological fault. By the mid-1960's virtually one generation had elapsed since the veterans of World War II, who had matured during the Depression, began building a prosperous economy in the shadow of the Cold War. Their big challenge was an economic one—to make a decent living, to provide security and comfort for their families. And they succeeded on a scale never before seen in the history of the world.

That is why many of their children are able to look for different challenges. Many of today's generation are free from single-minded concentration upon money and security, free to be idealistic, even free to be irresponsible without having to pay severe economic penalties.

During that same World War II-post-war era we created the greatest change of all. We let the Geni out of the bottle for all time: we brought about the technological revolution. Nuclear energy, electronic computers, automated factories, television, space exploration—Benefactors of mankind, all of them, yet each has its dark underside, its capacity for evil, for despoliation, for waste of human resources or insult to human sensibilities, if it is not properly used and controlled.

So a major problem concerning today's youth is not a "youth problem" after all. It is a problem for our entire nation, old and young alike. Technology has advanced so fast that our political structure, our educational system, our social forms have not been able to keep up. We see technicians emerging as leaders in business, in government, in education, because traditional sources of such leadership do not produce the specialized technical knowledge necessary to understand how this awesome new machinery functions.

Technology has revolutionized communications and transportation. For the first time in history news events can be seen while they are actually happening, at virtually any spot on the globe. Ideas, modes of dress and action travel literally with the speed of light into homes throughout the nation and around the world. Jet aircraft have brought any spot in the world within a day's travel. Our affluent young people consider foreign travel for recreation and education as a normal part of their experience. So technological change has brought people into one vast community, and young people sense this and react to it.

Then, we are faced with what is probably the greatest single cause of unease and dissent among the young. The tragic war in Viet Nam obsesses their thoughts. For many of them it has been part of the world ever since they emerged from childhood. The skepticism and bitterness about the war are shared by college and non-college students alike.

So the problem of youth, dissent, generation gap, call it what we will—is upon us.

A new generation has emerged in the midst of a revolution in technology and a cruel, controversial war. The result has been a churning among young Americans that makes parents sick with anxiety. Let us look quickly at the rash of symptoms we find so upsetting:

The violence, the protests, the dress, the drugs are symptoms of a basic dissatisfac-

tion with American society and the individual's place in it. A sizeable majority of young people in college and out see a need to improve our basic institutions—our system of business and industry, our politics, our judicial system, our higher education.

And herein lies the outstanding characteristic of today's student dissent. It is the young person's concern over inequities and injustices in our society. Naturally, there is a good deal of self-seeking in the protest and dissent. But there is more than selfish complaining. Our young people are concerned about others and about society as a whole. It is one of the healthiest signs of our times.

And here again I would like to cite a statistic, because so many unfounded assumptions permeate discussion of youthful dissent. Dr. Gallup reports that 51 percent of college students have done social work. He goes on to make this interesting point, and I quote: "It wasn't so long ago that doing extracurricular social work while in college was considered in some quarters to be 'square.' Now it is frequently a normal and effective part of one's college experience." Unquote.

When concerned but affluent young people scold their elders because of injustices in our society, how can we look them in the eye and say, "Why are you so ungrateful when you have been given so much?"

Yes, as a nation we have developed and prospered, but we have left many things undone. We have strenuous work to do on problems of poverty, job opportunities, education, housing, the environment, and so many others. The young critics accuse our society of tolerating injustices because we have not eliminated them. No doubt there is some basis for the charge, but history shows that a society's basic problems can never be solved quickly and neatly, and that a fast-growing nation inevitably creates new problems as it evolves.

America has a long heritage of problem-solving. Just 100 years ago the nation was torn by a dissent so widespread and so bitter that those Reconstruction days were known as "The Age of Hate." Whites and Blacks rioted against one another. The Ku Klux Klan was born. The president was impeached. Yet the nation survived, knitted itself together and resumed its progress.

In our own time the United States survived the Depression, then went on to build unparalleled prosperity for most of her people. In World War II America and her Allies put down the effort to impose a new Age of Darkness on all of Western civilization.

Looking to the future, I see still another cause for optimism. It lies in the technological revolution which helped to foster so much of today's dissent. When our three astronauts landed on the moon, people throughout the world, from shepherd to statesmen, were caught up in the emotional impact.

Communications satellites carry events around the world in a fraction of a second, linking peoples to watch together as a president is inaugurated or an Olympics champion is crowned. And that is but the beginning. In 1972, millions of villagers in India will see, on community TV sets, shows about planting and cultivating, pesticides and other valuable information. Those programs will be beamed from an orbiting satellite.

I admit to a strong parental interest in communications satellites. And as one who has represented our country abroad I am fascinated by the prospect of daily face-to-face diplomatic contacts via satellite TV and picture phone.

It is hard for most of us, reared in a simpler mechanical and electrical era, to contemplate the implications of today's unfolding technology. But the young people who grew up with the story of space exploration in their daily newspapers are attuned to accepting what has seemed impossible. And

they are the people to whom the torch is being passed.

Their number includes agitators who want chaos for chaos' sake, but it includes far, far more of tomorrow's scientists and engineers, doctors and executives, professors and statesmen. Many of them will fight to bring change and reform to the professions they enter. Their concern, their new perspective and their advanced education are needed by America.

As always in the past, the emerging generation will be the source of renewal of America's heritage. Our generation still has much hard work to do on problems that trouble the young and sap our national strength.

We must extricate the United States from the war in Viet Nam, which, more than any other issue of the day, has caused dissension and grief in our nation.

We must put an end to the cruelty and sheer waste of discrimination.

We must find ways to restore the soundness of our dollar.

We must discover means for operating our complex industrial machine which are consistent with the preservation of a healthy, ecologically sound natural environment.

Our responsibility as business leaders, governmental leaders and professional men and women is to recognize that we are in an era of convulsive change, to recognize our own increasing obsolescence. We must be prepared to assign to the most capable members of this new generation a heavy burden or responsibility and leadership.

In closing, I think it is appropriate to emphasize to you in this mature audience, the same thoughts I have expressed to a class of graduating college seniors: Don't you lose faith in America! Our nation's people have a history of turning restlessness and dissatisfaction into progress. Overcoming obstacles lifts us to new levels of achievement.

SLOVENIAN FESTIVAL DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 25, 1969, thousands of Americans of Slovenian descent living in the city of Chicago will celebrate the 51st anniversary of their independence gained from the Austro-Hungarian Empire on October 29, 1918.

They will also be celebrating the 19th anniversary of consecutive broadcasting for Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, producer of the Slovenian radio program, which is heard each Saturday at 4:30 p.m., on WEDC in Chicago. Dr. Leskovar is president of the Slovenian-American Radio Club, which annually sponsors the Slovenian Day program. I want to congratulate him on the celebration of his 19th anniversary as producer of this outstanding radio program as well as for the tremendous contributions he has made to the civic life of his community over the years.

The other able officers of the Slovenian-American Radio Club are: Frank Mikec, vice president; Mary Foys Lauretig, secretary; Alma Helder, treasurer; Stephanie Osterman, recording secretary; Roman Possedi, Sr., sergeant at arms; Otmar Tasner, Michael Fleischhacker, and Minka Grasic, auditors; Frank A. Schonta, cultural narrator; Corinne Leskovar, director of special

events; Joseph Osterman, Fred Orehek, Anna Tasner, Frank Karner, Frances Maxwell, Anton Skamperle, Ludvik Jelenc, Jerome Soukal, Ursula Krzysnik, and Frank Gerzel, directors. The offices of the Slovenian-American Radio Club are located at 2032 West Cermak Road in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent.

Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, has declared October 25 as "Slovenian Day" in Chicago and has urged all citizens to join in observance of the day and to take part in the festivities planned for the celebration. Additionally, Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie has proclaimed October 25 as "Slovenian Day" in Illinois.

The festivities will begin with a dinner at 7 p.m. at the St. Stephen Hall, 1835 22d Place, Chicago, Ill. More than 1,200 people are expected to attend the dinner at which the winner of the 1969 Slovenian Award will be announced. This award has been given annually for the last 17 years to an outstanding Slovenian-American for his work and his achievements in the community. Last year's winner of this award was Mr. Anton Udovich, 2623 South Springfield Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

The festival will include a performance by Korotan, a 50-voice mixed chorus from Cleveland, which will present folk-songs and classical songs in the Slovenian language, and the orchestra of Hanez Arko which will play dance music.

Master of ceremonies for the program will be Dr. Ludwig Leskovar, and among the distinguished guests will be Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI of the 11th District of Illinois, and Alderman Vito Marzullo, of the 25th ward, who will be representing the city council of Chicago.

The gubernatorial and mayoral proclamations will be presented to the audience by Miss Rosemarie Gomilar who will reign as "Gospodichna" or "Miss Slovenian Day." Miss Gomilar was born 18 years ago on the evening of the first Chicago Slovenian Day celebration when her father, Joseph Gomilar, was an officer of the Slovenian-American Radio Club which each year serves as the sponsor of the Slovenian Day celebration. Miss Gomilar is a senior at the West Chicago High School.

The Slovenian Americans, over 400,000 strong in the United States, have much of which they can be proud. Through hard work, dedication, and loyalty, they have achieved high and honored positions in public life. Among such outstanding individuals are Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK of Minnesota, and Ludwig J. Andolsek, Commissioner of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Not only as public servants, but as artisans and artists, as laborers and tradesmen, as men of letters and of science, and in many other occupations and professions, the Slovenian-Americans have made an outstanding contribution to the cultural advancement of our great country.

Slovenia forms one of the six South-Slavic groups, known as People's Republics, which make up today's Yugoslavia,

and has a territory at present of about 8,000 miles and a population of about 1,500,000. Throughout their history, which goes back more than 1,000 years, the courageous Slovenians have always been indomitable fighters for freedom and for their national traditions. Therefore, they have never been totally submerged in the sea of other peoples which surrounds their country.

Their spiritual and intellectual attainments have been second to none in that part of the world. As an example, the Slovenians succeeded in printing the first book in the year 1550 in the Slovenian language which was also the first printed book in any Slavic language.

The first Slovenian immigrants came to the United States as early as 1750. Among the immigrants who came here was Bishop Frederic Baraga, a great missionary figure in the history of America. He was born in Slovenia in 1797 and came to the United States in 1830 to devote his life to the Indians of the Upper Great Lakes. He is called the Apostle of the Lakelands and for 37 years served the Indians in that territory. He died in 1868 and was buried in Marquette, Mich. Father Baraga's contributions to the people were so exceptional that today a canonical investigation is being made into his life and labors in order to promote his beatification.

As Congressman for the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, where hundreds of Slovenian-Americans reside, I take great pleasure in congratulating and extending best wishes to the Americans of Slovenian heritage who reside in my district as well as to all those across our Nation who are joining in this celebration of Slovenian Festival Day.

Hon. Vito Marzullo, the alderman, and committeeman of the 25th ward, which is part of the Seventh District and where many, many Slovenians reside, joins me in extending his greetings to the Slovenian people on this happy occasion.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include the text of the mayor's proclamation, which follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, thousands of Americans of Slovenian descent living in this City for generations, have contributed much to the progress and development of Chicago; and

Whereas, Slovenians of Chicago have taken an active part in the growth of our American culture, contributing notably in the field of music, as exemplified so well by the production of the Slovenian Radio Program, under the direction of Doctor Ludwig A. Leskovar, which is celebrating its nineteenth consecutive year of broadcasting; and

Whereas, Slovenians throughout the world are celebrating the 51st Anniversary of their independence gained from the Austro-Hungarian Empire on October 29, 1918:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby declare Saturday, October 25, 1969 as "Slovenian Day in Chicago" and urge all citizens to join in observance of the day and to take part in the programs to be presented by the Slovenian Radio Program of Chicago.

Dated this twelfth day of September, A.D., 1969.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE HONORED AT INTERNATIONAL TRIBUTE DINNER IN CHICAGO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last weekend marked a most memorable occasion for the citizens of Chicago as the city paid tribute to the Weizmann Institute of Science at Rehovot, Israel.

The Weizmann Institute of Science is one of the truly great research institutions in the world and is attracting ever-increasing respect and attention for the great strides it is making in scientific pursuits.

In a most inspiring dinner held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, a series of speakers paid tribute to the institute and also to the late Senator Everett Dirksen, who had been a strong supporter of the institute and in whose honor a chair is dedicated for continued research in cancer.

I should like to place in the RECORD today some of the inspiring remarks delivered at the dinner.

We were all thrilled to hear Dr. Albert B. Sabin, president-elect of the Weizmann Institute of Science, relate his views on the impressive responsibilities which he will soon assume.

We were also moved by the stirring invocation by Rabbi Benzion C. Kaganoff of the Congregation Ezras Israel.

The Israeli Consul General, Shaul Ramati, placed the entire evening into proper perspective.

We were inspired by the remarks of former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg who related some of his experiences with Senator Dirksen.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, the excellent presentation to Mrs. Everett McKinley Dirksen delivered by former Ambassador Phil Klutznick, who captured the import of the Weizmann Institute of Science.

Chicago's favorite columnist, Irv Kupcinet, did an outstanding job as master of ceremonies, and I believe the highest gratitude goes to Lester Crown, general chairman of the evening, and Dr. William Novick, who was executive director of the banquet and who does such an inspiring job as director of the Chicago Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science. We were most grateful to Mr. Philip D. Sang, one of the principal supporters of the Weizmann Institute for his generous contribution to the success of the evening.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of these distinguished speakers in the order in which they were presented, follow:

INVOCATION AT SENATOR DIRKSEN MEMORIAL
TRIBUTE DINNER OF THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL,
OCTOBER 12, 1969

(By Rabbi Benzion C. Kaganoff, Congregation Ezras Israel, Chicago)

Almighty God—We invoke Thy blessings upon all assembled here tonight in behalf of the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel, an Institution dedicated to learning, to re-

search, and to reverence for life, to honor the memory of a distinguished son of Illinois—the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.

We honor his memory by re-affirming those principles of God and country and the highest values of humanity to which our city, our state, and our nation are committed.

"For what makes a state and its people great and strong?

Not architecture's graceful strength
Not factories' extended length
But men who will tolerate no wrong
And give their lives to make it right
To turn all darkness into light.

"What makes a State that man can love?

Not things charm the outward sense—
Not mere display of opulence;
But Right that no wrong can remove—
And Faith that no power on earth will turn—

And Truth and God and Honor for which men will yearn.

"This is the State that shall forever stand As a light upon a nation's hill

A voice that evil cannot still
A source of blessing to the land.
Its strength—not brick, nor stone, nor wood
But Justice, Love, and Brotherhood."

May all of us witness the fulfillment of the vision of Thy ancient prophets:—"Nation shall not lift up sword against Nation—neither shall they learn War anymore, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all men shall see it together". Amen.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE SHAUL RAMATI, CONSUL GENERAL OF ISRAEL

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Dirksen, Distinguished Guests: We are gathered here to honour the memory of Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen who stood for the old fashioned values that made this country great. Fortunately for this country and for mankind the mass of the people of this country still hold these values dear. This is the unbreakable bond between the United States of America and Israel, which cherishes them equally. These silent Americans, the unpublicized Americans, God fearing, untouched by big city vices, they who fearlessly and wholeheartedly support liberty for the individual a just society, the rule of law, the democratic system, equality of opportunity. No nation, race or class is their enemy. Their foes are tyranny, oppression, disease and poverty, ignorance and prejudice. They are moderate, honest, hardworking, observe the Ten Commandments, they are self reliant, still pioneers at heart, proud of their heritage, devoted to peace and progress. If the image of the United States in the World is very different to this, it is because these normal Americans are so unnewsworthy as far as the mass media and major newspapers are concerned. But Senator Dirksen, who embodied these qualities, because of his leadership, personality and eloquence, was always newsworthy and it was natural for him to support a land and people from which many of these ideals had sprung, which was doing its level best to live by them today in a region in which these ideals were rejected and spurned, which even whilst under bloody siege was beginning once against to make a unique contribution to the betterment of mankind.

No wonder that the mainstream of American opinion for which Dirksen often spoke supported the fighting of a historic wrong in 1948; rejected a discredited opportunistic policy which had permitted the Soviet Union to establish bridgeheads in the Middle East after their clients were defeated in 1956. No wonder that he favoured the new policies, of which Ambassador Arthur Goldberg was such an important architect to maintain the 1967 cease fire situation until it could be superseded by a true and lasting peace. Senator Dirksen assured them the bipartisan

support required for the effective continuity. He was convinced that American interest demanded denial of success to Soviet Imperialism, to tyrannical military dictatorships, to those whose minds were set on mass murder and the denial of those same rights of self-determination, independence and freedom to others which they claimed for themselves. In 1967 Israel had shown that it could defend not only itself but also the interests of all who love freedom in the Middle East. By their own unaided efforts against great odds they had saved the President of the United States and its Congress from having to make an almost impossibly difficult decision. No wonder that the Senator felt that Israel should receive the military aid and economic and diplomatic support, to assure its defence, to prevent war, and give the attainment of peace a chance, as well as to prevent a situation arising where the U.S. Government might be faced with the necessity of making the same agonising decision they had only so recently been enabled so narrowly to avoid.

Yet Dirksen realised Israel had much more to offer to the world than a demonstration of the power of free men defending their lives and liberty. He watched Israel's cooperation with the developing nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the alternative this offered to the panaceas promised by the Soviets and the Chinese. He watched their experimentation in making the desert bloom, of desalting sea water, frontiers that had to be conquered and conquered quickly if the calamity of mass starvation was not to engulf the world. He saw the efforts to harness solar energy to man's service, to find social forms and cultural expressions acceptable to men who brought with them the ways of life of the 100 lands from which they had come to Israel. Could it be that another great boon could come to mankind from Israel, the cure of cancer? And so, before he was himself struck down by this dread disease he singled out the Weizmann Institute and its Cancer Research for his particular project. Here the bi-annual Rehovoth Conferences of political leaders and scientists of how to make science serve rapid progress in the developing countries are held. Here promising scientists from the world over are brought to study and return to their countries with the keys to their progress. Here the use of isotopes is studied in medicine, in agriculture, and in the exploitation of ground water. Here advances were being made towards the discovery of the secrets of life and its enemies such as old age and cancer. He could not have chosen anything more worth while to support in Israel for the Weizmann Institute is serving all mankind. And neither could you ladies and gentlemen assembled here. And for this I congratulate you and I thank you.

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG

Mr. Crown, Mr. Kupcinet, Your Excellency the Counsel General, Mrs. Dirksen and Rabbits and guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I should like to address my first comments to Mrs. Dirksen. Luella, when we planned this affair and I was invited to come, your husband was very much alive. And we looked forward to this occasion as a fine celebration where old friends would get together and share the pleasure of his and your company in a cause to which he was dedicated and to which this very fine audience of friends of yours and his would gather together to really thank him for all that he has done as the Chairman has said in the Congress for this State which means so much to the Jewish people and to all freedom-loving people.

Now he is not with us. It is very hard to believe that he is not with us. You and I were talking before as we gathered at a dinner just a few weeks ago where Dorothy and I and you and Everett were at

the German Embassy in Washington at a festive occasion and we visited together. Now, it would not be in keeping with Everett Dirksen's spirit for us to make a memorial out of this occasion. You and I agreed about that earlier this evening. If there ever was a happy warrior, it was Everett Dirksen. If there ever was a man who loved life, it was Everett Dirksen and we shall not make a memorial out of this affair. Rather it will be an occasion for happy reminiscence about this wonderful man, great friend, outstanding American, great friend of Israel so that you can carry with you a feeling of how high our regard was for him and maybe that is the best thing any of us can leave to our families when the inevitable happens to all of us.

I would like to share with this audience a few reminiscences about Everett Dirksen. I knew him for quite a long time as some of you know and I was the beneficiary very much of great acts of friendship on his part—acts of friendship which were very characteristic about the man. I would like to relate a few of them and then I'd like to point up the unique role that he has played in our body politic.

When President Kennedy asked me to assume the office of Secretary of Labor, the first thing that you are supposed to do is to make sure that Congress will confirm your appointment and therefore what you do is you immediately get in touch with the important people in the Congress. That is what you are supposed to do by the Congressional advisors of the President. I was a new Secretary of Labor. I was about to do it but I did not have time to do it, because the very first telephone call I received after my appointment was announced on the Georgetown steps in September of 1960, was from Senator Dirksen who called me, congratulated me and said, "Would it be convenient for you to come to my office to have lunch with me tomorrow." And, of course, when the high-ranking Senator says would it be convenient it's like a command performance for a queen or president. You say, certainly. By the way my Democratic friend had not yet called, although I had campaigned for him very vigorously as Jack Arvey knows.

I came to the Senator's office and found to my surprise there was gathered together in his office all of the Republican members of the Senate-Labor Committee, of which Senator Dirksen was the ranking member. We had a very convivial lunch with all that helps make a lunch convivial. You would expect that in Everett's office. We had no speeches. We just sat there with all of the Senator Republican colleagues and at the very end just as we were about to break up, as though it was an afterthought, Senator Dirksen got up and said, "Well, gentlemen, I just forgot something." He said, "Arthur Goldberg has been my friend for twenty-five years." Then he looked around and said, "Need I say more."

Then the lunch was adjourned.

The second bit of reminiscence I would like to point out is on that occasion when my nomination was reported out as on the Senate-Judiciary Committee unanimously, an art which seems to have been lost these days. I found the normal course under those circumstances, since it was submitted by a Democratic President, is for the Chairman of the committee, or the Chairman of the subcommittee, who is our friend at that time, Estes Kefauver, to report out the nomination to the Senate. But, without any consultation with me but to my great pleasure and gratification, my nomination was reported to the Senate by Senator Dirksen which may have had something to do with my nomination by the Senate, also confirmed unanimously.

And then there is a third reminiscence. My wife and I, like many in this audience, give an annual Seder. And I remember,

Luella, you remember too, when Dorothy and I had a Seder and we invited our two Senators—Senator Dirksen and Senator Douglas among other friends. It is our custom to sing songs which is the tradition of conducting a Seder to sing songs. All kinds of songs at the Seder, not only the traditional liturgy, but anything that anyone wants to sing. Well, having represented the labor movement for a long time, among the songs that we traditionally sing at our Seder are songs that come out of the labor movement from the songbook that is published by the AFL-CIO. I wondered about how that would do with Everett, who at that time was having a few problems with the AFL-CIO. So we went out and bought another songbook and at that particular Seder we alternated songs—from the NAM songbook and from the AFL-CIO songbook. And we had, as you will recall, Luella, a very fine time indeed.

Now, Senator Dirksen embodied something very important in American life. He was not only a very congenial man, with no malice in his system toward anyone. He had great friends like myself who differed with him on many issues, but he was also a man who understood the important role and limitations of the opposition in American political life.

Now, it is extremely important that the role of an opposition and the limitations of an opposition both be preserved if we are to have a healthy democratic country. And sometimes people forget this.

I am a great believer in an opposition. Of course, I like to be in the majority party but I am a great believer that it is extremely healthy for a country and for the administration in power to have a strong vigorous, articulate and determined opposition. Everett Dirksen played that role in two administrations—Democratic administration that I had to do with, and it was a very important role indeed because the party in power is not always right. And a party in power needs to be reminded that in our country, happily a country that is a two-party system, that in the opposition there is a repository of knowledge and understanding and suggestions and ideas which the majority party and the administration power may sometimes be deficient in. And, therefore, if we watch the show on television, and it often was a great show indeed—Kup, I think you will agree, the Senator's show—you had a man who understood that whatever his personal relations were with the Presidents, he had a role to play in representing the opposition viewpoint.

The Senator also knew what the limitations were on opposition and there is one paramount rule about what the essential limitation is and that is that the country comes before political parties.

And I would carry that even further, and am afraid to do this in front of Colonel Arvey's presence, but the country comes before political parties, the state comes before political parties, the city comes before political parties. We are Americans first. That's our first loyalty. A loyalty to a political party comes second, and Everett Dirksen understood that. I knew that when I was Secretary of Labor and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations I could always come to Everett Dirksen and tell him frankly what the problems of the country were, and I knew that he would either agree or disagree and his agreement or disagreement would be fundamentally based ultimately on what he conceived to be the best interest of the country as a whole. I might not agree, as I said I often did not, but I never had any doubt that that was the basis upon which he made his decision as to the role that he ought to occupy.

I can tell you very frankly that the two Democratic Presidents under whom I served had the greatest amount of affection for him

and sometimes I wonder whether he didn't feel that he could play a better role under the two Democratic Presidents than under a Republican President. But perhaps a new Republican President had to get the full measure of what type of man Everett Dirksen was.

Now, he's being honored in a very great cause—a cause of a great scientific educational institution in Israel. Israel could not be the country that it is if high in the list of priorities there was not the fact that it had to develop great institutions of education and knowledge and research—great universities and a great scientific institute named after the beloved Chaim Weizmann.

Last year my wife and I had the great honor of going to Israel for the 50th Anniversary of Hebrew University, and I thought back as I stood on Mt. Scopus that that University was established at the time the guns were still firing in World War I. And when the concept that there could be a Jewish State seemed like a concept utterly lacking in reality, those who were working towards the establishment started this to be the supreme act of realism; that they should, even though poor, impoverished and lacking in support, create a great university. And it is quite interesting that here before the establishment of the Jewish State, 25 years ago, it was conceived in Rehovot that there ought to be a great scientific institute to contribute not solely, or indeed even primarily, to the problems of Israel but that Israel could be the type of country that had an institution devoted to scientific research which could benefit all of mankind. And this is what the Weizmann Institute has done and now I think the embodiment of that supreme realism is the fact that one of our great Americans, a great scientist of world-renowned who has contributed so much to the alleviation of disease for all people everywhere has assumed the Presidency of the Weizmann Institute in Dr. Sabin.

Israel has great problems. This is not the occasion to talk about them. It has the problem of survival—a problem which every nation must put first in all of its priorities. But I am sure were the Prime Minister of Israel here today, she would strongly second what I say to you—that all of the priorities of this country have to be met. There is no single priority which cannot be met. All of them have to be met if this country is to be the type of country that it must be and stand as a symbol of a democratic country dedicated to all of the great ideals and above all the great ideal that if there is to be peace it will be founded on the quality of its society.

I am personally very pleased, Luella, that Everett's name will be linked with this very distinguished and fine institution. I know that you would want it so and those of us who were his friends and are your friends want it so, too.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF DR. ALBERT B. SABIN, PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE

I look forward to my new job as President of the Weizmann Institute because I see in it an opportunity to participate in the fulfillment of Weizmann's original goals to serve Israel, to serve science, and to serve humanity.

Weizmann's vision included not only a return of Jews to their ancestral home after 19 centuries of frequently tragic exile but also the creation in the reborn nation of a culture and scientific tradition that hopefully would achieve something more than the fulfillment of its own needs. In biblical times the tiny land of Israel with its teachers and prophets contributed cultural and religious concepts that had an influence far beyond its borders on the people who embraced Christianity and Islam. In modern

times science is the force that has the greatest potential for influencing the shape of things to come. The great economic progress of the past in the U.S.A. and other economically advanced countries was based to a large extent on the exploitation of natural resources. Economic progress in the future must depend more and more on science as the most important resource. Good science should be supported by all wherever this important resource needs help—and the Weizmann Institute is general acknowledged by those who are competent to judge as a unique and outstanding scientific resource not only of Israel but of the world.

The Weizmann Institute, like all other great achievements in Israel, was built on faith—the faith that the men who came to work there would bring it the eminence it has achieved—and the faith that the tens of millions of dollars that had to be borrowed to make it the excellent scientific resource it has come to be would ultimately be provided not only by the Jews of the world but also by others who will benefit from the new knowledge that the Weizmann Institute has already created and will continue to create. The Weizmann Institute is in great need not only of support for its regular operating expenses, which are already in excess of 10 million dollars per annum, but also for the repayment of the 30 million dollar debt on which interest is now being paid annually. I have faith that the dedicated friends of the Weizmann Institute throughout the world will be even more generous in the future than they have been in the past.

During my stay in Rehovot last July, bomb shelters were being built on the campus of the Weizmann Institute. To me this was symbolic of Israel—work for the best without neglecting to prepare for the worst. If Israel is now living in a precarious balance of terror so is the rest of the world. Israel is in the process of creating the most heroic era in the history of the Jews, and as a Jew I shall derive a very deep gratification from the opportunity that I shall now have to play some small direct part in it. Israel is also a pilot plant for the hundreds of millions of people living in ever greater poverty and misery in the economically undeveloped countries of the world, and as a human being I also look forward to being a part of that important enterprise. And I hope that I shall live to see the day when the leaders of the Arab governments will accept a sovereign state of Israel in their midst and let their people work together with the people of Israel for the benefit of all who inhabit this historic region of the world.

PRESENTATION TO MRS. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

It was my first thought to use these moments to relate a few personal incidents. I would like to tell you when I first met the Congressman in Washington in 1941 shortly after I had arrived for sixty days' government service. The sixty days matured to nearly six years. Throughout I received at Congressman Dirksen's hands understanding and aid, which I sorely needed, especially since he was a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which concerned itself with my agency's budget.

Or, I could dwell on a critical moment in 1962 when following excruciating toil in the United Nations to save it financially and the outlook in the Senate was dreary, I appealed Senator Dirksen, as a heartsick and discouraged constituent rather than a public official. One should read and reread his eloquent speech endorsing the United Nations bond issue delivered on the floor of the Senate, which alone won the day and made a year's work a pleasant page in my own personal history.

Or, I could refer to moments only last fall when behind the scenes, his persistence as-

sured General Moshe Dayan's meeting with President-Elect Nixon. When I conveyed the General's appreciation to the Senator, he told me that all he would like to have happen is to be able to visit the General in Jerusalem soon—a hope which he never realized.

Or, I could fill several times my quota of minutes in documenting the incidents when he ignored all and sundry political considerations to come to the support of Israel as well as many causes in which our people had vital interests here and abroad. But this record needs no summary at my hands. If it were not so, we would not be gathered here tonight.

How good it would be if what has been said and what I am about to say could have been spoken in the presence of that unusual, personable and powerful leader of our day, the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen. But, in true Jewish tradition, we are not here to mourn a loss we are here to give thanks to the Almighty for the years that He gave us with our friend, counselor and leader. It is in this spirit I would make this presentation.

Tonight we entwine two names of history—Chaim Weizmann and Everett McKinley Dirksen. The scientist who traveled from obscurity in the little shtetl of Motyl in Russia to join the political struggle of Zionism and then as representative of a political minority to emerge as the first President of Israel—thereby helping to unite a small and struggling nation. And the man from another small town who traveled from the obscurity of Pekin, Illinois to the Congress and to the Senate in Washington, D.C. where he emerged in critical days as the Senate minority leader to help unite the varied peoples of this most powerful nation in the world.

One was first a deeply committed Jew with an overwhelming love for science, a devotion which he sublimated to enter the brawling, contentious and, at times, bitter struggle with and among his fellow Jews and the world at large seeking an age old dream—a national Jewish homeland.

The other, by his own admission a country boy, with love of drama and of words, who forsook the comfort of his environment for the brawling, contentious and sometimes bitter struggles of political life in our embattled nation.

I knew both men in their lesser as well as greater moments. Above all, they had one trait in common—they put love of nation and ideals above their own personal feelings. There was a dignity and a majesty as each rose time and again above narrow partisanship to superb patriotism. Smaller minds challenged each in turn because they changed their positions on occasions, but history will acknowledge that what they did was in the interest of a greater good. Only narrow, self-centered and fearful men stand pat irrespective of the changes about them. Big and courageous men can forget their own portraits long enough to place the nation and the people they serve above self.

When we recall the compatibility of a Republican minority leader with Democratic as well as Republican Presidents; when we recall the numerous times when a Republican minority leader made possible a Democratic administration program, it should be with the reverence accorded a stalwart and honorable opponent who forgot partisan advantage in the interest of the nation's hopes and its needs.

Oh, how much this reminds me of Chaim Weizmann's moment of trial at the birth of a State, an idea to which he had given his life and his health only to see his political opponent of many years take over the helm. It must have been with unbelievable anguish that he pondered the offer of the ceremonial office of the Presidency that would effectively sideline Weizmann in the declining years of his life. At that poignant moment when Weizmann accepted, David Ben-Gurion uttered a

sentiment that was in the hearts of most Israelis and Jews all over the world:

"I doubt whether the Presidency is necessary to Dr. Weizmann, but the Presidency of Dr. Weizmann is a moral necessity for the State of Israel."

Mrs. Dirksen, as we present to you this evidence of the action taken to eternally enshrine the name of your late husband in the Institute that bears a hallowed name in Israel, we are conscious of a sobering parallel. We doubt that the minority leadership was necessary to Everett McKinley Dirksen, but it was a vital necessity to keep a sense of balance and sanity in the midst of divisive, shrill and bitter challenges and partisanship in our beloved nation. No one can equate our loss with yours—but we, Democrats and Republicans, Americans all, will miss his quieting and eloquent optimism and his unique and unforgettable capacity to rise above personal and partisan consideration to help "heal the wounds of a nation" and to bring it closer to its true destiny.

How appropriate to our recollection of him are the words of Lord Byron: "Immortal, though no more; though fallen, great!"

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, since women gained the right to vote, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has worked steadily to expand the role of women in all segments of our national life. It is with particular pride and pleasure that I salute this fine group as the Nation once again celebrates National Business Women's Week.

This annual observance gives all of us an opportunity to salute anew the millions of women in our national labor force and calls attention to the increasingly important role being played by women in all fields of endeavor today. Due to the increase in life span, decrease in time required for home and child care, economic independence, women now have the time and desire to use their abilities and capacities to their maximum potential. And our Nation needs women to be involved in all segments of our national life.

Only when we recognize that women comprise a third of today's labor force and that most of the increase has occurred since World War II, can we realize the tremendous advances women have made in every segment of our society. The doors to every profession have been opened to women in recent years, largely through their own determined efforts. Today, women doctors, lawyers, scientists, and business executives are making lasting contributions in their respective fields. At the same time, organizations such as the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs—B. & P.W.—still perform yeoman service in their endeavors to elevate the status of all women.

The Federation itself has an impressive membership of more than 180,000 than 3,800 chapters are promoting the

district in the United States. Its more than 3,800 chapters are promoting the interests of business and professional women who have organized to extend opportunities to an even greater number of women at every level. Through its scholarships and awards, it gives many young women the opportunity to fulfill their ambitions in the business and professional community. The spirit of cooperation and understanding which the B. & P.W. has advanced among working women is illustrative of what can be accomplished by a determined organization with a worthwhile purpose.

The Federation has an outstanding national program calling for action beneficial to our entire Nation. Its interest extends to all areas of national concern, including air and water pollution control, conserving human and natural resources, improving safety conditions on our highways, and seeking ways to promote national security and peace. Exciting national aims are strengthened by local activities. To the individual, the organization offers encouragement to seek new channels of expression, needed information and sincere fellowship.

More and more, we are being made aware of the important contributions made to our Federal, State, and local governments, to our Nation's economy, to our own local communities and to the private business world by the American woman. She is meeting our Nation's manpower shortages and offering a new dignity to the affairs of this country by her inspiring presence, her dependability, and her many worthwhile contributions and activities.

The aims and ideals of career women everywhere, including such areas as equal employment opportunity, uniform taxation, and retirement laws, and equitable jury representation, are in perfect harmony with the precepts and traditions of our American democratic society. I am proud to acknowledge the endeavors of these courageous women especially in my own congressional district and throughout North Carolina as we celebrate National Business Women's Week and urge all concerned citizens from every strata of our society to give support and recognition to their worthwhile cause.

POSSIBLE FLAW IN H.R. 14195

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed with the statements made by my colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN) calling attention to a possible flaw in H.R. 14195 with regard to the institution of a contest by one who has been wrongfully kept off the ballot in a State where there is no write-in procedure under State law.

This potential flaw could undoubtedly have been taken care of readily by an amendment to the bill, but no such amendment could be presented under

the suspension of the rules procedure in effect here.

It seems to me that such a significant and complex bill as this one should be brought up under a rule, so that perfecting amendments can be proposed and considered.

Accordingly, I voted "no" on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

CHANGE WITHIN THE UNCHANGING

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Mr. Tim Paulsell of Fort Worth, Tex., is a member of the board of trustees of Baylor University, Waco, Tex. During their recent session which incidentally was the 125th annual session of the board of trustees, Abner V. McCall, president of Baylor made an address which I believe to be one of the finest of the times. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include President McCall's address:

CHANGE WITHIN THE UNCHANGING

(Address by Baylor University President
Abner V. McCall)

CHANGE WITHIN THE UNCHANGING

We are beginning the 125th year of the life of Baylor University. It is the custom of all men to resort to ceremony to emphasize the importance of certain occasions. We put on different apparel, gather together, solemnly march about, and make speeches on such occasions. Thus, at christenings, weddings, inaugurations, coronations, commencements, and other such important events, we put on special robes, gather, march, and speak in order to say to our fellows, "Stop and take note. This is an extraordinary and significant occasion." For this reason we have marched hither in these hot black robes and colorful hoods. So pause and take note at this the beginning of the 125th year of the life of Baylor University.

In this part of the world, Baylor is comparatively old; and some say that she is old fashioned. Indeed, the basic principles for which this University stands are old. They were proclaimed clearly about 2,000 years ago but indeed are far older than 2,000 years. We believe they are eternal. We believe that they are eternal truths which existed from the beginning and are related to the eternal Creator who is the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow. This aspect of Baylor University is unchanging and is the chief reason that this University was established, has operated for 125 years, and will continue to operate tomorrow.

WE BELIEVE IN A PERSONAL GOD

We believe in an infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient God as revealed in His son Jesus Christ through Whom we are offered salvation. We believe in a personal God who created man uniquely in His own image, Who has an inalienable and infinite compassion for every man, and in Whose sight man is of inestimable value. We may study the history, sociology, economics, languages, art, anatomy, and psychology of man, but man is worth studying only because he is specially related to God. We believe that God has a purpose and a will for man and that this purpose and will is embodied in the Great Commandment to worship God with all thy heart, soul, and

mind, and to love thy neighbor as thyself. We believe it is the divine will that man do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God. We believe there is a divine stamp on personal integrity, morality, and responsibility, upon respect, compassion, and concern for all fellowmen, upon justice, courage and freedom. We recognize that there must be a constant search for proper and effective implementation of these with differences of opinion thereon, but we regard the principles as immutable.

ETERNAL UNCHANGING TRUTHS

We know that there are many in the world who do not believe in our God, in His special concern for man, in man's unique nature, or in God's purpose and will for man. We know that many in our time have doubts as to these principles; and while all these matters may properly be discussed at this University, this University was established and still operates on the basis that these are not open questions but are eternal and unchanging truths, and the policies of the University shall not vary therefrom nor the University cease proclaiming them.

There are many who claim that there are no eternal unchanging truths, that such truths are relative and changing with the time, place, and people; and that all questions remain forever open, and the search for truth on every point is endless. They claim that the primary purpose of the university is to seek forever for the truth and that no restrictions or obstacles should ever be placed on this search.

There are over 2,000 accredited colleges and universities in the United States. There are junior colleges, four-year liberal arts colleges, and large complex universities. Some are public and tax-supported, and others are private and independent. Some of the latter are secular, and others are church-related. They differ vastly in philosophy and program. This pluralism is in accord with our traditional freedom in every area of American life. In the field of higher education, the student has a wide and varied field from which to select a school compatible with his personal philosophy and need. In the exercise of their freedom, Texas Baptists have established and operate Baylor University as a private, independent denominational university with policies and programs which reflect their religious tenets. They invite those in fundamental agreement to come to teach and to learn. Those not in fundamental agreement should exercise their freedom by selecting one of the other 2,000 colleges or universities in accord with their philosophy and need.

PERSONAL FREEDOM, INTEGRITY, AND DIGNITY

In the Christian religion, certain fundamental truths are regarded as absolute, and these absolutes place restrictions on the search for truth in other areas. Our recognition of the inalienable right of man to personal freedom, integrity, and dignity places limits upon the search for truth in all areas. The medical researcher in his search for truth is not permitted to experiment upon human beings. We denounced the Nazis for doing so. The police official in seeking the truth concerning a violation of the law is not permitted to use physical or psychological coercion to compel the accused to speak against himself. The right of man to be let alone in his own home and in his family and associations without unreasonable intrusions and invasions is, in our culture, accorded a greater value than the search for truth. This University subscribes to unchanging Christian values that are superior to the unrestricted search for truth.

Those who disagree often quote our Lord, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." This is a quotation lifted out of context; and as in most cases, when removed from its context, has a much differ-

ent meaning. The full text is found in the Gospel of John, Chapter 8, Verses 31-36:

"Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, 'If ye continue in my word, then ye are my disciples indeed;

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

"Then answered him, 'We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, 'Ye shall be made free'?"

"Jesus answered them, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.

"And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

Our Lord on this occasion was not talking of scientific truth, secular truth or of about the world, but eternal spiritual truth which frees men from the slavery and burden of sin. Certainly knowledge of scientific or secular truth may free man from the burdens of ignorance and superstition and give him power over nature and natural forces which may give him freedom from certain physical suffering and want. But the history of mankind contains no proof that scientific or secular knowledge alone makes men spiritually or politically free or makes them appreciate freedom. The fine scientific education afforded in the universities in Nazi Germany and Communist Russia equaled that found anywhere, but certainly did not bring freedom to the citizens of those countries. Truth in the sense of knowledge of facts does not alone make men just, merciful, or compassionate. It does not make them follow in the word of Jesus.

REAL FREEDOM

This University is founded on the belief that only the truth proclaimed by our Lord gives real freedom and that this truth is unchanging. An educational program that emphasizes this truth we believe is ever modern and ever relevant to the life of the student in the university and outside the university in the future.

It has been often said, however, that change is the chief characteristic of this age and that the rate of change is ever accelerating. A character in the Negro spiritual musical *Green Pastures* reported to the Lord, "Everything which is nailed down on earth is coming loose." We are experiencing an explosion of scientific knowledge. As much has been learned about the physical world since World War II as was learned in all the preceding history of man. The instruments for the discovery, collecting, storing, retrieving, and communication of scientific knowledge have become vastly more sophisticated and effective. The total sum and incredible complexity of discovered facts dwarfs that of a generation ago. The computer, television, recorder, and other electronic devices are revolutionizing the "knowledge industry." In these areas a university must be constantly changing to keep pace. The faculty, curriculum, facilities, and instruments must constantly change. This is a costly process and grows ever more costly as more specialized teachers are demanded and more complicated equipment is required. Baylor University must continue to be flexible, changing, and progressive in these areas.

We should note, however, that the basic traditional liberal arts courses are not irrelevant today. The courses on language and literature designed to teach a person to listen or read with understanding and comprehension and to speak or write with clarity and force are just as necessary for the education of a free man today as in the days of Socrates. The study of history is as essential to the understanding of the present and the planning of the future as it was a century ago. The same can be said of courses in economics, political science, sociology, psychology, biology, geology, art, religion, and other basic disciplines. The ability to gather and analyze

related facts and draw rational conclusions therefrom is still a prime end of education and is more essential to effective living today than ever before. Some current demands by student groups and others that these courses be abandoned in favor of social and political involvement and activism for credit are self-defeating. Meaningful and effective social and political involvement in the long run are possible only for those properly prepared with the basic background knowledge and insights and the basic skills of thinking and communicating. The chief contribution to social and political action a university can make is the preparation of its students by providing them with the basic knowledge and skills required therefor. The function of a university as an instrument of immediate social or political action is secondary and auxiliary to the basic educational purpose. This is one of the major areas of change in university programs today, and Baylor University must keep aware of such developments, but we should keep in mind that our function is primarily to operate an educational institution with order and deliberation and not a political party or a social action movement.

THE LIVING TEACHER REMAINS INDISPENSABLE

It should also be noted that, while all the new and rapidly changing educational equipment will produce changes in the educational processes, the combined effect of all of them will not be as revolutionary in education as the advent of the book. The printed book was and still is the teacher's chief instrument. Theoretically, the book and all the other modern devices and facilities to record and communicate knowledge should make the teacher superfluous; but it has not been so.

The living teacher remains indispensable to effective education. A teacher with a genuine human concern for the student is indispensable to stimulating inspiration and dedication in a student. Particularly in the field of spiritual eternal values, computers, recorders, and other electronic equipment cannot replace the dedicated, compassionate Christian teacher. While this University must strive to provide its faculty with the best of such modern devices, let us keep firmly in mind that the quality of our educational program will continue to depend upon the quality and conviction of our faculty, and it is here we should continue to devote our main attention and our resources in the coming years.

GROW A FOREST IN 3 YEARS

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a revolutionary new concept in forestry is being explored in Georgia, and the U.S. Information Agency is spreading the good news around the world.

Forestry scientists in Georgia have been experimenting with a new method of planting sycamore trees at a very close spacing and then harvesting crops of sprouts with a silage cutter every 2 to 3 years. Harvesting trees for pulpwood every 2 to 3 years as compared to the present 20 to 40 years is indeed revolutionary.

This new system will help the United States and other nations meet their growing needs for wood-based products.

Dean A. H. Herrick of the University

of Georgia School of Forest Resources has prepared a feature article on the subject for distribution by USIA to publications in Latin America, the Near East, Europe, and Africa.

I would like to share this most interesting article with my colleagues:

GROW A FOREST IN 3 YEARS

(By A. H. Herrick)

Harvesting trees for pulpwood every two to three years—compared to the present 20 to 40 years—is a revolutionary new concept being explored by forestry scientists in Georgia.

It holds promise of helping the United States and other nations meet growing needs for timber, pulp, and other wood-based products. And costs would be greatly reduced.

The new system, called "silage sycamore," consists of planting sycamore trees at a very close spacing and then harvesting crops of sprouts with a silage cutter every two to three years. Time and space savings are comparable to conventional wide-spaced tree plantations for pulpwood or other wood products. And higher yields of wood fiber per acre of land are expected. Trees are now harvested for pulpwood every 20 to 40 years.

Regeneration of forests by sprouts is not new. Willow shoots have been grown for basket weaving since the dawn of civilization. But bulk production of fiber or cellulose, by harvesting young sprout growth of trees, would be a real innovation. What we need for our two- or three-year forest is a tree that has the fiber properties sought by industry to make reconstituted products such as particleboard and paper.

Ten years of sycamore studies by the U.S. Forest Service at Athens, Georgia, proved the great versatility of that species. It occurs naturally in all states east of the Great Plains except Minnesota and grows on a wide range of soils and sites. Under reasonably good sunlight, soil and moisture conditions, sycamore grows fast. It sprouts prolifically from a low stump and responds well to fertilization. Then, too, it has relatively few insects and disease enemies in the South.

Not to be overlooked are other species such as sweetgum, yellow-poplar, and cottonwood. Even boxelder is a possibility because of its rapid early growth, light wood color, seeding characteristics, and possibilities for direct seeding. But sycamore is favored.

In the beginning, the new sycamore forest should be planted on a well-prepared site by using seed, seedlings or cuttings. Use of cuttings is particularly attractive since genetic gains are realized quickly; superior stock can be selected in one or two years and reproduced vegetatively.

Mechanical weed control and cultivation improve survival and growth. Repeated croppings will require fertilizer applications, and intensive management may call for irrigation. Possibly both irrigation and fertilization can be accomplished by applying discharges from sewage treatment plants to the forest crop.

Fertilizers, and pesticides if necessary, can be applied from aircraft. Likewise, when the product to be manufactured will not tolerate leaves, an aerial spray can be used for defoliation during the growing season. It would be nice to do all the harvesting in the dormant season when the leaves have fallen but mills need supplies of chips the year around. The two- or three-year forest will replace itself by sprouting after each harvest cutting.

Sprout stands differ from annual crops which must be harvested when ripe and then stored. The sycamore tree silage can be stored on the stump for one or more years when harvesting needs to be delayed for any reason.

Experimentation so far suggests that initial growing space should equal the square of as many feet as there are years in the har-

vest interval. For example, in a planting designed for a three-year cutting cycle, the trees would be given nine square feet (.837 square meters) initially. The close spacings make full use of the site almost immediately. In conventional cuttings at eight-by-eight-foot (2.4-by-2.4-meter) or wider spacings, the three crowns do not fully shade the ground for several years.

Two-year-old rootstocks in a nursery planting of sycamore placed one foot (.3 meter) apart in four-foot (1.2-meter) rows produced an average of more than 17 tons of one-year-old sprouts per acre (42 tons per hectare). When a similar planting was harvested after six years, only a few of the trees had died, but growth was drastically reduced during the last four years. At the end of six years, 42 tons of green material were produced per acre (104 per hectare). This equals seven tons or a respectable 2.3 cords per acre (17 tons per hectare) per year. However, if the sprouts had been harvested each year for six years, the total yield probably would have exceeded 100 tons per acre (247 tons per hectare) or about two and a half times the total of the single cutting.

A rig like a forage harvester is used to convert the forest of sprouts to chips. In one pass, the machine reverses the stem three or four inches (7.6 to 10 centimeters) above the ground, chips up the entire miniature tree, and blows the "silage" into a trailer towed behind. When full, the trailer is hauled to a loading dock or transport terminal for dumping. Chips are either stored or sent to the mill for processing.

Foresters are not the only ones pleasantly surprised with sycamore as a short-term wood producer. Pulp and paper technologists have been amazed to discover that this "upstart" of the timber world has excellent characteristics for making certain types of products. Its very thin bark permits use of the whole tree and eliminates the cost of debarking before chemical conversion.

Fresh samples of paper made from unbeaten pulp show green flecks from the chlorophyll in the leaves that were cooked with wood and bark just as the sprouts came out of the silage chopper. Yet, the strength properties, bleaching qualities and printability of whole-tree young sycamore sprouts command the respectful attention of the paper industry.

A vast variety of paper products, fiberboards and hardboards or molded articles for building and other purposes, can be manufactured from seedling-sprout silage, as is now being done from wood grown the conventional way. Soon, entire wall units as well as floor and deck units for homes and other small buildings may be molded in pairs, with a dead-air space in between to serve as insulation. These units would be light in weight and structurally very strong. The wall units would be ready to receive completed door and window units. Such buildings could be erected quickly at low cost.

With the silage sycamore concept, some tremendous cost savings in wood production can be expected. Gains are accomplished by cashing in on both biologic and economic principles. Every square foot of growing space is used. Yields are near capacity, and rotations (number of years between crops) are minimized. Consequently, both time and space are conserved.

Our sprout forest continually renews itself and yields heavy crops, thanks to close spacings and rapid growth. Rootstocks not only replace the newly-harvested stems by sprouting, but also stimulate new growth by giving the sprouts carbohydrates stored in root tissues. Yields per acre are tremendous. The young stems are easy to harvest and chip with fairly simple and light equipment. The young wood is relatively uniform in its characteristics. Bark and leaves are not considered trash in the manufacture of some products.

Maybe the young forest of sprouts will mass-produce raw material for mass-produced housing to help shelter exploding populations. What about the other two necessities of life—clothing and food? Rayon, along with other chemical converts, may also be an end product of the new forest, helping to clothe people in generations to come.

Sugar, molasses and yeast can also be derived from wood. They could help considerably to provide the world with vital and urgently needed foods and proteins at low cost.

MAYOR PAGE AND MAYOR KNIGHT RECOMMEND SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 23, 1969, Mayor Peter Page of Bethel Park, chairman of the legislative committee of the Pennsylvania State Mayors Association made the following statement before the House Ways and Means Committee regarding an increase in social security. Mayor Page was accompanied by Mayor William Knight of Munhall, president of the Pennsylvania State Mayors Association, and Mr. Leo Kostman, State solicitor.

It is a pleasure to place this fine statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe my colleagues, as well as the American people will find it interesting and to the point:

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,
New Rayburn Building, Washington,
D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Today, more than ever before, the United States is taking bold strides in many areas—in the field of science, in our vast space programs, in our changing system of attitudes toward the world in which we live. Much of what we have known as our "way of life" is severely tested, and in some instances, is being found inadequate in light of today's needs. Our method of provisioning for, and administering the federal insurance program known as Social Security is one such area of inadequacy. For some unknown reason, we still treat this plan, which is nothing more than a publicly operated, privately funded retirement program, as if it were simply another governmental dole, subject to the application of minimal concern and political expediency.

I think it is a generally recognized fact that partial revisions of the Social Security program can no longer be tolerated. If the plan is to function successfully for millions of our citizens dependent upon its benefits, a total re-structuring must take place without further delay. The following data sets forth what is felt could be certain meaningful changes in the basic concept of the Law. While they do not offer a Utopian approach to the problem, consideration of these measures, by this Committee, should at least provide a basis from which some answers may be found.

1. An immediate increase of 15% in existing benefits—There is little doubt that present benefits levels must be increased. Existing payments, in most cases, fail to provide even minimal subsistence standards. It is inconceivable to expect 25,000,000 people, all totally dependent upon Social Security to exist on incomes at or near the poverty level. While an immediate increase of 15% in

present benefits would by no means provide a complete answer to the problem, it would at least offer a more responsible approach to this need.

The Pennsylvania State Association of Mayors, the people it represents, and our Nation's citizens who now receive Social Security recognize that a 15% increase in existing benefits is necessary now. They do not concur with the administration restrictive ceiling of 10%. They do not agree that such an increase will add to inflationary pressures. These people are totally disappointed and thoroughly confused by the President's recent pronouncement that he would veto any increase in excess of 10%. They feel, as do many of our country's leading economists and Social experts, that a Federally-enforced poverty level cannot be tolerated. They feel, and rightly so, that a 15% increase will not grant to each recipient an excess of disposable income; rather, it will serve to bring their meager existence more in line with their needs. In a great many cases, it will mean a very basic difference between an adequate existence, or life at a near starvation level.

2. A revision of the Supplemental Earnings Ceiling—At present a recipient of Social Security benefits can earn no more than \$1,680.00 annually without forfeiting a disproportionate share of those benefits. Such a restriction not only imposes a severe hardship on those able to supplement their retirement, but it also places them in the rather dubious position of accepting a Federally-enforced guardianship, one that offers a sub-standard subsistence with no opportunity to improve their lot. The net result legislates against individual initiative and self-reliance, at a time when such qualities could prove most valuable, both to the recipient and our Nation.

There is no basis, in theory or in fact, to the retention of such a grossly restrictive penalty feature. There are few conceivable reasons to penalize a man or woman who earns more than the present allowable ceiling \$1,680.00 yearly. Such a measure takes \$1.00 from the recipient for every \$2.00 he or she may earn. It makes little social, moral, or economic sense to prod a group of people to expand their energies and utilize their time with pronouncements of usefulness, on one side, and to literally "pick their pockets" once they have attained a degree of usefulness.

A more practical approach would be to revise this penalty feature of the program to a ceiling level of at least \$4,800.00 before benefits would be adversely affected. Such a revision would enable the insured to maintain a better standard of existence, characteristics that are necessary but often lacking among our able bodied senior citizens once their initiative has been removed.

3. A reduction in the Tax-Free Age—Under the tenets of the present Social Security Law, the recipient may earn all of which he is capable without forfeiture of benefits, once he has reached 72 years of age. I am certain that many of our citizens are more than able to support themselves at 72, or even at 82 years of age. Realistically, however, these people comprise a minority. It would be far more practical to allow the individual to begin such penalty-free earnings at age 65. At this age, a vast number of professional and management people who are forced to retire by Company Policy, could move into similar areas, and continue their productivity without interruption. It is absurd to retire a life long contributor to our Society at 65 years of age, and then force him into further retirement, as mandated by the present law. If a man or woman is capable of subsidizing his Social Security benefits, he should not be penalized by virtue of this totally unjust measure.

4. One of the more critical benefits of Social Security, but one that, like the rest of the program, has been allowed to fall into a

state of complete neglect, is the funeral and burial allowance. For many of the twenty-five (25) million recipients, the present \$255.00 burial payment represents their total ability to pay the final costs involved in laying to rest themselves or their loved ones. In today's inflated economy, few burial arrangements can be made for less than \$800.00 to \$1,000.00. The present \$255.00 allowance simply resigns a portion of those people to the disgrace and humiliation of a pauper's grave. This amount must be increased for the sake of practicality and in the name of humanity!

The Pennsylvania State Mayors' Association, acting in behalf of the seven (7) million people of Pennsylvania that it represents, is firmly convinced that actions of this Committee cannot and must not be swayed by partisan politics, administrative pressure, or personal expediency. It must act swiftly, directly, and humanely to correct the tragic faults now found in our out-dated and dangerously inadequate Social Security Program. We realize that such far-reaching changes will not come overnight. We also realize, however, that a purpose of service to our Senior Citizens must arise from this Committee. It must overshadow any easy or piece-meal answers that may be found in simply patching the existing law. The time for total revision is long overdue. It must come now, for many of our Senior Citizens live in a now world—in many cases, tomorrow will be a day too late—I urge this Committee to move in a way that will leave no doubt in the minds of these Americans as to whether or not our nation cares. Let your actions prove your concern.

Sincerely,

P. J. PAGE,
Mayor, Chairman Pennsylvania State
Mayors Legislative Committee.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 41st observance of National Business Women's Week. At this time we salute American business and professional women who have contributed time, effort, and ingenuity to business communities. Their successes have come only after a long struggle for recognition and equality.

Women have had to overcome the stigma of being the weaker sex and have had to prove their worth as productive working citizens. At the turn of the century the typical working girl was characterized as someone from the lower class who worked out of necessity. Education did not train women for jobs, rather it prepared them for social ends. The female labor force was largely unskilled. They had little job security and generally suffered from poor working conditions.

Conditions have improved since 1900 due to persistent efforts on the part of working women to improve their professional status. They now work to provide additional income for their families and often turn to business and professional fields for self-fulfillment. Moreover, they have proven themselves competent in business and professional endeavors and have tackled jobs which traditionally were handled only by men.

With the aid of an ever-growing female labor force today's industry has achieved monumental feats. Presently women are entitled to equal opportunities in hiring, training, pay, and promotion because they have merited equal status in the business world.

This week we salute American business and professional women for their industrial revolution and recognize their contributions to business and society through their untiring efforts and their unquestionable competency in what was once "a man's world."

**"CALL FOR ACTION"—NEW VOICE
FOR THE PEOPLE**

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a major problem in municipal government is the difficulty citizens have in getting help when they need it. Too often the maze of bureaucracy prevents such simple things as garbage being removed or a traffic light being installed.

In New York City since 1963 radio station WMCA has sponsored a unique social service program called "Call for Action," which has permitted New Yorkers with problems to call a number, be told what agency they should call, and get action. The project combines two elements:

One is a staff of volunteers who know what agencies offer certain services and then man the telephone calls from citizens who need help. The other is WMCA, a community-minded radio station which has been sponsoring the project. It provides desks and telephones for the "Call for Action" volunteers.

Similar programs have been encouraged by the urban coalition. Such programs have sprung up in Washington and Philadelphia, and will start soon in Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Fresno, New Haven, Utica, San Antonio, and Altoona.

Mrs. Ellen Straus, the wife of WMCA's president and owner, R. Peter Straus, has been the inspiration behind the concept. With imagination and drive she has created a program which is a model for others to emulate. She and her band of volunteers deserve the gratitude of their fellow New Yorkers.

I include in the RECORD an article describing the project which appeared in the October Reader's Digest entitled "Call for Action—New Voice for the People," written by James Daniel:

**"CALL FOR ACTION"—NEW VOICE FOR THE
PEOPLE**

(By James Daniel)

For two months, every time she looked out of her front window, Mrs. Georgia B. counted three abandoned cars, usually almost hidden under swarms of children. For two months, the New York City Sanitation Department promised to remove them "next week." Finally, when her small son cut himself on broken glass from one of the cars, Mrs. B. telephoned a number she had heard about over her favorite radio station. A volunteer taking the call gave Mrs. B. another number to call and the name of the person

to talk to. Mrs. B. made the call—and next day the junk cars were gone.

Jacqueline C., 19, trustingly signed a contract with a correspondence school that guaranteed her a job as an airline hostess for a tuition fee of \$700, of which \$100 was payable in advance to the salesman. Because of her age, her father co-signed. When she discovered that the correspondence "school" was only a post-office box number, she tried to get out of her obligation. But the finance company holding the contract threatened to sue her father for the \$600, plus court costs. Jacqueline, in anguish, called the same number recommended by the radio station and soon was put in touch with a Legal Aid Society lawyer. Though he was unable to catch up with the fast-talking salesman, he persuaded the finance company to drop its claim.

Mrs. B. and Jacqueline C. are just two of the 120,000 New Yorkers who in the past six years have received a sympathetic hearing and practical assistance from a unique social-service organization named Call for Action. This one-stop clearinghouse puts individuals with a problem in touch with the public or private agencies most likely to have a solution. If the problem is complicated, or if there is any suspicion that the agency will fail to do its job, Call for Action will itself make a call to a key person in the agency who can expedite service. Periodically—to see how well the agencies are functioning and whether its own referrals are on target—Call for Action checks out the end results of all the calls it has received for a day or a week. The checks reveal that four out of five callers are helped.

While Call for Action projects are now being initiated in several cities, the concept began and has been most fully tested in New York City. Here, as elsewhere, its effectiveness depends upon two distinct sources of support. One is the staff of 50 volunteers—mostly young housewives—who first survey the agencies of the community to find out what kind of help each is equipped to offer, and thereafter man the telephones. In New York, each works at least one day a week, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. Monday through Friday.

The other source of support is a sponsoring radio station. In New York the sponsor since the project began in 1963 has been WMCA, a rock-'n'-roll station with many free-wheeling "talk" shows. WMCA provides Call for Action with desk space and telephones. And at regular intervals it reviews Call for Action's cases to find topics for documentary shows and editorials which keep public and private agencies intensely aware that their services are being watched. (Callers are also urged to tell agencies that "WMCA—Call for Action said for me to call you.")

The range of problems handled by Call for Action is impressively diverse. Of 11,388 recent calls, 20 percent dealt with housing, 13 percent with consumer frauds, 10 percent with health problems. Others ranged from employment and schooling to traffic, police, Social Security, narcotics, racial and religious discrimination and air pollution.

Behind most of these calls lies a small but intensely human drama:

When a large public-housing complex suddenly experienced an inordinate number of burglaries, the rumor spread that a master key had been stolen. The tenants were near panic until one thought to telephone Call for Action. A series of phone calls led to an official determination that no master key was missing—but that after 18 years of service the lock cylinders were so worn that it was child's play to pick them. With a gentle nudge from Call for Action, housing-project officials agreed to install new cylinders in all the tenants' doors.

A blind man with four children was talked by a con man into selling merchandise over

the phone. All he had to do was use his own phone, to which the con man attached a tape recorder. The promoter said that he would then take the tapes, make the sales and pay the blind man commissions, plus his phone charges. Instead, after picking up the tapes, the promoter made the sales and vanished. The phone company then disconnected the man's line because of an unpaid bill for more than \$100. Call for Action persuaded the welfare department to pay the phone bill, and currently is pushing for tighter laws against such selling practices.

An expectant mother became hooked on drugs, and was deserted by her husband. Fearing that the child would be born defective, a neighbor phoned Call for Action. Volunteers located an agency willing to take on the multiple problem of abandonment, addiction and pregnancy, and the neighbor signed commitment papers to get the girl in a hospital. In due time this Good Samaritan was able to report the birth of a perfect baby and the reconciliation of husband and wife.

Not all cases have happy endings, of course. Call for Action volunteers still grieve for a 12-year-old boy whose mother reported that he was staying out all night drinking, stealing and experimenting with drugs. The mother went from agency to agency trying to get help. Finally, the boy was arrested. "Now," said the mother bitterly, "everybody wants to help. Why couldn't they before?" Call for Action and WMCA put the mother's recorded question on the air to dramatize the need for more community facilities.

Observers of Call for Action feel that it has social significance beyond the resolving of tens of thousands of domestic tragedies and near tragedies. First, it reinforces in poor people both the habit of making their grievances known and the expectation that if they have a just claim it will be resolved. Many of the callers have never before had the experience of really being listened to. They are astounded when they discover that you can fight City Hall—and win. It shows them that there are better ways of getting attention than starting riots or burning down buildings.

Second, it raises the quality of administration. While trying to find jobs for people in Harlem, for instance, Call for Action learned that there was no local employment office in the area of New York with the densest population and the highest incidence of unemployment. Call for Action leaned on officials until such an office was opened.

Perhaps the greatest victory over bureaucratic bungling came when R. Peter Straus, owner-president of WMCA, asked Call for Action volunteers to look into the reasons for the steady deterioration of much of New York's older housing. An invitation over the air to phone in about broken stairs, lack of heat, uncollected garbage and rats brought a flood of calls. In trying to refer callers to the appropriate city departments, Call for Action discovered incredible overlaps in bureaucratic jurisdictional lines. For example, the health department had charge of complaints about lack of hot water in faucets—while the buildings department had charge of complaints about the lack of hot water in radiators.

Unable to make city officials take notice, half a dozen volunteers, led by Straus's wife, Ellen, appeared one morning at the main city housing office and were accepted by the regular help as new employees. Proceeding to the files, they gathered facts about cases which eventually led to the flushing out of a syndicate of slumlords who milk properties dry, then abandon them. Two long-range results were the establishment of a central complaint number for housing calls in City Hall, and a joint city-federal project to investigate the possibility of computerizing property ownership records.

Currently, Call for Action is being expanded in two directions. In New York,

WMCA, which has won nine public-service awards for its sponsorship of the program, is encouraging the New York volunteers to double the time that the phones are kept open each day (from two hours to four), and to extend their coverage from New York City to surrounding suburban areas.

Nationally, the Urban Coalition, a group of businessmen activists who work closely with community groups to bring about peaceable change in the big cities, is encouraging Call for Action programs in other cities, and has arranged with Mrs. Straus to share her volunteer-group experience with others wishing to start Call for Action projects. In recent months, programs similar to the New York project have started up in Washington and Philadelphia, and are expected to begin soon in Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Fresno, New Haven, Utica, San Antonio and Altoona, among other cities.

John Gardner, head of the Coalition and former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, believes that Call for Action has a major national role to play. "When I was in government," he recalls, "I was struck by the need for some procedure that would enable people to place their grievances before those in authority and get prompt action. Call for Action can do this because it stands apart from government or any other vested interest and thus is able to concentrate on getting results. It is an enormously constructive idea which can help all kinds of people cope with all kinds of problems. More importantly, it can help combat the sense of powerlessness that is so prevalent in our large cities."

MOST REV. MICHAEL KIEN, ARCHBISHOP OF THAILAND, SPEAKS OUT ON THE RECENT VIETNAM MORATORIUM ACTIVITIES

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think the following article which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, bearing upon the recent Vietnam moratorium, will be of interest to the Members.

The Most Reverend Michael Kien, Archbishop of Thailand, should be in a position to know what effect the moratorium demonstrations would have upon our quest for peace.

The article follows:

THAI BISHOP: PROTEST HURT WAR PULL-OUT

Activities such as the Vietnam moratorium may actually slow United States withdrawal from Vietnam, the Most Rev. Michael Kien, Archbishop of Thailand, said Friday.

Archbishop Kien stopped briefly in Omaha to visit the Revs. James R. Cain, Anthony B. Mickells and Anthony Petrusic who visited him in Thailand last year.

He has been in the United States since June raising funds for Catholic missions in Thailand and is returning to Thailand after stopping in New York City.

"I don't blame the moratorium because I know the ways of American democracy," Archbishop Kien said in an interview. "But I wonder if this was the proper time for it. President Nixon is doing his best for American society and the American people."

The native of Thailand said events like the moratorium and other protest demonstrations will "make the North Vietnamese more intransigent and less willing to yield." He added:

"Patience is the key word. If you try to take things easier, you will get what you want quicker."

He predicted that the Vietnamese will be able to take over the war in a year or two, permitting the complete withdrawal of American troops.

He urged the United States to pull out of both Vietnam and Thailand gradually and said the presence of American troops in Thailand is "welcome."

THE ALASKAN NATIVE STORY: A BIT OF ESKIMO HISTORY

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, some interesting testimony concerning the early history of Alaska and the position of the Eskimo people who live on the Bering Sea was provided the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs last week by Jerome Trigg, Sr., president of the Arctic Native Brotherhood.

The Trigg statement told us much about the Eskimo people and about their view of the transaction by which the United States purchased Alaska from the Czar of Russia.

I believe the Trigg statement will make interesting reading for all Americans, and the full text of it follows:

TESTIMONY REGARDING ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS

(By Jerome Trigg, Sr.)

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Members of the Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of the Alaska native, I should like to welcome you to Alaska, and to thank you for this opportunity to enter testimony concerning issues vital to survival of our people, "The Alaska Natives." I am Jerome Trigg, Sr., President of the Arctic Native Brotherhood. Our organization's office is in Nome, Alaska, which is located on the Bering Sea coast of Seward Peninsula. My people are called in English the Kowaruk Nation of Eskimo.

It is proper and fitting that a brief history of our past as it relates to the issues before us today be included in this testimony. We have recorded the history in the memory of our people, and what we know to be true has been proven by the research of scientists.

Our people in the beginning lived in caves when Alaska was tropical. Later after a disaster of three days and nights of eclipse of the sun we started having seasons. We have used our land wisely since time before the coming of the white man. We of the Seward Peninsula were an organized nation, proud and unconquered. We didn't waste anything for we needed everything for survival. Both from the land and the sea, we had our hunting and fishing areas.

One could not infringe on others unless permission was given. Once yearly there were meetings of chiefs from all the villages to map out agreements. In time of trouble, all villages assisted those who were being attacked. We drove the warlike Siberian natives back, though there were others that were friendly and traded with us.

We didn't know of the Russians, much less that they were in our part of the world. Nor did we know about the United States. We were strong and proud, and today we still feel that we own the Seward Peninsula.

We have traded the products of the sea: seal oil, seal skins, dried meat, dried fish, rawhide ropes, and many other items to the

inland natives for caribou hides, squirrel skins, copper, jade slate and other items. We crisscross the peninsula in search of game and fish and to trade with each other. Due to the short season and long winter, it takes a vast area of land to produce the game and fish the native needs.

Before the white man, the natives lived in sod huts, partially underground and warm. Today the Eskimo lives in cardboard shacks in the worst poverty in the nation.

I have briefly described a nation of people who live wisely and carefully. We are peaceful hard-working tax-paying people, able to make what we have go a long way. Our deep loyalty to the United States is well known. The graves of our men killed in the arctic on patrols of World War II and other graves from later wars in other parts of the world speak for us.

We have been isolated and forgotten because we are a quiet people who must work constantly to stay alive. Some of our people have been left behind the times, as things changed and the riches of our lands were needed by this nation and other countries of the world.

We did not invent the wheel, but the wheel does not work on tundra and snow. We developed sleds instead, and the skin boats. We have learned to adapt to new things if they are useful: outboard motor, snow machine and other items.

I would like to give a few reasons why we desire and need a full and just settlement. First, I would like to point out that we are permanent residents. Even after our land was exploited we remained. We love our land. We have united with the Alaska Federation of Natives. We are proud to be part of that organization.

We are in need of housing with utilities. We have Eskimo kids that never have baths. We have much skin disease and ear problems. Many related health problems due to poor housing and water problems.

We have one of the lowest death ages of any group in the nation.

We cannot borrow from banks to build houses, for you must have an adequate income to pay a loan back. Our children are going to school in distant places. We want them home. We would like to improve our villages to meet modern living conditions with running water. We would like to send our children to institutions of higher learning of our choice. We would like job training for the workers of our area.

We do not want to always live off the taxes that other people pay. We want to earn our own way and pay taxes to support public services we all need, and to have the same freedom to make the choices in our lives that other people do.

The single greatest cause for our present situation, as second-class citizens, is too much dependence on welfare and decision-making by government agencies.

The gold rush, even for all the gold taken from native lands, left the native worse off. Will the oil rush trample us too, and destroy the game and resources of the wide areas of land we still must depend on for food and clothing? The native, too, desires to benefit from development of the resources of the land but we wish, for once, to guide this development so that our children will never have to suffer the hardships that absentee exploitation brought to my generation and older generations.

We are prepared to take on the job of managing a large sum of money and to invest that money in our people, the future generations of our people, and in the good of our state and our nation.

If the settlement is too small we will only be able to attack the symptoms of our problems. This is all that tax money spent so far has been able to do. There must be large settlements in the beginning to establish the system and the means of accomplishing

all that must be done. There must be a regular amount of money which can be expected and planned for.

We think that the Federation's proposal for 40 million acres and \$500 million with a two percent overriding royalty is a reasonable and just solution to our land claims. This combination of ownership in land and settlement money will allow the native people to promote and guide development of the land. This proposal will allow us to meet the demands of the future.

We believe that our Eskimo lands were illegally sold without our knowledge or consent by a country which had not conquered or lived on those lands. We also believe that our lands were sold by Russia to the United States when neither country had true knowledge of their use, occupation or ownership. We believe we are justly entitled to payments

for non-renewable resources which were removed without benefit to our people and for the lands which are now occupied by the descendants of others.

We have here in Alaska native bank officers, commercial airline pilots, commercial boat and barge operators, airline managers, and other executives, air station managers, military officers, and school teachers. We have members of our people in other states who occupy a wide range of occupation. We have some native corporations.

The money received in the final settlement will provide the capital to enable us to obtain education, advice, and technical assistance for ourselves and our children. It will provide money for building safe, sanitary and adequate housing for our people. It will provide the foundation and support for private ownership of property and business. It will equip

us to compete for jobs and to obtain funds for major construction in our communities, and give us the freedom to make our own choices and mistakes and to profit from them.

We are proud of our citizenship but not the limits that are placed upon it. We are proud of our willingness and ability to serve in our nation's defense. We now wish to contribute to its economy by becoming self-sufficient and independent people. We expect to use the money to which we are justly entitled to prepare our coming generation to take advantage of the opportunities and the choices which this nation can offer to them. We want our children and our children's children to be proud of their past and their heritage as American Eskimos, American Aleuts or American Alaskan Indians.

Thank you.

SENATE—Monday, October 27, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God and Father of all mankind, whose promise is to bless that nation whose people strive to do Thy will, make known to us the way we should think and work and live to fulfill the divine intention. Let Thy greatness overrule our mistakes and strengthen our weakness. Hasten the day when Thy purposes are fulfilled, not only in the hearts of a few wise and brave men but throughout the whole Nation, in Congress and court, in workshop and office, in field and forest, in city and in country. Draw us together in this Senate in unity of spirit and in the bonds of peace that the words of our mouths and the work of our minds may be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate. The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 27, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 23, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were commu-

nicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, I am transmitting the 23d annual report, covering the calendar year 1968, on United States participation in the United Nations.

The large number of topics covered, the number of U.N. agencies involved, and the increasing contributions of the United States to U.N. programs all show how important the United Nations has become to the peace, security, and welfare of the world. In the United States, support of the United Nations and participation in its many activities have always been nonpartisan.

I therefore take pleasure in transmitting to the Congress this report of the President on our participation in the United Nations.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 27, 1969.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to sundry committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. WINN, of Kansas, had been appointed as a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the bill (S. 1857) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, pur-

suant to Public Law 81-507, as amended, vice Mr. BELL, of California, excused.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to 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.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9946) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in certain tracts of land to the board of education of Lee County, S.C.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. STEED, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MAHON, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14020) to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U.S. savings bonds, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14020) to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U.S. savings bonds, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.