

other program involving the provision by State or local governments of housing or related facilities, shall be made available only on condition that the recipient submit and carry out an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14547. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14548. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to detect and treat incidents of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 14549. A bill to provide for the protection of children against physical injury caused or threatened by those who are responsible for their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 14550. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in the monthly benefits payable thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$80, to liberalize the earnings test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 14551. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for civil service retirement purposes service as an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14552. A bill to amend title II of the

Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 14553. A bill to protect the privacy of the American home from the invasion by mail of sexually provocative material, to prohibit the use of the United States mails to disseminate material harmful to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DORN, and Mr. MCKNEALLY):

H.R. 14554. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 14555. A bill that section 481(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 be amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 14556. A bill to facilitate the movement of persons and goods in interstate commerce, and to aid in eliminating the burdens on interstate commerce which result from lack of adequately coordinated transportation facilities in many parts of the United States, through a comprehensive program of Federal assistance to States and localities to aid in the provision of such facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. DENT, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr.

ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SLACK, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WHALLEY, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 14557. A bill to require an investigation and study, including research, into possible uses of solid wastes resulting from mining and processing coal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 975. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of February 8-14 as "National Angel Flight Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia:

H. Res. 600. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 14558. A bill for the relief of John and Libera Chimenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14559. A bill for the relief of Angelina do Carmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14560. A bill for the relief of Manuel De Freitas and his wife, Raquel De Jesus Ferreira Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 14561. A bill for the relief of the heirs at law of Jiro Kunisaki and Ellen Kishiyama, his daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### SECRETARY HICKEL SPEAKS ON POLLUTION TO EXECUTIVES

#### HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on October 23 and 24, the Department of the Interior sponsored in Washington the National Executives' Conference on Water Pollution Abatement.

This excellent program attracted several hundred executives from across the Nation, Canada, Europe, and Japan to listen to speeches on the problems and solutions to water pollution. This proved to be one of the most successful conferences of this type ever held, as the speakers included the presidents of such companies as E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., International Harvester Co., Ontario Paper Co., Ltd., United States Steel Corp., as well as other top executives both from the United States and Europe.

At an evening session on October 23, the participants listened to remarks by the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Walter J. Hickel. I believe that this speech, which I also had the honor to hear, should be read by every American concerned about the need for water pollution abatement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR WALTER J. HICKEL BEFORE THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVES' CONFERENCE ON WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 23, 1969

It is a tragedy that business and government must come together—to solve a problem that should not exist.

There is no place for pollution in the United States and in the World.

But there is no place in this World that it does not exist.

President Nixon, in speaking to the United Nations called "protecting our environment" one of the five areas of concern to everyone.

The President said:

"Increasingly, the task of protecting man's environment is a matter of international concern.

"Pollution of air and water, upsetting the balance of nature—these are not only local problems, and not only national problems, but matters that affect the basic relationships of man to his planet."

Here in the United States we have overloaded the water that sustains us with so many wastes nature cannot handle them.

We have seriously upset the balance that sustained our environment for millions of years.

It is time that we—as individuals, business and government helped solve the problems we made for nature.

You have come here to examine the problems and exchange experiences and ideas.

I am here charged with the responsibility of eliminating existing pollution.

And preventing any future pollution.

I have come here charged with the responsibility of insuring that our children will live in an environment free from the destruction that we have done to nature.

I knew—when I accepted the responsibilities of serving as your 38th Secretary of the Interior, that the job would be tough.

But I want to tell everyone of you here tonight that we are condemning our children—and our children's children—if we don't do the job before us.

Some of the most blatant sources of pollution in the United States are in our urban areas—the cities and their suburbs.

And today, 140 million Americans—seventy per cent of all our citizens—live on less than two per cent of our land.

By the Year 2000, this urban population probably will grow to 270 million.

Municipal and industrial waste already totals over 18 billion gallons a year.

But we must see these pollution figures diminished—and finally stopped altogether.

But this will not be possible unless we finally start anticipating problems—instead of just reacting to them.

Let me give you a local example:

I think most of you here know that the elimination of air pollution is in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—not in Interior.

And yet, among the many of you who flew into Washington for this Conference, how many of you know that the jets that flew you here, dump 35 tons of solid wastes in just one day as they approach and depart Washington's airports? That's a lot of smog... and I'm afraid much of it ends up in our waters.

My point: pollution—of all kinds—is related.

All industry, large or small—in fact, all

200 million Americans—produce fantastic quantities of garbage and pollution.

You see, I am afraid man is a "messy animal."

In a way even nature is a "polluter." Nature's purest water—fresh rain water—can also contribute to pollution.

For as that rain water falls on the millions of acres of pavement that cover our cities . . . and as it gradually drains into our streams and rivers—through nature's natural re-cycling—it picks up and carries oil, scum, soot—and every other pollutant we can imagine.

So . . . that "pure" rain water doesn't remain that way very long—by the time it reaches a stream, a river, or the water table.

And the same holds true in rural areas—a fact those of you from the agricultural sector should not forget.

What happens when the pure rain water falls on a freshly plowed field? By the time it reaches a stream, it's probably loaded with fertilizing chemicals of every sort.

So what do we do about all these problems?

Well, those of you who know Wally Hickel, know that I'm a "positive approach" kind of guy.

I believe in taking a problem and turning it around into a benefit.

For example, some of the Interior Department researchers in Athens, Georgia, have discovered that Georgia's red clay actually reduces water pollution by holding pesticides in the soil.

Through absorption, the clay particles "hold onto" the pesticide molecules, rendering them less harmful and less mobile.

The next step is to develop chemical pesticides that will "break down" while they are being held so they are harmless when they finally reach our streams.

Again, my point: When you add up all that urban, industrial, agricultural, and even natural pollution, we have a coast-to-coast picture of environmental breakdown.

But each of us has a choice: Improve the environment in which we live—or let it continue to deteriorate.

As far as I—and the Interior Department—are concerned, we have made our choice.

And, in all fairness, I know that many of you—too—have chosen the "positive approach" . . . the "let's get it done attitude" instead of the negative position that the problem is unsolvable.

After all, you—as businessmen—are also realists.

And many of you have already realized that pollution costs you "plenty." But this does not have to be the case.

Enlightened management, freed from some of the shackles of the past, is rapidly realizing that elimination of pollution not only means more black ink on the profit and loss sheet . . .

It also means dividends in public relations . . . that less definite, but equally vital, ingredient in a successful business.

The sad part is that some businessmen are still like the mayor of a certain eastern city who refused to install a new sewage treatment plant in his community.

It would have cost about \$250,000 at the time—just a few years ago.

Later, when the court ordered him to install the facility. He found it now cost \$400,000 for the equipment he had once rejected.

When confronted with this situation, he tried to resign. But the court would not let him, and the judge even suggested that the voters might be able to sue the mayor and the city council for the \$150,000 difference.

The mandate which I would like to pass on to you today, from the American people is this:

They must act because they have the will to change and improve our environment.

And we must work quickly because the future is closing in on us.

Again, I'm not a "sit back and wait" kind of guy.

We have initiated a tough, common sense policy for water pollution abatement.

And to date, we have moved to stop pollution as quickly and completely as possible within the mechanical, legal, and financial means available to us.

And gentlemen, this is only the beginning. We have begun the "war against pollutants," and we do not intend to lose.

But we need your continuing cooperation. Much of industry has already spent billions of dollars on water pollution control.

And just as surely, I know that we must spend billions more before the job will be done.

It's tragic, but many people don't mind somebody else's water becoming unusable—it's only their own they care about.

Well, when the beaches are closed because they're covered with filth . . .

When your drinking water has a funny smell—and worse taste . . .

When you don't have enough water to take a bath—or it looks like it just came out of a storm drain, instead of a faucet . . .

When there are no more edible fish left in our rivers and lakes—because the fish themselves cannot stand the polluted water or to eat the smaller fish they would normally subsist on—because they, too, are "dis-ease on the fin" . . .

At that point, ladies and gentlemen, we will have no one to blame but ourselves.

CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR ATTACKS PROGRAMS FOR NATION'S NEEDY

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received several protests from my district against the attempt of Gov. Ronald Reagan to usurp control of the funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Governor has never been enthusiastic for Federal programs which come into his State to help the neglected needy. The following editorial in the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune of October 22 has created alarm that his program of usurping control might infiltrate into the office of Governors in other States:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Oct. 22, 1969]

A POOR PLOT

For once, California Sen. George Murphy is doing a song and dance routine that has a plot. The plot involves clamping a dangerous restriction on the Office of Economic Opportunity's power to help poor people get legal service they can't afford.

The script was apparently written by Gov. Ronald Reagan, another former Hollywood performer.

Murphy's amendment to a money bill, pushed through the Senate, would give governors the right to veto any legal service plan the OEO wants to start in their states.

Reagan hasn't fared well with OEO attorneys in his state, because the legal assistance they have given to migrant workers,

especially, has frustrated some of his attempts to maintain the status quo.

The War on Poverty has touched more bases than those involving food, shelter and basic necessities. Protection of the law made available through expert legal help has also been denied poor people generally. They hunger for that too, and they deserve it.

The legal services plan has helped welfare mothers, slum tenants, even steelworkers, whose rights often have been brushed aside for lack of somebody to speak for them. Many landmark cases have hit the courts, a fact that some state and local officials view with varying degrees of irritation.

None has been troubled as much with the tide of progress as Reagan, who frankly doesn't like it.

Giving governors absolute veto over such programs would be a reactionary mistake. The House has a chance to correct the Senate's error, and we hope Northwest Indiana's representatives will get with it.

OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld is lobbying to get the amendment killed. He is enthusiastic about the legal services program. It has great promise, and should be allowed to flourish. Governors should have a say in federally-financed programs within their states, but they ought not have the power to block programs by whim.

California doesn't belong to Ronald Reagan alone, a fact he is finding out, and it irks him. But this case is bigger than California, for as California goes in this one, so goes the nation.

Sargent Shriver, former OEO boss, once said, "Any program which enables the poor to do battle with the forces that oppress them at governmental expense has a high potential for conflict with the officials who make public policy affecting the poor. This is especially true where it is governmental action, often in programs designed to aid the poor, that is found to be oppressive."

What that means is that Murphy and Reagan have produced a bad show.

DISSENT FROM THE DISSENSERS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many comments have been made about the public displeasure with the Vietnam war and our commitments there. Much is said about the necessity of dissent and the need to encourage dissenters.

Dr. John E. Huss, of Charleston, S.C., wrote a letter last week to the Charleston News and Courier in which he expressed his dissent from the dissenters. It is a fine letter, one which I think is a perfect expression of the proper attitude toward the American commitments in Vietnam.

Dr. Huss says:

Along with all true Americans, I want peace; I pray and yearn for it every day. I would like to see every American military man come home now—but not at the price of sellout and disgrace.

These are the sentiments of true Americanism and of our traditional commitments to honor and peace. Dr. Huss goes on to say:

War is an anachronism; and the days of bloodshed should perish from this earth. America is ready for an honorable peace, but if war goes on, let's put the blame where it belongs—on Hanoi and Moscow!

I put my confidence in the President of the United States and our government. If we would all stand as one there would be movement on the table at Paris.

Mr. President, these are noble feelings beautifully expressed. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Huss' letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the News and Courier, Oct. 23, 1969]  
DISSENT FROM DISSENT

TO THE NEWS AND COURIER:

I want to take my stand and let it be known that although it is popular in our day to be in dissent with the government of the United States, I am in dissent with the philosophy of the dissenters.

The moratorium of Oct. 15 was something with which I could not find myself in sympathy. I will feel the same way about future moratoriums. If much of the philosophy that pervades our country today had existed in generations of the past we would have no America today.

Along with all true Americans I want peace; I pray and yearn for it every day. I'd like to see every American military man come home NOW—but not at the price of a sellout and disgrace.

One of the great poems of World War I has these lines written by John McCrae:

"If ye break faith with us who die,  
We shall not sleep,  
Though poppies grow in Flanders fields."

If there are to be day-long readings of the names of the 44,700 who have died in Vietnam, let us read the names motivated with the desire to see that these men have not died in vain. Let us not break faith with them.

War is an anachronism; and the days of bloodshed should perish from this earth. America is ready for an honorable peace, but if war goes on, let's put the blame where it belongs—on Hanoi and Moscow!

I put my confidence in the President of the United States and our government. If we would all stand as one there would be movement on the table at Paris. I repeat, I am in dissent with the philosophy of the dissenters!

JOHN E. HUSS.

## VIETNAM—THE SHORTEST ROAD TO PEACE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last week a petition by some 28 retired military officers and a magazine article reflecting the views of another 12, all of whom unanimously agree that the war in Vietnam could be won in 6 to 8 weeks, and the killing ended by use of conventional weapons, if the military leaders were free of political restrictions. See page 31432 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 23, 1969.

News reports have it that Gen. William Westmoreland, former top U.S. commander in Vietnam and now Chief of Staff of the Army, recently commented here in Washington that the war in Viet-

nam would already be over if U.S. forces had been unleashed.

General Westmoreland's statement reinforces the conclusion of the other distinguished officers that the shortest road to peace in Vietnam—the earliest end to the killing and drain of our resources—would be to adopt a positive policy—that being victory.

An Evans and Novak column of September 11 follows:

PRESIDENT FACES A WIDENING SPLIT BETWEEN GENERALS, AIDES ON WAR

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The quiet but rising pressure of the generals for a military instead of political solution to the Vietnam war was dramatically evident in a recent private luncheon on Capitol Hill.

Guest of honor was Gen. William Westmoreland, formerly top U.S. commander in Vietnam and now chief of staff of the Army. His hosts were several congressmen, headed by Rep. Olin (Tiger) Teague of Texas, Democratic chairman of the House Veterans Committee and a hawk.

Westmoreland was careful to say nothing critical of President Nixon and the Nixon plan to withdraw U.S. combat troops as fast as they can be replaced by South Vietnamese. That plan was the brainchild of Westmoreland's boss, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

But when the dishes were cleared and the coffee poured, the general's host asked hard questions, specifically whether the war could be won if all restraints were removed from the U.S. military. Westmoreland said that in his opinion the war would be over now if U.S. forces had been unleashed.

More important, Westmoreland—again answering specific questions—raised the horrible specter of hordes of North Vietnamese regulars suddenly descending on the U.S. troops remaining after most of the combat troops have been withdrawn.

To the congressmen present, Westmoreland was conjuring up "a giant Dienbienphu"—a reference to the catastrophic French defeat by Ho Chi Minh in 1954.

Westmoreland's grim words could not be described as any veiled signal for a revolt of the generals. But they were tangible evidence of the rearguard action that Laird, Secretary of State William P. Rogers and the President himself are now fighting to carry out the troop-withdrawal policy.

The words are testimony, too, to deepening fears within the White House of right-wing political reaction against the President's plan to "Vietnamize" the war. To the extent that U.S. casualties remain high as the withdrawals proceed, Mr. Nixon is highly vulnerable to political attack.

This partially explains the long delay in the President's announcement of a second troop pullback, following the first withdrawal of 25,000 troops announced on June 8.

Moreover, in making the decision to delay that second announcement, the President was buying time out of political factors having nothing at all to do with Vietnam. The success of the Apollo moon shot, it was decided in the White House, created so much pro-Nixon euphoria that a delay in the announcement promised for August would be politically acceptable. White House strategists also calculated that a troop pullout would have maximum effectiveness in cooling the campuses if it came after the start of the new school year.

In sum, the White House determined that Mr. Nixon could appease the generals by stretching out the process of de-Americanizing the war without triggering an immediate backfire from the doves.

But despite the euphoria of Apollo, the cost of the long delay has been severe. It has damaged Mr. Nixon's credibility and has revealed the fundamental split between his civilian advisers—Laird, Rogers, and Henry Kissinger, his national security adviser—and the generals.

It isn't generally known, for example, that during the polite, public spat between the State and Defense Departments over the level of North Vietnamese infiltration into South Vietnam, some high military officers in the Pentagon secretly lobbied the press. Their message: That the State Department did not know what it was talking about in claiming a major reduction in infiltration. This lobbying undoubtedly was done without Laird's knowledge.

Furthermore, the delay was deeply resented at working levels of the State Department (it came only four days after Rogers' careful press conference pledge that the U.S. would take major risks for peace).

This is the backdrop to the President's summit meeting Friday. With every major civilian and military official involved in the war present, Mr. Nixon will have to adjudicate growing differences between his generals, more convinced than ever that the enemy is now on the brink of military defeat, and his civilian advisers, who will insist on following the announced plan of withdrawals.

Whichever way Mr. Nixon chooses, the generals, emboldened by their success last month, are not about to give up their flanking attacks on the policy of pulling U.S. troops out of the war. That is the real cost of the President's delay.

## MEALS ON WHEELS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, when the Senate passed the Food Stamp Amendments of 1969 (S. 2547) on September 24, it contained my proposal to permit the elderly and the incapacitated homebound to exchange food stamps for cooked meals prepared by nonprofit organizations. S. 2547 is now under consideration by the House of Representatives and I urge that body to duplicate the forward-looking action taken by the Senate in approving my plan.

My bill was inspired by the meals on wheels programs being conducted in 27 States across America by more than 75 charitable organizations. My proposal was designed to encourage and make possible the expansion of the meals on wheels and similar programs throughout the Nation where the need exists. It is a fact that there are many elderly incapacitated persons who are homebound and very often among the most isolated, lonely, hungry, and malnourished in the communities and who cannot shop, prepare meals, or cook for themselves.

I am deeply concerned about the local legal restraints which could dangerously thwart this growing movement to bring nutritious meals to needy families. William Raspberry's article published in last Wednesday's Washington Post is an all-too-graphic example of the kinds of difficulties good Federal Government pro-

grams must overcome. The burden is upon the localities to do whatever is necessary to cooperate with the Federal and State governments, as well as private or religious groups, which can and are willing to alleviate some of the human suffering which unfortunately exists in our country.

I strongly urge the Zoning Commission in the District of Columbia to take remedial action to correct the unjust situation described in Mr. Raspberry's column.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that William Raspberry's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

**CITY BLOCKS "MEALS ON WHEELS" FOR AGED**  
(By William Raspberry)

St. James Lutheran Church had this great idea: They would prepare meals for elderly, blind, shut-in and otherwise handicapped people who cannot do their own marketing and cooking. The meals would be delivered, twice daily, for the actual cost of the food.

Volunteers would do most of the work, with perhaps a paid cook. It was to be a nonprofit operation.

But St. James is located at 16th Street and Eastern Avenue NW, an area zoned as residential.

The District's zoning administrator held that the church's proposed "Meals on Wheels" operation was at least technically a commercial catering operation and, therefore, could not be considered a normal church activity.

The ruling was upheld by the board of zoning adjustment, and that's pretty much how it is right now. But that's not how the Rev. John A. Scherzer intends for it to remain.

Dr. Scherzer, a retired minister who until recently was acting director of Lutheran Social Services, thinks the ruling doesn't make much sense.

How, he wants to know, can it be right to permit "healthy and active people to enjoy the consumption of food on church premises"—or for that matter to allow churches to hold bingo parties and rummage sales—"while the preparation of meals, packaging and delivering them in compliance with public health standards to hungry, undernourished, helpless neighbors is illegal?"

St. James proposes to supply a hot noon meal and a cold supper five days a week for \$10 a week to some 30 residents of the 16th and Eastern area. Eventually, Lutheran Social Services had hoped to supply the meals to some 3,000 shut-ins, operating from churches all over the city.

Dr. Scherzer said volunteers would handle the marketing, packaging and delivery of meals. As the program has worked in other cities, he said, only the cooks and in some cases, cooks' assistants are paid.

Zoning officials, in rejecting the plan, contended that the requirement that participants pay for their meals makes it a commercial catering operation, a contention Dr. Scherzer won't buy.

"No commercial catering establishment is in operation purely for the purpose of meeting the needs of clients without any concern for profit," he said.

He said he personally canvassed a sampling of catering establishments listed in the Yellow Pages and found that the lowest quotation he could get was for \$3.75 per person a day plus packaging and delivery charges.

This, he said, demonstrates that "Meals on Wheels" is a commercial enterprise in only the most limited sense. Zoning officials have,

in effect, made "illegal and impossible the practice of love and compassion," he said.

There is no denying that point, although Dr. Scherzer may be a little harsh on the zoning officials.

It is not a question of whether the proposed service is a needed one; it unquestionably is. At issue is whether it can be permitted under the zoning laws.

Sterling Tucker, the D.C. Council vice chairman whose assistance has been sought by Lutheran Social Services, said he has looked at the ordinances and finds that the board of zoning adjustment is "technically correct."

"If you charge any money at all, you technically are operating a commercial establishment," Tucker said. "I don't think you can criticize the board on that score. They could have interpreted the law differently, but they might have been outside their jurisdiction."

But Tucker, a member of the zoning commission, the next step in the appeal ladder, said he will propose that the commission "provide a broader interpretation" that will exclude nonprofit operations from the "commercial" definition.

If Tucker can sell his point of view, the old folks and the handicapped might get their meals after all.

PEACE

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Larry Curtis, of Boston, has brought to my attention an editorial which recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. Written by Editor-in-Chief Erwin Canham, this article succinctly states the central dilemma of our efforts to extricate American forces from South Vietnam:

The nub of the Vietnam problem, of course, is not that there should be American disengagement but how to bring it about and what to do to prevent future tragedies. . . . There should not be a total upsetting of the balance of Southeast Asia so that more nations fall to aggression. The United States cannot shake off its responsibilities as a world citizen.

Editor Canham's credentials are well known. He is a 1925 graduate of Bates College and was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford. His expertise in the field of international relations derives in part from his experience as a former alternate U.S. delegate to the U.N. General Assembly. He has served with distinction as editor of the internationally known Christian Science Monitor for many years.

His editorial is thoughtful and deserving of wide attention. Accordingly, I insert it at this point in the RECORD under unanimous consent:

PEACE

(By Erwin D. Canham)

The yearning for peace runs deep in the human heart.

It is not confined to those who march for peace. Yet the sight and sound of some 100,000 persons gathered in a traditional public meeting place such as Boston Common, striving to express their yearning, is a tremendous experience.

We must not assume that such expressions

of public will and emotion can do anything like all that is needed to assure peace. There were similar outpourings between the two world wars. In Britain, particularly, deep yearnings for peace were expressed in the so-called Peace Ballot, signed by some 12 million people.

Those British expressions were widely misinterpreted and on balance they did harm. Part of the Peace Ballot was support of collective security through armaments to enforce peace against aggression. Winston Churchill himself actively supported the movement. Yet in public thought, and governmental action, the Peace Ballot was interpreted as merely pacifism. It inhibited Britain's badly needed rearmament against Nazi aggression.

ISSUE COMPLICATED

The present sentiment for peace in the United States can also be badly misinterpreted. There is within it, of course, a profound rejection of all war. But this sentiment is almost totally conditioned by the Vietnam war. How would sentiments run if the proposal was to conduct operations against some racist nation which was seeking to suppress the freedom of others? Or if it were action to enforce some United Nations decision?

The issue is also confused with the unfinished business of American society, both domestic and international. Certainly much needs to be done to reduce the evils of racial injustice, poverty, and pollution. The international role of the United States must not be one of imperialism or domination, but of cooperation so that lesser-developed nations may make better progress at meeting their own needs.

The nub of the Vietnam problem, of course, is not that there should be American disengagement, but how to bring it about and what to do to prevent future tragedies. There must not be a Dunkirk. There must not be a slaughter of the South Vietnamese. There should not be a total upsetting of the balance in Southeast Asia so that more nations fall to aggression. The United States cannot shake off its responsibilities as a world citizen.

NEGOTIATIONS HARMED?

It would be wonderful if the American Government could put to use the idealism and fervor which demands an end to the Vietnam war. Perhaps somehow it can. The demonstrations appear to hurt the government in its efforts to negotiate a peace, by encouraging Hanoi to hang on until the plum drops in its lap. But the negotiations might never have reached formal agreement anyway. There has been no real sign of success. Instead, the war is likely to deescalate, to simmer down, and to become essentially merely a civil struggle between the Vietnamese which someday they can settle on their own terms.

Thus, it may be possible for the United States to increase its troop pullouts, to strengthen pressures on the Saigon government to take larger responsibilities, and above all to persuade it to strengthen the terms of that government so it can expect wider public support in South Vietnam.

UNILATERAL DANGER

American public opinion needs more credible evidence that progress is being made toward ending the war. Presumably President Nixon revealed such evidence to former Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey on his recent White House visit. This would explain Mr. Humphrey's supporting statement. American public opinion needs to feel that the commitment to disengage major U.S. participation in Vietnam is irrevocable.

An American program for peace cannot be based on unilateral disarmament. That would be the surest road to war, as it was in the

1930's. Agreed reduction of armaments is something else again. The United States can also clean up its own defense scandals now coming to light. It can press on diligently with rigorous scrutiny of its defense system and expenditures. It can look harder at the political influence of defense industry.

But in the world of the 1970's, the preservation of peace still requires deterrent military power. It requires international police power against aggression. The arms race could be contained, but this can only be done through secure international agreement. That way lies the present, transitional road toward peace.

#### MORATORIUM AGAINST COMMUNISM

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have heard a lot about moratoriums lately. The people who favor this sort of demonstration have gotten a lot of publicity and are doing damage to the efforts of the President to bring the war to an honorable conclusion.

However, there is one moratorium that I favor, and that is the moratorium which was organized last Sunday in Buffalo, N.Y. This was the "Moratorium Against Communism," arranged by the American Hungarians of the Niagara Frontier. The Hungarians understand the nature of communism and have learned the hard way. This is the 13th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising. The Reverend Paul Kantor, one of the organizers of the Moratorium Against Communism, said he wanted to "ask freedom-loving Americans to proclaim a moratorium against the Communist dictators in Moscow."

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Hungarian Group Sets Sunday Rally Outside City Hall," published in the Buffalo News of Wednesday, October 22, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Oct. 22, 1969]

#### HUNGARIAN GROUP SETS SUNDAY RALLY OUTSIDE CITY HALL

A "Moratorium Against Communism" has been scheduled for Sunday at 3 PM in the Council chambers of City Hall by the American Hungarians of the Niagara Frontier.

Commemorating the 13th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising, the program will include a speech by Walter Chopyk, a member of the Captive Nations Committee, and an English poetry reading by Hungarian poets.

In honor of the occasion, Mayor Sedita has proclaimed Oct. 26, Hungarian Freedom Day. The Hungarian Boy Scouts also will participate.

The Rev. Paul Kantor of the West Side Hungarian Reformed Church organized the commemoration to "ask freedom-loving Americans to proclaim a moratorium against the Communist dictators in Moscow."

Mr. Kantor also said that Communist dictators "make it their business to send agents

to the U. S. A. to misguide our young people" and that Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) ought to be renamed "students for Destroying Society."

#### BLINDNESS GIVES REPORTER INSIGHT

### HON. RALPH TYLER SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune there was featured a story entitled "Blindness Gives Reporter Insight." This is a real human interest story in which Donna Gill sets forth her unusual experience. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### "BLINDNESS" GIVES REPORTER INSIGHT (By Donna Gill)

The click of heels echoed on the hard surface below. Voices to the left. Luggage scraping. Muted laughter. Sounds, everywhere sounds.

I was blind.

It had only been moments since Norman Dahl of the Illinois Lions clubs blind activities committee, had taped the gauze over my eyes and applied the wide blindfold, but already I was getting an idea of what it was like in the world of the sightless—what it was like to be blind.

#### ARRIVED AT O'HARE

We had arrived at O'Hare International airport early that crisp morning to board a flight to Detroit, there to transfer to a car for the trip 25 miles north to Rochester, Mich., and the Leader Dogs for the Blind school. For the rest of the day—flying, eating, traveling, walking, and just living—I would be blind.

I held Dahl's arm and he led me away from the ticket counter and down the corridors of the airport. It was hard to concentrate. It was a mixed jumble, as if hearing everything in the world all at once and for the first time.

As people walked by, I remembered listening to stereo demonstration records—the ones where the train comes at you and fades in the distance while you try to imagine what it looks like.

It was a world of electronic blackness with dots and flashes of white streaming across the insides of your eyes like when you first close your eyes to go to sleep in a darkened room. At this point, the noises were a turmoil of conflicting signals.

"Now we're approaching some steps and . . ."

My heart dropped into my toes. I was scared. A step? Mt. Everest. But I told myself my fear was unfounded. I stepped. There. That wasn't so bad.

Then we boarded the plane. Temperature changed. Voices echoed. The situation had changed and the body and brain were busy compensating for a handicap. The brain worked for me, selectively plucking meaningful noises out of a topsy-turvy for reference and discarding other sounds.

#### HANDS BEGIN TO SEE

My ears heard what they should, my feet investigated the material beneath me, and my hands began to see as I groped for the seat belt.

I love to fly. There is an exhilaration that comes from watching ground disappear and breaking thru billowing clouds into a beckoning sky. It would be missing this time. Depression loomed with its unseeing eyes and black stare.

But the mood didn't last long. There was too much going on.

Take-off might be terrifying for a sightless person not used to flying. You are immersed in a kaleidoscope of noise and sensation as if you are being launched in a jet-propelled cage that doesn't extend beyond the seat and voice next to you.

#### BACK INTO PERSPECTIVE

However, after the climb, voices of passengers in other parts of the plane and echoing air noises of a large plane in flight end the closed feeling and bring spaces back into perspective.

I felt a wave of air sickness due to motion exaggerated when one can't see, and then breakfast came. I could hardly wait to dig in. It was more than hunger; it was a test. Could I feed myself? Could I be independent?

Dahl told me where the food was according to the clock. Fruit, 11. Roll, 8. Milk, 10; Omelet and bacon, 6.

#### LEARNS TO EAT

I fumbled, but soon found that weight, temperatures, pressures, and textures help you find food and tell you if it is secure on the fork. It may have been sloppy and uncoordinated, but eating that meal truly gave me a sense of accomplishment.

The next battle was regaining balance after leaving the plane and on the way to the waiting car. Then the world of voices began again as we started the trip.

I felt totally blind, not blindfolded. I couldn't wait to get to the school, meet my dog, and take off on my own, without having to wait for someone to offer me an arm.

#### FACED CAR SICKNESS

I keep my mind off being car sick—something that doesn't happen to me when I can see—I tried to figure out where we were by the noises. Traffic sounds, echoes in underpasses, the length between stops, and the odors all combined to give me clues.

But the sighted world was far away from mine, and I dropped into a feeling of invisibility, much as the ostrich imagines he can't be seen if he can't see.

The feeling was temporary, however. As time passed I got used to the blindness and ignored it. I began not to even notice the blackness before my eyes.

#### IMAGINATION TAKES OVER

Imagination took over and I visualized things or just saw nothing. It is not quite a feeling of staring into space. It is more of a beige world that has no form or color. It is a nothing.

But when it becomes a nothing, you become a something. Blindness has been accepted, concentration becomes acute, and you learn. I had gone thru curiosity, depression, sickness, defeat, and victory in only a few hours and I felt more alive than I ever had.

Dahl told me of the program at the Leader school. Dogs of many breeds are trained for 12 weeks. The trainers themselves have been blindfolded for 30 days so they will understand what the blind person is going thru when he arrives for the following four-week course.

#### COST IS \$2,500

The cost—about \$2,500 for a team—is underwritten so that the service is free to the blind. Lions clubs in many states finance 70 to 80 per cent of the work of the 30-year-old non-profit school.

In Illinois, Lions clubs raise money annually thru Candy Day for the blind, to be held next Friday.

We were there. The car door opened, and

a friendly voice announced, "Hi. Welcome. I'm Poc." He was Harold Pocklington, director, but "here we use only first names. This is family."

#### VOICES SOUND FRIENDLY

I felt trusting, almost too much so. Any voice sounds friendly when you have been in the darkness. I wondered if blind persons get over this feeling with time and independence.

I took a blind person's tour of the facilities there, saw a porcelain lion statue with my hands, and then left for downtown for training with a Leader Dog.

Poc and the others at the school give no special favors to blind persons. And it is welcomed by the blind, because no one wants to think he is pitied or catered to.

"There's nothing more maddening, if you're blind, than to go to a restaurant with a friend, only to have the waiter ask the other guy what you want to order as if you lost your mind as well as your sight," Poc said.

Downtown I met Dan McDonald, one of the trainers. We began without a dog. At the start of training, you walk behind a harness held by the trainer.

He teaches you hand and voice signals, the proper way to find a curb, how to turn corners, how to keep in step. The trainer studies you. Are you hesitant? Afraid? A slow or fast walker? What do you do in emergencies? Are you outgoing or introverted? What is your voice tone?

#### MATCHED WITH DOG

The trainer uses this information to match you with a dog. The goal is a coordinated unit, a dog and human that act and move as one. It was time to bring out the dog.

I was excited. This was it. I could hardly wait. There was Queenie, a white German Shepherd.

I clasped the harness handle in my left hand with the leash resting across the handle and under my thumb.

"Queenie, forward! Good dog!"

#### WALKS QUITE FAST

Away we went, four miles per hour, faster than most pedestrians walk. It is a strange feeling at first to go almost running off into the darkness. The more we walked, the better we got. But soon, the darkness remains I wasn't scared. I believed in the dog.

#### OWN JOB EASY

I imagined the white dog detouring, around obstacles and pedestrians, watching for traffic, and looking out for low-hanging awnings. My job was so easy in comparison—just walk along and praise the dog.

I was not afraid of bumping into things, but I did run into the edge of a building. It was my own fault—I was walking too far away from Queenie. I laughed at myself and we continued.

It was a good feeling to be normal, even tho blind. The walking was coming naturally, and I began to think about where we were. We started in an area that I thought must be older homes on a side street because grass grew in the cracks of a broken sidewalk and traffic was almost nonexistent.

#### CROSSES SOME STREETS

We crossed a few streets, turned a few corners, and it was time to head for the business district. We got to a corner. Queenie stopped to give me time to find the curb, and then I signaled her to go forward.

I started to step off the curb, but she wouldn't let me.

She stepped around in front of me and blocked my move. I was dumbfounded about her actions until a car came whipping around the corner. That time the "good dog" and dozens of pats were truly heart felt. When it was clear, Queenie and I crossed the street, stopping before the up-curb, and continuing the walk.

#### MINOR VICTORIES ACHIEVED

I could tell more now. I knew when we were approaching an intersection before Queenie stopped because of traffic sounds. I knew we were in a busy section now because of the people passing by, the noises, and the condition of the sidewalk. Curbs and minor obstacles taken for granted by the sighted became minor victories to us.

Dan said many blind persons fear turning themselves over to a dog and pull back, trying to stop the dog instead of going with it. That wasn't my problem, but direction was. I had trouble trying to find the correct store in a block of stores.

But dogs learn your routine and often know where you want to go and take you right there, sometimes even putting their noses on the doorknob to help you find it.

#### STORY OF AMPUTEE

Dan told me about one dog whose owner was not only blind but also a double amputee who collapsed while walking. Whenever the man would wobble, the Leader Dog would throw itself against the man's legs to prop him up until he regained his balance. Dogs also walk slower for persons who have trouble with mobility. They seem to know instinctively that something is wrong.

The lesson was over—and Queenie was gone. I missed her. I could see how attached a dog and person could become in a short time.

Experts vary on their preferences for travel aids for the blind—some prefer dogs, others a cane or other mechanical device. No one method is correct for every blind person. But I could see how companionship would be a strong argument for a dog.

#### RETURNS TO SCHOOL

It was time to go back to the school grounds, have a late lunch, listen to a movie about the school, and talk to some of the students about their accomplishments—they bowled, cooked, worked, went to college, played golf, and enjoyed fairly normal lives.

By then I was exhausted.

Reactions to blindness vary with the individual, but I had gone over stages that many blind persons go thru a longer period of time; curiosity, depression, changing attitudes and habits, resignation, learning, and return to normalcy.

It had been a mental and physical strain, but when the blindfold was finally removed, it was like being reborn. I couldn't look at things fast enough.

The day was over. The other students would stay there. Their blindness would not end.

For me, it was over, but one thing would never be the same. From then on, I would be seeing things thru appreciative eyes—eyes that had to be blind before they could really see.

#### ART LINKLETTER'S MISSION

#### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which I believe is self-explanatory, appeared in the Chicago Tribune on October 23:

#### ART LINKLETTER'S MISSION

Fortunately, Art Linkletter is a man to whom personal tragedy can give the strength and desire to help protect others from the same tragedy.

Mr. Linkletter blames the recent death of his 20-year-old daughter, Diane, on LSD—"a tiger in her bloodstream." Her death has de-

termined him to do all he can to warn others of the danger of drugs that warp the mind. He has agreed to testify before a Congressional committee, and he has made a recording telling of his daughter's drift into the shadowy world of drugs and of her family's efforts to dissuade her. Few who have heard it will be able to forget it.

Too few people recognize or are willing to admit the danger that these drugs pose to so many of the young. Too little has been said about the deaths and insanity that have already resulted from their use. The tendency, as Mr. Linkletter says, is for families to hush these things up "as a terrible secret."

There are many ways of fighting this danger; laws and border patrols; the punishment of drug peddlers and promoters who are willing to sabotage a generation in the name of "love" in order to make a fast buck; and the solemn warnings of elders who, all too often, talk about drugs with about as much authority as they talk about Santa Claus or the balance of payments.

But all of us were young once and most of us can remember the tendency to discount the solemn advice of our elders and to want to find out for ourselves. Today's youth is especially restless. To more of them than ever, an experience is something to be experienced, just as to a mountain climber a mountain is something to be climbed. If a young person is restless or disturbed or foolish enough, he will find himself imprisoned in a psychedelic chamber of unreality from which he may not be able to escape for years if ever.

Sometimes the lure of independence or experience does not yield to reason. It takes an unusually vivid and personal lesson to get the message across—something like the anti-smoking warnings delivered on television by the late William Talman of the Perry Mason show while he was dying of cancer. This is what the experience of the Linkletters can now provide for others.

It has taken some courage for Mr. Linkletter to talk publicly about the events and family discussions leading up to his daughter's plunge from a sixth floor window. He deserves the admiration and sympathy of his contemporaries and the life-long gratitude of every young man or woman who hears of his family's tragedy and decides, "That's not for me."

#### HANOI'S MYOPIA

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 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. 18, 1969]

#### HANOI'S MYOPIA

Certainly one of the most unsettling aspects of the so-called Moratorium Day of protest against our involvement in the Vietnam War is in the new confidence it has given the enemy.

Even before the day began, Hanoi was blatantly intruding into our domestic affairs, attempting to prescribe the behavior of American citizens. The thrust of Hanoi's propaganda was simple; the price of "peace" is surrender.

The day after the protest, North Vietnam was saying that a nation that could send men to the moon should be able to manage a precipitate retreat from South Vietnam. Xuan Thuy, Hanoi's chief negotiator at Paris, added that President Nixon showed his contempt for American public opinion by failing to heed the protestors.

And, as an act of consummate brutality, Hanoi lost no opportunity before or after Moratorium Day to exploit the anxieties and fears of the wives of American prisoners of war. The wives were turned back by the North Vietnamese in Paris, and told to join the protest against our national policy. The implication was "or else."

In all these matters the facts are clear. First, there can be no genuine peace through surrender. There never has been. Our landing of men on the moon and the rate of withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam are not remotely related. The savagery toward prisoners and exploitation of the raw emotions of distraught wives speaks for itself.

And, of course, President Nixon is showing respect for American public opinion.

The latest polls show 57 per cent of the Americans favor his leadership. By contrast the protestors in Moratorium Day did not represent 10 per cent of the nation's college students or .0025 per cent of the population.

Hanoi, in seeking to manage the affairs of the United States of America, is suffering from acute myopia.

### GENOCIDE IN TIBET IGNORED BY UNO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Dalai Lama of Tibet laments that his people are in eminent danger of extinction as a race, religion, ethnic group, and ancient and honorable culture.

The Red Chinese acts he describes are immediately recognized as the internationally abhorred practice of genocide—deportation, sterilization, promoted intermarriage, destruction of monks and all vestiges of their religion and culture.

The destruction of the Tibetans right before our eyes should remind all that there are more subtle methods of committing genocide than liquidating people at the wall.

But throughout the Communist occupation and rape of Tibet—to where they are today almost a nonexistent race—there has been no voice of wrath or censure from that great debating society, the UNO, which last week-end spent its energies and time recounting its imaginary accomplishments, and seeking more appropriations. Nor has there been any action taken by the 67 nations of the world which have ratified the Genocide Convention. If the convention has any meaning at all, why have not these nations interceded and shaken the conscience of the world at these unprecedented atrocities.

Apparently the only concern in the UNO is to condemn the deliberate, peaceful separate development, and preservation of racial and cultural identities—the antithesis of genocide—in South Africa; to censure the civilized self-government of Rhodesia; to deplore the Portuguese administration of its African provinces and to perpetuate itself at the expense of American taxpayers.

In fact, in the absence of even calling

for international economic sanctions against Red China for the genocidal acts against the Tibetans, the United Nations Organization demonstrates that it condones genocide while condemning the antithesis.

Pertinent and related news clippings showing the true state of affairs follow: [From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1969]

#### DALAI LAMA SAYS RACE FACES EXTINCTION

NEW DELHI.—"The Tibetan race is in danger of extinction," the Dalai Lama, exiled god king of Tibet, said recently of conditions in the homeland he has not seen for 10 years.

"The Chinese have deported Tibetans. They practice sterilization in some areas. They encourage intermarriage," he said in an interview, gesturing occasionally with both hands.

Wrapped in a maroon-colored monk's robe, the Dalai Lama, 34, spoke of the changes in his country since the Chinese Communists occupied it in 1950 and forced him to flee for his life nine years later.

He said there is "not a single monk" left in Tibet, a land of about 3 million people where 10 per cent of the population was once made up of Buddhist monks.

"They have destroyed practically all documents and temples," he said. The documents—books and scriptures some of them hundreds of years old—held the secrets of centuries of Tibetan history and culture isolated from the outside world by the forbidding peaks of the Himalayan Mountains.

Speaking through an interpreter, a Buddhist monk, on the more difficult questions, the Dalai Lama said ambushes by Tibetan guerrillas have become so common that "Chinese must travel in large groups for protection."

Last month Indian Foreign Ministry sources reported the Chinese were moving nuclear installations out of their troubled Singkiang Province bordering the Soviet Union to safer positions in Tibet.

"The information about these rumors seems to be true, but we have no detailed information," the Dalai Lama said.

"It's disheartening the situation can only deteriorate in Tibet and become a greater loss for the Tibetan people," he added.

[From the Washington Post, October 1969]  
U.N. Aid

UNITED NATIONS.—Ninety-eight countries pledged a total of \$131.6 million to the UN development program. Fifteen other countries, including the United States, are expected to pledge \$106 million more, bringing the total to \$238 million.

This compares with \$195 million pledged for 1969. Forty-five countries increased the sums promised for 1970. President Nixon has asked Congress for \$100 million as the American contribution compared to about \$75 million last year, but Congress has not yet acted.

South Africa was expelled from the Tokyo Congress of the Universal Postal Union because of its segregationist policies, but a motion to expel it from the organization altogether was defeated by a tie vote of 57-57. Expulsion from the meeting passed by 63 to 53.

#### U.S. ENVOY SUGGESTS PRACTICAL GOALS FOR U.N. IN 25TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

UNITED NATIONS, October 23.—The United States told the General Assembly today that the United Nations ought to avoid self-congratulations on its 25th anniversary in 1970 and concentrate on realizable objectives.

Among these Ambassador Charles W. Yost pointed out an agreement on guidelines for

UN peacekeeping operations. The United States firmly believes, he said, "that this goal can be achieved during the coming year."

This optimism is based on negotiations with the Soviet Union and other countries here. Yost stressed that any agreement recognizing the "primary role" of the Security Council also must take account of the residual responsibilities of the assembly and the authority of the secretary general.

Extra support for the peacekeeping function was supplied by Cyrus Vance, former deputy secretary of defense, Vietnam negotiator and President Johnson's special envoy in the Cyprus dispute, which involves a current UN peacekeeping operation.

Vance told a United Nations Day audience in Des Moines, Iowa, that a standby UN peacekeeping force of 25,000 men should be established to be drawn largely from the middle powers, with a reserve of 15,000. He also proposed that the United States take the lead in settling the UN financial dispute and establishing a \$60-million peacekeeping fund.

Ghanaian Ambassador Richard Akwei presented a report of the preparatory committee on the 25th anniversary. But introduction of a resolution sponsored by 20 nations, including the United States, to set up an anniversary session of the assembly next October was delayed by objections.

Algeria objected on behalf of a group of nonaligned countries in an effort to broaden the resolution with more references to the second UN development decade, friendly relations among states and decolonization.

In a related move, the Lusaka manifesto on Southern Africa was placed on the assembly agenda at the request of 39 African countries. Drawn up by East African leaders in Zambia, it distinguishes between racism in South Africa and Rhodesia and the lack of self-determination in Portuguese territories such as Angola and Mozambique.

Yost paid tribute to the Lusaka manifesto. His speech also emphasized disarmament efforts and more reference to the World Court and similar bodies in peaceful settlement of disputes. Yost further supported the objective of an end to colonialism and alien domination.

#### [From the Rhodesia Herald, July 30, 1969] BASIC CHINESE OBJECTIVE IS ZAMBEZI BELT, WHERE WHITE AND BLACK AFRICAS MEET

"What is the *quid pro quo* for China? When does Chairman Mao present his IOU?" This is the Chinese puzzle in Africa today.

These are the two questions one constantly encounters in Addis, Nairobi, Dar, Lusaka and the other capitals where the full impact of China's "forward policy" is now being felt.

It is a circular puzzle with no obvious answer. It rattles about in the subconscious mind as one travels the bush roads of Zambia and Tanzania, in the terrain where the prospective Zamtan Railway is to be built. £115m., 1,042 miles of steel, operational by 1975.

"The Chinese think long: finish the railway five years from now: finish the guerilla war in 20."

The speaker had been a Western diplomat who gave me lunch in Dar es Salaam; one of the many China watchers among the men who staff 47 diplomatic missions in the Tanzanian capital.

His words came back to me as I slowed the car to glance at a neat, inconspicuous signboard where there was a break in the elephant grass and two tyre tracks led away under the thorn trees.

Beneath the Chinese characters were a few words in English stating that this was the Zambia-Tanzania rail survey, People's Republic of China.

Thirty yards away, jutting above the tall grass, was a cluster of bamboo poles topped with bulging plastic lanterns looking like red pumpkins. The same bright mandarin red they use for the book jackets for the Thoughts of Chairman Mao.

I was far inland from the Indian Ocean, on the route that runs up and over the spine of Africa at Mbeva at 5,600 ft.—higher than the main pass on the Canadian Pacific in the Rockies, and often as cool if not cooler.

All told, more than 1,000 miles of track to be laid through baking scrubland, the Mikumi flood plain, the fortress wall of the Rift Valley and on through the malarial zone that killed David Livingstone, to Zambia's railroad and the Copperbelt.

The equivalent stretch on the CPR took the Canadians 10 years; the Chinese propose to drive their last spike in five. The comparison may be unfair; China will have modern equipment, road access, and a work force of 4,000 men who are unlikely to complain.

But no one who has seen the enormous Friendship Textile Mill near Dar es Salaam doubts that the railway can be built on schedule on simple, rugged lines suited to African conditions.

#### SMILES FADED

Western visitors strove to conceal polite smiles for two reasons when the Friendship Mill was opened for inspection after the dedication ceremony.

First, the machinery—obviously new—looked as if it had been ordered from some sepi catalogue of the 1920s. Secondly, wherever you would expect to find a tabulator or cash register the Chinese had installed a simple abacus.

A year later the smirks are forgotten.

Harassed African managers, used to the holdups when a machine from the West breaks down and you queue up for a technician, find to their relief that almost any handyman can keep the Chinese machines in good order. As for the abacus, it proves to be both speedy and unbreakable.

I thought of the diplomat's words again—"the Chinese think long"—when I encountered a British engineer who knows the Mtwara zone like the back of his hand, though our conversation took place a thousand miles inland from there.

#### IGNORANCE

"Drive through here today," he said—"if you can get a permit, which I doubt—and the Chinese instructors will pick you up on their walkie-talkie network and track you all the way: round through Newala, up to Masasi and Nachingwea, and back across to the Lindi junction. It's good practice for their pupils."

What strikes the traveller like myself most forcibly of all, on returning to Europe, is the bland insouciance—one could almost describe it as willful ignorance—about what China's aims are in Africa and how effectively she is pursuing these goals under the new diplomatic policy that began in 1966.

The Zamtan Railway is the textbook example.

The myth that obstinately persists in London and the other capitals in the West goes like this: the Chinese are heavy-handed; they are extracting absolute allegiance to the Peking line as the pre-condition to any aid they actually give; they are not serious about Zamtan, which remains pie-in-the-sky and is useful simply to keep the African Governments in a client role and for fending off the Russians.

The facts are the opposite.

Quite simply the explanation seems to be that the Chinese burnt their fingers in the affair of the Algiers Summit in 1965, learned their lesson about the ultra-sensitivity of

Africans, and made a diplomatic volte-face soon afterwards.

The Algiers affair was the proposed "Second Bandung" that never came off. But so insistent was Premier Chou about China's friends agreeing to take their places at the table—part of the policy for out-flanking the Russians—that Chinese diplomats were made to crack the whip with clumsy urgency that failed to work.

#### LOST FACE

Ultimately, in a shake-out that ruffled the OAU and drove Algeria and Egypt into the Moscow camp, the Algiers summit collapsed. Peking lost face badly; and after a minor demarche in November the Chinese pulled back and reconsidered their whole Africa policy.

Other events forced the process on. Nkrumah fell while actually visiting Peking in February, 1966. In Ghana, the legendary "Chinese training camp" at Obinmasi, in the bush north of Accra, proved to be a reality and Col. Yen Leng and his instructing staff were asked to leave.

Later when Formosa's deputy Foreign Minister, Mr. Yang, was passing through Accra Airport and members of the Red China mission went out as a team to heckle and boo him, the Ghana Government asked Peking to withdraw its mission.

This reduced mainland China to 13 missions in Africa against 19 for Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists.

The Chinese rethink appears to have ended in a decision in 1966 to concentrate on the part of Africa where offers of economic and military aid would inevitably be received with gratitude rather than suspicion.

In retrospect, it is obvious enough: Peking would move in on the Zambezi belt where the black-white confrontation had sharpened with Ian Smith's UDI.

A Russian gaffe strengthened the Chinese position as the true friends of black Africa.

Portugal invited two members of the editorial board of Pravda to visit Mozambique for a tour of the "terrorist zones" and this was accepted in principle.

(An unofficial Soviet mission was in Portugal in February this year, supposedly paving the way for the embassy that Dr. Caetano has invited them to open in Lisbon.)

Britain's failure to respond effectively to UDI provided another opening.

When Tanzania broke with Britain over the failure to bring down Smith, Dr. Nyerere sacrificed £7m. of new aid money still in the pipeline from Britain. Mr. Wilson suspended (and later cancelled) the loan.

Peking after a short interval announced a new interest-free loan to help bridge the gap bringing Chinese total aid to £16m.

When, a year after UDI, President Nyerere spoke the first words at the opening of a 100-kilowatt transmitter, the most powerful in Eastern Africa, which is now the main voice of black Africa in the propaganda war with Salisbury and Pretoria, Mr. Ho and Mr. Chou were guests of honour.

For China as they remind you in Dar es Salaam, had built and equipped the transmitter and paid the bill.

#### GUERRILLA CAMP

Four Chinese experts were reported to have arrived in Tanzania last month to start the surveys for a new cement works and a brick factory.

These projects were merely the latest in an endless list of state farms, rice projects, a sports stadium, a shoe factory and so on.

There is the army barracks at Nachingwea, the new training course at Moshi for police field force units, the unchronicled list of guerilla camps, and the tanks—sufficient for two squadrons, with reserves—which can be glimpsed as one passes the main army barracks at Calito.

Both in Tanzania and Zambia there are extensive teams of Chinese doctors, orderlies and medical technicians who may be connected with the guerilla programme, but also carry out an impressive "meet-the-people" campaign in the villages.

President Nyerere has a sharp retort for those from the West who offer solicited advice about China. He says, simply:

"We will never allow our friends to choose our enemies for us. Our independence is not for sale to the East any more than the West."

On the South Africa-Rhodesia problem President Nyerere said in May, at the opening of the new textile mill at Mwanza, built with French aid:

"Only the Western world can help solve the problem of Southern Africa with the minimum of violence. We still appeal for that. It can be seen in the recent Lusaka Manifesto.

"If all this fails we shall be compelled to take arms from the East, and we shall be accused of being Communists.

"To us China is a friend in need. Take, for example, the railway between Tanzania and Zambia. We tried very hard to get it built by the Western world. But we failed. The Chinese are ready to build it for us. But the West, now, does not want China to build it. So, should we go without a railway?"

As for this project being a lot of airy politics, the thing that emerges from talks at Ministries in Dar and Lusaka is the hard, specific nature of the agreements.

These began with Presidents Nyerere and Kaunda making separate visits to Peking, continued with the setting up of a corporate body to manage the project—the Zambia-Tanzania Railway Authority—and continued with talks in Peking, where the signing ceremony, on September 5, 1967, was attended by Chou En-lia.

Apparently oblivious of these facts, the director of the AID office in Washington, Peter Straus, said in September, 1967:

"We are now engaged in a survey of Middle Africa transportation. The study obviously will include the proposed Zambia railroad."

The American agency carrying this report quoted "Washington sources" on the Zamtan project: "Non-Communist countries do not take the Chinese offer very seriously."

On September 10 the leader of the Zambian team, Mr. Soko, arrived home from Peking, and said: "I am fully satisfied the railway will now go ahead."

On December 26 that year eight Chinese experts arrived quietly in Dar, led by a Mr. Liu Chi-fu. They had talks in Lusaka on December 30.

The moment when the die was finally cast came on April 1 last year with ministerial talks between the three Governments at Dar. This resulted in the "Tripartite Agreement" of April 8.

The formal signing ceremony followed on April 28, 1968.

#### WELL AHEAD

I gather the agreement provides for the survey and design stage that is now running well ahead of schedule, on a route of 1,042 miles between existing railheads at Kidatu in Tanzania and Katanino in Zambia.

And although there has yet to be a final summit session on the long-term finance, the 1968 document sets out the general terms of the interest-free loan to the value of 200m. Zambian Kwachas, which is roughly £115m. (sterling).

On April 12, 1968, amid hoots of sirens, the 20,000-ton liner MV Yao Hua slid into Dar harbour with the advance party of 154 surveyors lining the rails. Each clasped his little red book, and the banner above their heads proclaimed: "Long Live the Invincible Thoughts of Mao Tse-tung."

The West may continue to scoff, but I am sure Mr. Vorster in Pretoria takes China very seriously indeed.

## DOD'S "CHRISTMAS BONUS"

## HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Government service can sometimes be an experience rife with disappointment and frustration. Dependent upon the whims of a political bureaucracy, many Government employees expensively trained for particular skills, are leaving the Government rather than be subjected to the economic and professional harassment leveled at them in the wake of so-called economy efforts.

One such employee, a constituent of mine, is leaving Government service for the reasons stated above.

I have chosen not to include her name so as to protect her from zealous supervisors who fear criticism of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that this once dedicated public servant has justifiable reasons for criticizing this system and I think it is in the interest of the Members of the Congress to judge for themselves if this brand of economy is the best way to run a business.

The letter follows:

The Honorable JEROME WALDIE,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: Today I received an early Christmas bonus from the Department of the Navy (my employer of the past twenty-two years) advising me that I would be reduced in salary \$1400.00 per year effective 24 November due to budget limitations. I find myself in the position, which is not unique to career government employees, of being removed from a position for which I have been especially trained at great government expense, of having financial commitments which I will be unable to meet and with every prospect of having my future retirement plans shattered. As a crowning indignity, there will be no "Saved Pay" to cushion the blow for the next two years.

Sir, I am tired of working at a job which offers me so little in the way of job security, so little in the way of fringe benefits and nothing in the way of concern for people. I am more tired of having my job become a political football with every change of political administration. I am tired of the pay raises which are given so late, so grudgingly and so publicly and which are taken away so quietly by the simple expedient of denying funds to meet the increased payroll. I am tired of being gagged by the Hatch Act to the extent that I cannot tell my voting friends and neighbors how it really is in the career federal service. I am tired of administrations which decry unemployment publicly and create it privately. I am tired of being expected to smile bravely when the ship springs a leak and charge forward at three-fourths pay for the greater glory of the economy and the Secretary of Defense. I am tired of being patted on the head by the Admirals whose jobs are never put in jeopardy by a reduction in force. I am tired of being expected to give loyalty and dedication to an employer who offers me nothing in return. I am tired of being dehumanized in the effort to survive economically. Most of all, I am tired of the Republicans who have made all of these things possible.

Since I am eligible to option for severance pay in lieu of demotion, I am leaving the career service on the effective date of my adverse personnel action; it is ironic that I will

be able to earn more money in the next twelve months by not working than by accepting the offer of alternate employment. Perhaps, the overall savings realized from current methods of reduction in force will not be nearly as effective as the budget-choppers hoped.

## THE FARM YOUTH

## HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the declining economic status of our countryside is a serious consideration of all of our people in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

One of our newspaper editors who is particularly vocal in this respect is O. B. Auguston of the West Central Daily Tribune of Willmar. He has spent a fruitful lifetime in the countryside. He writes with the authority of firsthand experience.

Recently, he attended a 4-H banquet held in his hometown of Willmar. There are some thoughts in the editorial he wrote following that banquet that I would like to share with my colleagues by reprinting them herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

## THE FARM YOUTH

(By O. B. Auguston)

Tuesday evening, as a member of the local Kiwanis Club, a sponsor, we attended the annual 4-H banquet held at our high school. What a fine occasion this is and has been down through the years. And what a sight to look over the assembly of so many hundreds of boys and girls from the country, who, as members, comprise the many 4-H clubs of our country. When you look at all these youngsters you get an idea of the size of this movement in our midst.

These boys and girls of the country try to personify certain beliefs and principles. At this time, during national 4-H Week, they are stressing that "Head, Heart, Hands, and Health" together are the creative forces that develop love for fellowmen, encourage leadership, and teach responsibility while molding character. Those are high principles and we believe we need a lot of them in our time, even more, if we are at all conscious of certain conditions in our country.

The crowd of farm youth at the banquet is still very large. But we imagine that what has happened in the country as far as agriculture is concerned could have some effect on the number of youths in various clubs, unless there are more clubs and more members recruited.

One hears at times of urban youth in the movement. As to this, one would prefer country youth exclusively as they do have everything in common. Blending often leads to complications and a basic identity may be lost that has great value, something like the thought incorporated in the saying, "this is our very own."

Our constant regret, however, is any decline in the number of farm boys and girls who may be left if the trend continues for less and less family farms, for such are the backbone of the 4-H movement. Not that it can't exist with less, but there is always something intrinsic in larger numbers all interested in the same goals and purposes.

If the cities are to grow, why think in terms of the countryside growing less? Also,

it seems to us, that some of the finest of human traits and qualities have come from the countryside, from rural America.

Perhaps what good things are found in the present interurbia may be traced to the kind of rural area folks who went to those big cities in the yesterdays and laid some worthy foundations. For it goes without saying and backed by facts that in practically all areas of the things desirable, the percentages in rural America are the highest. And in reverse, the percentage of the things undesirable are the lowest in rural America.

So one would say, "Let us still strive to retain our family farms, retain our farm youth on the land and to achieve these things, still strive for an economy which will attain both of these."

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON  
FROM DUMITRU DANIELOPOL

## HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I am including an open letter to President Nixon from Dumitru Danielopol, who is a special correspondent for the Copley Press. The following letter appeared in the Joliet Herald-News, Joliet, Ill. on October 14, 1969:

[From the Joliet Herald-News, Oct. 14, 1969]

DUMITRU DANIELOPOL: TO OUR PRESIDENT  
President RICHARD M. NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.,

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Don't feel lonesome on Wednesday—Vietnam Moratorium day—when anti-war demonstrators attack you and try to force you to do something you know is wrong.

There are hundreds of millions of people here in the United States and around the world who know that you are right. They know that freedom is indivisible, that it cannot accommodate tyranny in one corner of the world and survive in another.

People like myself whose birthplaces are now behind the Iron Curtain are wholeheartedly with you. We have learned about communism at first hand. Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Albanians, Romanians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Yugoslavs, Ukrainians, Cubans, Chinese, Jews, Christians, Mohammedans—no matter what color, race or creed—we have suffered indiscriminately at the hands of the Communists. We know their ruthlessness and their perfidy.

The tens of millions who have taken refuge from communism in free lands stand by you.

We don't want to see what happened to us happen to the people of Vietnam, if it can be prevented.

And you know, and we know, that it can be prevented.

The great majority of native-born Americans back you, too, Mr. President, especially those sent overseas to fight the Nazis and the Fascists because governments in democratic countries in Europe in the 1930s failed to understand totalitarianism and failed to do what America is doing right now—stopping aggression while there is still time.

Every major national veterans organization in this country is on record in support of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

No one wants to prevent free discussion, free opinion and even dissent—but on the condition that our rights are respected, too.

It seems incredible that so many people in high places advocate appeasement and the

abandonment of a country fighting for its inalienable right to self determination.

Never in history have the aims of the Communists coincided with those of free people. Never have they voiced any policies that did not try to destroy freedom somewhere in the world. Yet today they seem to have so many articulate allies.

We know, Mr. President, that should the Americans abandon Vietnam—as the dissenters insist—America will cease to be the greatest country in the world.

There are times in the history of great countries and of great men when they have to stand up—even if alone—for what is right.

I witnessed some of those moments in the House of Commons when Winston Churchill tore his government and his party to shreds for the shameful Munich agreement of 1938. He was powerless, but he knew he was right.

From London, I heard Col. Charles de Gaulle, an unknown, call on his fellow Frenchmen, who had been shamefully defeated, to rally against overwhelming odds in the summer of 1940. He, too, was powerless, but he knew he was right.

Mr. President, you are in a much more favorable position than those leaders. You have the power, you have the time, for you are our President and our Commander in Chief, and you have an arsenal that can bring an honorable conclusion in Vietnam.

And, Mr. President, you have us on our side. We don't march or demonstrate, but that doesn't mean we aren't ready to help you.

Sincerely,

DUMITRU DANIELOPOL.

Washington, D.C.

ZAMBIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—  
OCTOBER 24, 1969

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Zambia is one of the new sovereign states in southern Africa. With an area of about 290,000 square miles and a population of about 4,000,000, it is a land-locked country, bounded on the east by Tanzania, on the southeast by Mozambique, on the south by Rhodesia, and on the west by Angola. It is a high plateau country, rich in valuable minerals, though 85 percent of the people earn their living by agricultural occupation.

The country became a British protectorate in the 1890's, and later was known as Northern Rhodesia. In 1924 a legislative council was instituted, and since 1945 this council was dominated by native representatives. Gradually they pressed for national independence, and attained their goal on October 24, 1964. The new state is the Republic of Zambia. It is a member of the British Commonwealth, and has been a member of the United Nations for more than 4 years. Zambia possesses one of the largest known copper mine deposits, which is a great boon to its economy. Its agricultural products are peanuts, tobacco, cotton, and grain.

On the fifth anniversary of Zambia's Independence Day we wish peace and prosperity to the people of Zambia.

HORTON OFFERS COMPREHENSIVE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, honking horns, cars darting in and out of lanes, massive traffic jams, have become the normal routine of everyday commuting.

We have turned our highways leading to airports and railroad and ports into giant parking lots. Or we have gone the other direction, and built airports in the midst of nowhere, highways that do not connect with rail terminals, bridges that do not relate to roads, and the list goes on.

In the next 6 years there will be 30 million more people, 20 million more automobiles, and four times the traffic at airports. We have spent millions to create mazes leading to nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is not another railroad, another airport, another highway. The answer is to coordinate our existing facilities—patch up the quilt.

In my own area the Rochester-Geneese Regional Transportation Authority has been created to coordinate transportation plans for the Greater Rochester, N.Y., community. This includes a major metropolitan center, suburbs, small villages and rural towns.

Today, I am cosponsoring legislation originally offered by my able colleague, Hon. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., of Connecticut, which will help alleviate this growing transportation jam. It will encourage coordinated planning on an interstate, State, and local level.

This bill, called the Federal Transportation Act of 1969 provides that no Federal money can be spent for any transportation project unless it is clearly shown to be part of an overall transportation plan for the State.

In addition, it sets up a transportation trust fund made up of all Federal money earmarked for transportation facilities. This money will be allocated to the States in a ratio based on 20 percent land area, 40 percent total population, and 40 percent large population centers.

The Secretary of Transportation will be responsible for administering this act through the new Office of Planning and Coordination to be established in the Department.

The key to unsnarling traffic in the next 20 years is service. It must be adequate, coordinated, and useful. Mr. Speaker, our biggest mistake would be to aimlessly spend millions on proliferating our disordered system.

The Federal Transportation Act will, I believe, create a turning point in our meandering. It will provide for the development of orderly financing and coordinate thousands of rambling transportation systems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider the alternatives, and to fully support this measure.

RAIL PLAN ASKS 2½-HOUR RUN,  
BOSTON TO NEW YORK

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress an article that appeared in the Sunday edition of the Boston Globe, written by Globe staff member A. S. Plotkin, one of the Nation's top experts on the problems of railroad transportation.

This column reveals the results of a consultants' report by the New England Regional Commission indicating that it is possible to provide railroad passenger service to and from Boston and New York on a scheduled 2½-hour run.

The Department of Transportation should take a good hard look at this report.

The entire Northeast corridor needs railroad beds.

Faster passenger and freight service is needed.

The news article follows:

RAIL PLAN ASK 2½-HOUR RUN, BOSTON TO  
NEW YORK

(By A. S. Plotkin)

A consultants' report claiming that 2½-hour Boston-New York rail service is needed and feasible was released yesterday by the New England Regional Commission.

A key element in the \$600 million proposal would be the laying of 90 miles of straight new track between Providence and New Haven. This would cut out much of the curvy Shore Line route now used, it was contended, and new electrically-powered trains could use their potential speed of 160 m.p.h.

The basic report was completed earlier this year and was described in an exclusive Boston Globe story June 15. The commission, a state-Federal agency, is responsible for planning and carrying out economic and social development in the region.

A spokesman denied release of the report was delayed until now because Gov. John Dempsey of Connecticut was unhappy with the proposal.

Penn Central now runs eight conventional slow trains daily between the two cities. It also operates one daily round trip with the jet-powered TurboTrain, under contract with the U.S. Dept. of Transportation.

This small experimental train, a product of United Aircraft, takes three hours, 39 minutes. There is no prospect soon of appreciably faster—or more—trips with two available TurboTrains even if grade crossings on the Shore Line route are made safer.

The report was prepared by Systems Analysis and Research Corp. of Cambridge and Thomas K. Dyer Inc. of Lexington.

The consultants claim that by heading west out of Providence, and via Willimantic, Ct., about 20 miles can be saved over the Shore Line route. It is mostly open, unpopulated country.

They say the improved line would draw many riders, and save billions otherwise needed for new roads and airports, reduce air pollution and stimulate economic development.

Financing, it is contended should be mostly from Federal sources, possibly including a new public-private venture like COMSAT, the satellite agency.

D.O.T., with limited money for high speed ground experiments, is loath to put all of it in rail ventures, and will soon try air-cushion and other unorthodox systems. It has set aside only about \$9.5 million for TurboTrain, and about \$13 million for Metroliner—although United Aircraft and Penn Central each has invested millions of its own.

A dissent to part of the consultants' report was appended by the commission. It came from United Aircraft, which claimed that use of its TurboTrains, instead, of electrically-powered trains, would do away with the need of making such huge new capital outlays for new railbeds.

The TurboTrain maker claims its equipment could make the Boston-New York runs in under three hours with an investment of \$100 million.

#### SPEAK NOT FOR DEAD SON, FATHER TELLS PROTESTERS

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Howard C. Harrison, who resides in my congressional district in New Orleans, has called to my attention an article which appeared in the Times-Picayune of October 17, 1969.

It concerns a father's remarks about his son who died in Vietnam. After reading the article, I agree with Mr. Harrison that all should read what this patriotic American had to say.

I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

SPEAK NOT FOR DEAD SON, FATHER TELLS PROTESTERS—"LET THEM REMEMBER HE DID NOT SURRENDER"

LAS VEGAS, NEV.—"When they read my son's name to advocate peace at any price—the price being defeat, let them remember that he whose name they read did not surrender," wrote an anguished Malcolm Thompson.

"When they read the name of Gregory M. Thompson, let them realize that they are proving before the world the truth of the oft-repeated Communist claim that many Americans have become soft, decadent and yielding to any determined force which opposes them . . .

"When those hypocrites read the list of dead who defended South Vietnam, let them know that they have reached the ultimate low in the world record of human infamy, in that they willingly and cunningly utter a dead man's name to achieve the defeat of the cause for which he died."

Thompson's son, Gregory, was an 18-year-old Army PFC who was killed in combat in Vietnam May 17, 1969. The father's words, in a letter sent the Las Vegas Review-Journal the day after Moratorium Day, mirrored the other side of America's continuing Vietnam debate.

"It is the ones who saw his body returned in a flag-draped coffin who should be heard—not the protesters," Thompson wrote.

"These transparent propagandists were not there to see my son buried, nor do they accompany me on my trips to lay flowers on his grave . . .

"It is we the parents who said goodbye to him when he went away to fight—not the peace agitators.

"It is we the parents who wrote long, anxious letters to him during his three months of almost continuous combat—not the agitators . . .

"My son was killed while fighting for his country.

"America cannot be permitted to perpetually persuade its citizens to instill in their sons a sense of patriotism, loyalty and a determination to defend the oppressed, and then, after the sons have died, suddenly change her mind and yield to those who killed him."

#### WE CAN RUN, BUT WE CAN'T HIDE

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. L. Dancy, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, Peoria, Ill., appeared in a debate on our involvement in Vietnam before a college audience at Bradley University recently and his editorial of October 20, 1969, sets forth some interesting observations regarding the attitudes and the mood of those young people. I include the editorial entitled "We Can Run—But We Can't Hide," in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Oct. 20, 1969]

WE CAN RUN—BUT WE CAN'T HIDE

(By C. L. Dancy)

I looked out on 1,500 or 2,000 youthful faces at Bradley last week and watched them as they heard me and others speak about the war—in different ways.

I was impressed by these young people. In their varied reactions to different appeals and moods, there was something new.

They have a real problem, smacking them straight in the face, just as they are walking onto the adult stage.

And they seem to sense that it is only the first such real problem, and that more decisions on how to survive in a contentious world of many nations and terrible weapons will face them from this day on.

There is more to it than the immediate threat over their heads posed by Vietnam and they seem to recognize this.

Many of them are clearly genuinely concerned to acquire some real understanding of this problem and some real preparation for dealing with future ones.

It's true that many want to believe Vietnam is just one gigantic American mistake which we can correct and then live happily ever after. They are relieved and enjoy hearing that our whole policy is and has been "Rubbish!" and all we have to do is change it.

But it is a different reaction than I've seen in previous college audiences. It is limited. There is a sense that they are feeling, now, something of the reality into which they have been born.

Joe Louis said it about a prize fighter many, many years ago.

He said: "He can run but he can't hide!" It seemed to me these young people have an uneasy feeling, now. They have a vague awareness that this is the situation in which America finds itself in this world.

We can run—but we can't hide. And they are concerned to know and understand more about these matters—more than just therapy and reassurance.

I had a feeling most of them came for something more than what was actually provided.

I think we should have taken them, and their problem, more seriously.

And I think they sense and realize that the "Rubbish!" approach might just as well have been "Oskeywowow!" and "Yea, Team!" That this was the approach of a pep rally—rather than a responsible inquiry.

One of the professors said that this great outpouring of young people to hear what was supposed to be a responsible and serious discussion of truth, the whole truth, revealed that "At last, Bradley was something more than a basketball school!"

The attitude of the students, indeed, suggested that.

But the language of a political pep rally is not a great step up the ladder, after all, from that of a basketball pep rally—and if the role of cheerleader is going to be played, it is more seemingly in girls with short skirts than in professors.

These young people deserve something more than two sets of opposing "absolutes" thrown at them, when they know full well that claims of "total virtue" and of "total evil" are equally absurd.

Clearly, in their faces, these "absolute!" approaches are the balance of truth and understanding unassisted. Seeking knowledge. Seeking genuine understanding, instead of Razzmatazz.

Because a great truth remains that they will live with new crises and new messes and new frustrations from this day forward and they need to be equipped to deal with them as realistically and shrewdly as possible.

Nor is there any simple magical ideological formula for it.

There is this great trust they clearly sense, about the U.S. and themselves, which makes answers, understanding, and the equipment for facing problems absolutely essential: In the world of 1969 and forward.

We can run—but we can't hide.

#### HOUSING BILL APPROVAL

### HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the press of congressional duties in my home district this past weekend prevented me, regrettably, from staying for the final vote Thursday on the housing bill, though I was fortunately able to delay my departure until it was obvious that this important piece of legislation would receive an overwhelming vote of approval. However, for the record, I would like to state that had I been able to remain for the final rollcall on passage, I would have joined those 339 colleagues who cast a ye vote because I believe that housing for low- and middle-income families is certainly one of the high-priority items on our legislative calendar.

With the trend toward higher and higher costs for the working people of this country and the downward trend in new starts, it has become increasingly more apparent that the Nation is facing a housing crisis of growing magnitude. I have become particularly alarmed at the continually rising costs and interest rates which have put decent, adequate housing virtually out of reach for great numbers of Americans.

The units lost through natural disasters and urban renewal programs have obviously added to the housing shortage and the pinch perhaps is felt no more keener than in my own 33d California District. The vacancy rate in San Bernardino County is the lowest in the State and I have no doubt that many of our colleagues have districts no less affected.

The goal of H.R. 13827 is not only more homes but a suitable, safe, and sanitary home with a livable environment for every American family and it is my sincere hope that we can now proceed without delay toward achieving the necessary objective of 20 million new housing units in the next 10 years.

THE MAINE TIMES

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, it might seem surprising that Time magazine would devote several columns of attention to a weekly newspaper in my State, the Maine Times, which has a subscriber list which, while growing, is still less than 10,000 and an estimated readership of less than 50,000. It might seem even more surprising that this article would appear in Time's environment section, rather than the press section. But to those who have come to appreciate what the Maine Times is really all about, it is not surprising at all. This recognition is but one of the many tributes which the Maine Times is receiving after its initial year of publication.

The Maine Times is already a success as a newspaper, or "magapaper," as it calls itself. Its readership includes not only the more influential and concerned citizens of Maine, but many persons who will some day move to our State, in order to appreciate the unique natural beauty which is Maine's most precious commodity. But the Maine Times goes beyond success as a publication; it is a triumph for our State, for its people, and ultimately for all of us.

I am inserting in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues the article which appeared in the October 31, 1969, edition of Time:

RESOURCES: TRYING TO SAVE MAINE

Not long ago, industrial developers asked the 236 voters of Trenton, Maine, to approve the construction of an aluminum refinery and a nuclear power plant on the pristine shores of Union River Bay. A yes vote might have been expected. After all, countless U.S. towns beg for new industry to pay taxes and provide jobs. But the Trenton vote was a resounding no. A key factor was the Maine Times, a plucky weekly newspaper that lambasted the developers and explained precisely how their plans could pollute Trenton's air, land and water.

One year old this month, the Times is a unique statewide paper that tirelessly harasses would-be wreckers of Maine's environment. The attack is mounted by two Yale graduates, Editor John N. Cole, 46, and Publisher Peter W. Cox, 32, who raised \$100,000 to pay for offset printing, two full-time reporters and a rented building in the hamlet of Topsham. Cole quit an incipient gray-flannel career in Manhattan to become a commercial fisherman, later edited several Maine newspapers. Cox is the son of Oscar Cox, a noted international lawyer. By no means opposed to all industry, they have warmly praised a few lumber and paper companies for enlightened use of Maine land. What they do oppose is destruction of the unspoiled Maine coast by high-risk industries

like oil and aluminum. As Editor Cole puts it: "There is no such thing as a little rape."

PROTESTS AND PAYOFFS

With punchy headlines and a tabloid format, the paper unflinchingly alerts its 10,000 readers to each week's environmental toll—an oil spill off Casco Bay, a fish kill at Mystery Lake, a historic barn razed at the University of Maine. Much vitriol is aimed at the paper industry, a major source of water pollution in the state. The Times recently flayed a new wave of fly-by-night operators who reopen abandoned paper mills for "short-term profit and long-term pollution."

Happily, the muckraking pays off. Largely because of the Times, for example, one of those reopened mills closed last week. One article detailed how paper mills in the Pacific Northwest took the smell out of making brown paper, with the implication that Maine's mills should do the same. Another story started a cleanup of the Saco River by pinpointing 39 specific sources of pollution along its 125-mile length. In recent weeks, the paper single-handedly fought to ban snowmobiles from the virgin wilderness of Baxter State Park—successfully.

NAKED STATE

Maine is the last state on the upper Eastern seaboard that has not been industrialized. Now its vast forests and ore deposits make it a tempting target for mindless exploitation. As Cole tells it, even the Mafia has joined various land grabs in Maine.

The big worry is the oil industry. Maine still has no laws regulating oil spills, offshore drilling and the like. Yet oilmen are now surveying the state's harbors, the only ports in the East deep enough to berth the industry's ever larger supertankers. The key trouble spot is Machiasport, where three companies plan major refineries despite thick fogs and tricky currents that pose serious risks of tankers mishaps and oil spillage. Devoid of controls, says Cole, "the state is standing stark naked to the oilmen."

Nonetheless, Cole has "no doubt" that the oil industry will gain entrée to Maine's ports. But he and others are fighting hard for legal safeguards. And despite the pressures, he is optimistic. "Maine is still relatively clean," he says. "If enough people are concerned about the state, we can do something with it." By rousing such concern, the Times may ease the pain in Maine.

MEANING OF PEACE IS THE ISSUE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 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. 16, 1969] MORATORIUM SHOWS CONFUSION: MEANING OF PEACE IS THE ISSUE

Several important truths were underscored yesterday as the people of the United States of America dramatized our involvement in the Vietnam War.

One is that all responsible Americans are for "peace" whatever their political persuasions.

But another is that it is impossible to use the word "peace" today and be fully understood.

Simply the idealists and the naive peace is today "non-war."

They cry, "Get out of Vietnam this instant and everything will be miraculously peaceful forever," failing to realize that weakness cannot beget tranquility.

To the Communists—here, in Hanoi and in Cuba—"peace" translates into victory for them, and still more aggression.

The Communist brand of peace simply means subjugating to their will anyone and everyone who stands in their way.

The late Syngman Rhee of South Korea described peace, Communist style, in these words: "If survival alone is your idea of peace, you have no problem. Just surrender. The Communists do not kill their slaves."

This is the consequence of the instant, transitory peace advocated by the Moratorium Day leaders yesterday.

And if people listened closely to the Moratorium Day dialogue they could also have heard some of the consequences of such capitulation by the United States.

The unreasoned retreat would inevitably mean more crosses, row upon row, with an American under each.

It would mean abandonment of 16 million South Vietnamese to the savagery of a vicious aggressor.

It would prolong the worldwide confrontation between Communists and free men, assuring future wars and bloodshed.

It would mean a worldwide realignment of alliances that would presage the decline of the United States of America from its world eminence.

It would mean that the affairs of the government of the United States itself would be influenced more and more by whoever could mobilize the largest mob.

But overshadowing all of these sober reflections, it was evident yesterday from the reaction of the usually silent majority in the United States that the mood of the nation is for a genuine peace.

The quiet Americans were saying that they want a genuine peace in the world—one that assures man personal security, the right to aspire and an equal opportunity to reach his aspirations.

Unless this kind of peace is our object in Southeast Asia, even the simple absence of war will become only a dream.

A PRIEST SHOULD GO TO THE BEACH EVERY NOW AND THEN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have long been acquainted with Msgr. Joseph Skillin, vice chancellor and secretary of the Diocese of Oakland, Calif., and have been one of his most ardent admirers. He is a rare man. He is truly a man of great faith and compassion.

I am so impressed with Monsignor Skillin's dissertation on "A Priest Should Go to the Beach Every Now and Then," that I should like to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be shared by all. It follows:

A PRIEST SHOULD GO TO THE BEACH EVERY NOW AND THEN

(By Msgr. Joseph Skillin)

Feel the wind play on your face.  
The sun tightens your skin to a tanner tough.  
The salt leaps out of the sea to season your lips.  
Watch the water move a million grains of sand;  
watch the sand swallow a million frothy bubbles of the sea.  
Know that the rock is slowly molded by powerful salt chisels.

Yet the jutting rock demands the onrushing wave to step aside.  
 And all the while the sun, or the fog, or the stars  
 paint the entire scene a rotating collage of color.  
 Yet it is always the same place—  
 A place of life  
 And death  
 And turmoil  
 And exchange.  
 But these are the very things that make that beach a vision of Power and Glory.  
 To be aloof, unrelated, untouched  
 Unchanged, or unchanging  
 Is to be dead.  
 Pray for the beachboys.

#### OUR NATIONAL PARKS' FUTURE?

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, is the future of our national parks in danger? It appears that our parks are in danger because of inaction by the administration which threatens to not only cut off funds for the purchase of new sites, but to also render other parks defenseless against encroaching commercial development. Everglades National Park falls into the latter category, as Christian Science Monitor staff writer Robert Cahn points out in an October 22 article. Because of the timeliness of the article, I submit it for the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

#### EVERGLADES OPTIMISM PETERS OUT (By Robert Cahn)

The aura of optimism surrounding the Sept. 10 "summit" meeting on protecting the Everglades National Park has faded in both Washington and southern Florida.

At a press conference after the meeting of Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel, and Florida Gov. Claude R. Kirk Jr., the principals sounded as if the "enemy" was well on the run.

The mammoth international jetport planned for the site six miles north of the park boundary would be stopped; an alternate jetport site would be found; environmental safeguards would be adopted before a jet-training airport was allowed to become operational; and land-use studies would be made to protect the park from future developments.

#### AIRPORT TO OPERATE

Since Sept. 10, however, virtually nothing has been done. Meanwhile, threats to the park are mounting.

The Dade County Port Authority's training airport is preparing to start operations Nov. 15 even though environmental safeguards have not been set.

The joint task force of the Interior and Transportation Departments which Secretary Volpe said on Sept. 10 would complete a report on Everglades-airport problems "within 30 to 60 days, if not less," has not held a single meeting since Sept. 10.

A new danger has emerged even closer to the park, in the possibility of a commercial subdivision on 33,000 acres of Big Cypress Swamp. The proposed land-development project borders the northwest sector of the park and could drastically affect the water supply for a large section of the park.

The National Audubon Society has filed with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) a formal memo of opposition to operation of the training airport and is having an informal hearing with FAA officials this week in Miami.

#### POSTPONEMENT URGED

On Oct. 17, four United States senators urged Secretary Volpe to order a postponement of the Nov. 15 date for commencement of training operations at the single-runway airport just completed.

"It is extremely unlikely that this timetable will leave room for adequate consideration and adoption of the necessary plans to protect the park" the senators said in a letter. Signing the letter were Sens. Clifford P. Case (R) of New Jersey, Philip A. Hart (D) of Michigan, Henry M. Jackson (D) of Washington, and Gaylord Nelson (D) of Wisconsin.

But officials of the FAA, which is a part of the Department of Transportation, have not had a mandate from Secretary Volpe to consider environmental hazards before beginning operations. The FAA already has published the required notice in the Federal Register setting aside airspace within an 8.5-mile radius of the training airport.

The recently released "Leopold" report of the Interior Department recommended consideration of environmental factors such as air pollution from engine exhausts, excessive noise levels, and the hazard of having planes strike birds in flight.

The report, which said that the proposed international jetport and its attendant facilities would destroy the national park, was prepared by an Interior Department team under the leadership of Dr. Luna B. Leopold of the U.S. Geological Survey.

Interior Department officials in Washington are considering environmental safeguards such as a 5,000-foot minimum flight level over the National Park, no use of hard pesticides in certain areas, and no burning of solid rubbish on the training airport site.

But neither Interior nor Transportation has taken the initiative in calling a task-force meeting to work on environmental safeguards.

At the Sept. 10 press conference, Secretary Volpe said that he and Secretary Hickel and Governor Kirk agreed that a training airport can "with proper safeguards and effort, be utilized without having an adverse environmental impact on the ecology of the Everglades." The joint task force was being instructed to make positive recommendations as to how the park could be protected, he added.

#### JETPORT LINKED

The new threat, even closer to the park, is directly connected with the proposed jetport. A land developer has filed a petition for a drainage district of 33,000 acres in a Monroe County watershed area which serves the headwaters for a large section of the park. The district would actually include several parcels of private land within park boundaries.

A spokesman for the developers says the immediate purpose of putting in a canal system for drainage would be for agriculture. "Eventually this land can be developed in relation to the jetport," the spokesman told a Miami newspaperman.

A hearing on the drainage-district application will be held Nov. 17 in Key West. The National Park Service is expected to oppose granting the application because of hazards to the park. The National Audubon Society also will oppose the application, says Joe B. Browder, Southeastern representative of the society.

#### DRAINAGE FORESEEN

Says Mr. Browder, "The proposal to drain land between the park and the jetport ought to be proof enough for anyone, including Secretaries Hickel and Volpe, that development of even the training facility will result

in the drainage of Big Cypress Swamp and that part of the national park that depends on it for water.

"Leaving the Dade County Port Authority with a right to develop any facility is going to continue to generate constructive commercial development," Mr. Browder adds.

Both the Leopold report and a special report on the Everglades by a panel of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering have advocated that protections be found to prevent development of the Big Cypress Swamp, even if the international jetport is moved from its present site.

The study by the academies suggested that a natural-water conservation district be formed for the entire Big Cypress Swamp area. The Department of the Interior is known to be planning a large-scale study of the area, aimed at finding ways of protecting the water supply for the park.

Florida sources also report no progress on the proposal by Governor Kirk to find an alternate site for the jetport. Officials say that no alternate sites have been referred for consideration either to the Federal Aviation Administration or to the Interior Department.

DREAMING, WISHFUL THINKING  
ARE NOT GOING TO END THIS  
WAR

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have had the pleasure to read the material of Gould Lincoln, a respected elder statesman of the Fourth Estate.

In the Saturday, October 25, issue of the Washington Star, Mr. Lincoln had some very sage advice:

It's time we who talk of dreams wake up and come down to earth, realize we have a war on our hands and the duty we owe to the American people and the country—and to the people who are seeking to be free and looking to us for help. Dreaming and wishful thinking are not going to end this war or solve the many problems which confront us.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following column by Mr. Lincoln to my colleagues:

#### I HAD A DREAM—MOSTLY POLITICAL (By Gould Lincoln)

In this day of division in the Republican party and among the Democrats, of division over the Vietnam war, of division between white and black, and among the whites and blacks, it is forgotten that divisions have run always deep during time of war. They have arisen, indeed, in every war, beginning with the War of the Revolution, down to the war in Vietnam. And America and its people have always survived. It undoubtedly will survive again.

In every war we have had peaceniks. We had the Tories during our fight for freedom from Britain. We had our peaceniks during the Civil War which freed the Blacks. We had huge numbers of peaceniks before we entered the first World War—with people of German extraction, Republican and Democrat alike, leading the way. Before World War 2 the isolationists—peaceniks to the end—divided party and country.

For example as late as Aug. 7, 1941, a bill to extend the military draft survived in the House of Representatives by a single vote and it passed the Senate by a vote of 44 to 28. Here too the division was largely along po-

litical party lines though the parties had their own divisions, as they do today over the Vietnam war. At that time there was a Democrat in the White House.

Today there is a Republican. The opponents of the draft in the Senate were 14 Democrats, 13 Republicans and 1 Independent. In the House the vote for passage of the draft bill was 203 to 202. Think of that, at a time only months before Pearl Harbor.

The House rollcall showed 182 Democrats voting for the draft, joined by only 21 Republicans, under the leadership of James W. Wadsworth of New York, who was given credit for influencing some Democrats to line up for the bill, too. Voting against the draft were 65 Democrats and 133 Republicans.

The war in Korea, waged to preserve the freedom of the people of South Korea and sanctioned by the United Nations, was bitterly denounced later as "Truman's War," just as the peaceniks today denounce the Vietnam war as "Johnson's war" and more recently as "Nixon's war." And by the same caliber of peaceniks.

During all those wars, for the freedom of people attacked by totalitarian powers, men of importance "had a dream"—Wilson, who fought World War I and Henry Ford who opposed it and Roosevelt who got us into World War 2.

"I have a dream" has been the cry of men seeking peace and unity in this country. I had a dream, so vivid as to appear fact. I dreamed that in this day of Democrat against Democrat and Republican against Republican and white against black and vice versa, Franklin Delano Roosevelt had offered himself as a candidate for President to unite the battle-torn Democratic party.

Dwight D. Eisenhower had come forward as a candidate for president on the Republican party ticket to unite the warring factions of the GOP. Each also looked forward to uniting the American people, black and white. Roosevelt who got this country into a great war, and Eisenhower who fought that war to victory.

So certain was I that my dream was reality and so certain was I that each man could unite his party and lead it, I was preparing to write the story.

Then I woke up.

And it's time that others who talk of dreams wake up too and come down to earth, realize that we have a war on our hands and the duty we owe to the American people and the country—and to the people who are seeking to be free and looking to us for help. Dreaming and wishful thinking are not going to end this war or solve the many problems which confront us.

Vice President Spiro Agnew is speaking out for reality, for the cause of peace in which he believes—as does his superior, President Nixon. He is denounced and criticized as a name caller. He is entitled to his day and his say, although the dreamers say "No."

THE PRINCETON UNDERGRADUATES FOR A STABLE AMERICA

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, recently a letter was brought to my attention that I think my colleagues would benefit from hearing.

The letter, written by Pvt. Tim Jorgensen presently serving in Vietnam, is in response to the formation of the Princeton Undergraduates for a Stable America—USA—by a young constituent of mine, Harding Jones of Middletown, Ohio. Harding, who is a sophomore at Princeton University, has received overwhelmingly favorable response to his organization, and this letter is one of the most stirring.

Private Jorgensen's comments should be read to all those who demonstrated against the war in Vietnam. His comments clearly reveal the damaging effect that such public antiwar criticisms have on the morale of our troops in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the letter follows:

October 15, 1969.

TO HARDING JONES: This is to be a short note in appreciation of what myself and many G.I.'s here in Viet Nam feel is the best move by our fellow undergraduates.

I personally commend you and your experts in forming the undergraduates for a stable America—

Viet Nam is a rare experience and enables those who serve here to see and judge things in a completely different scope—

Being here some 6 months I have formed many thoughts concerning my country. And when the G.I. reads of all the violence in his hometown he gets very depressed—

I was this way, depressed, until I read this article in the "Stars & Stripes"—you brought new hope for myself and many G.I.'s.

I wish to convey all my support to your organization and would very much like to attend a meeting and talk with you all—

Good luck and all my support.

Sp.4. TIM M. JORGENSEN.

XXX-XX-XXXX,  
110 Trans Co,  
APO S.F.

CONGRESS NEGLECTING PROBLEMS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 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 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 recommend 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.

PODELL SOCIAL SECURITY BILL DEMANDS 50-PERCENT INCREASE IN ELDERLY BENEFITS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the greatest shame of our Nation today is the plight of 20 million senior citizens, whose fixed incomes are being rapidly destroyed by inflation. While the Government talks, inflation continues to eat away at their limited resources. So far, only one proposal has emanated from the Nixon administration which is aimed at the increasing difficulties of the older American and it has fallen far short of the mark. A mere 10-percent increase in social security is too little, too late for them. They say nice things about social security, but just do not have their hearts in it. It therefore remains for the Democratic Party to put forward a meaningful reform in the area of increasing social security.

Major corporation profits are going up

along with prices, and the elderly pay. They must have drugs, which are constantly going up in price. In order to have such necessities, which curb pain, they often do without other necessities, especially in the way of food, clothing, and those few little extras which make the difference in the quality of their lives.

These people bought their retirement with valuable dollars which are now being turned into too few cheap dollars. None of them were poor when they retired, but they are becoming poor now. None of them want to become public charges. All they ask is that society be fair to them, allowing them to live in dignity, without a shadow of fear hanging over their heads. We have a vehicle for this justice immediately at hand in the form of the social security system, which is not being utilized to its fullest extent on behalf of older citizens of our Nation. They spent year after year of prime work contributing to society, and now they sit helplessly while it doles out a pittance to them. This is especially unjust in light of the fact that what they ask for has been given by other countries to their elderly for years. Bismarck did it a century ago. Many European countries, destroyed in World War II, treat their older citizens better than we do now. We can and must make the social security system operate with more justice, and we can do so almost immediately. The money is there, and I have introduced a measure in cooperation with Mr. JACOB GILBERT of New York, which is aimed at accomplishing just this set of goals.

There has been enough in the way of empty promises. Let the President and the Congress take action as Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Jack Kennedy did when they were in office and could do something for the elderly. My bill is very basic and comprehensive, commanding support from the National Council of Senior Citizens and the AFL-CIO.

The bill recognizes for the first time that our elderly have a right to live their retirement years in dignity and reasonable comfort. Current social security benefits, some as little as \$44 monthly, do not provide that assurance.

My bill will increase overall benefits by at least 50 percent, also providing a monthly minimum of \$90 beginning in January and \$120 beginning in 1972. Hearings are now underway in the House. The Podell bill boosts benefits for our older citizens in 10 different ways. The 10 major points, each an improvement over the present program, are as follows:

First, an increase in retirement benefits from a minimum of \$120 to a maximum of \$378;

Second, computation of benefits on the basis of a retiree's highest earnings;

Third, at age 65, 100 percent widow's benefits;

Fourth, improved benefits for those retiring prior to age 65;

Fifth, increase in permissible earnings for retirees, without loss of benefits;

Sixth, increase in death benefit to \$500;

Seventh, liberalization of disability benefits;

Eighth, improvement of widow's benefits;

Ninth, extension of medicare to the disabled; and

Tenth, extension of medicare to include prescription drugs.

A new principle is further introduced in tandem with my measure. The Federal Government is included as a partner in the social security system. All Americans have a share in that social security system. Decent retirement benefits can come only from adequate Federal financing.

Here then, is my entire package. All the Congress has to do is act, instead of promise, as in the past. Inflation and the elderly's needs will not wait another minute.

The attached charts compare existing programs with what the elderly would receive under my proposal:

MONTHLY CASH SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS UNDER PRESENT LAW AND UNDER THE GILBERT BILL FOR A RETIRED COUPLE (MAN AND WIFE) AT AGE 65

Average monthly earnings	Benefit amounts		
	Present law	Gilbert bill	
		Effective January 1970	Effective January 1972
Minimum benefit.....	\$82.50	\$135.00	\$180.00
\$150.....	132.60	159.20	191.10
\$250.....	172.50	207.00	248.40
\$350.....	210.60	252.80	303.30
\$450.....	247.50	297.00	356.40
\$550.....	284.90	341.90	410.30
\$650.....	323.00	392.40	471.00
\$750.....		438.00	525.60

MONTHLY CASH SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS UNDER PRESENT LAW AND UNDER THE GILBERT BILL FOR A WIDOW AT AGE 62—Continued

Average monthly earnings	Benefit amounts		
	Present law	Gilbert bill	
		Effective January 1970	Effective January 1972
Minimum benefit.....	\$55.00	\$90.00	\$120.00
\$150.....	88.40	106.10	127.40
\$250.....	115.00	138.00	165.60
\$350.....	140.40	168.50	202.20
\$450.....	165.00	198.00	237.60
\$550.....	189.90	227.90	273.50
\$650.....	218.00	261.60	314.00
\$750.....		292.00	350.40

MONTHLY CASH SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS UNDER PRESENT LAW AND UNDER THE GILBERT BILL FOR A RETIRED WORKER OR WIDOW AT AGE 65

Average monthly earnings	Benefit amounts		
	Present law	Gilbert bill	
		Effective January 1970	Effective January 1972
Minimum benefit.....	\$55.00	\$90.00	\$120.00
\$150.....	73.00	90.00	120.00
\$250.....	94.90	113.90	136.70
\$350.....	115.90	139.10	166.90
\$450.....	136.20	163.40	196.10
\$550.....	156.70	188.10	225.70
\$650.....	179.90	215.90	259.10
\$750.....		240.90	289.10

ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL SECURITY (OASDI) BILL INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE JACOB H. GILBERT

Item	Existing law	Bill									
<b>1. Benefit amounts:</b>											
(a) Basic amounts.....	Benefits for a worker beginning at age 65, or when disabled before age 65, range from \$55 to \$218. Benefits for dependents and survivors are based on these amounts.	Benefit amounts for the worker would be increased in 2 steps: Beginning and range: January 1970, \$90 to \$293; January 1972, \$120 to \$537. Benefits for dependents and survivors would be increased proportionately.									
(b) Automatic adjustment.....	No provision.....	Benefit amounts would be automatically adjusted annually for at least a 3-percent increase in the cost of living.									
(c) Actuarial reduction.....	Benefits for workers, and their wives or husbands, who start getting benefits before age 65 are payable at reduced rates. The benefits are reduced to an amount that will on the average give the same total lifetime benefits that would have been paid if the benefits had not begun until age 65. A worker's benefit at age 62 is 80 percent of the benefit he would have gotten at age 65; a wife's or dependent husband's benefit is 75 percent of the amount payable at age 65.	Smaller reductions would be made. A worker's benefit at age 62 would be 85 percent of the unreduced amount; a wife's or husband's, 82½ percent.									
(d) Widow's and widower's.....	Benefits beginning at or after age 62 are equal to 82½ percent of the benefit amount that would be payable to the deceased spouse.  Disabled widows and widowers can get benefits at or after age 50. Where benefits begin before age 62, the benefit amounts are reduced.	The amount payable where benefits begin at or after age 65 would be equal to 100 percent of the benefit amount that would be payable to the deceased spouse. Benefits beginning before age 65 would be reduced; where benefits begin at age 62 the benefit amount would be equal to 82½ percent of the benefit of the deceased spouse. Benefits would be payable to a disabled widow or widower at any age. No reduction would be made in benefits that begin before age 62; the benefit amount would be 82½ percent of the deceased spouse's benefit, the amount payable under present law and under the bill to a widow who begins getting her benefits at age 62.									
(e) Special age-72 payments.....	Certain people who reach age 72 before 1972 and who have not worked under social security long enough to get regular benefits can get special payments of \$40 for an individual, \$60 for a couple.	The special payments would be increased in 2 steps: <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Beginning</th> <th>Individual</th> <th>Couple</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>January 1970.....</td> <td>\$48</td> <td>\$72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>January 1972.....</td> <td>58</td> <td>87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Beginning	Individual	Couple	January 1970.....	\$48	\$72	January 1972.....	58	87
Beginning	Individual	Couple									
January 1970.....	\$48	\$72									
January 1972.....	58	87									
(f) Lump-sum death.....	Equal to 3 times the worker's benefit amount but not more than \$255. Range: \$165 to \$255.	The \$255 limit would be increased to \$500.									

Item	Existing law	Bill																																												
2. Benefit computations.....	All social security benefit amounts are based on the insured worker's average monthly earnings. Nearly all benefits are now based on average monthly earnings after 1950—figured over 5 less than the number of years after 1950 and up to the year the worker reaches age 65 (62 for women), becomes disabled, or dies.	The number of years used in figuring the worker's average monthly earnings would be reduced by 1/3 beginning in December 1970, and to this best 10 years out of any 15-consecutive years beginning in December 1972. The average monthly earnings figured over the shortened periods would be adjusted to take account of the length of time the person worked under social security. The ending point of the period that is used to determine insured status for a man, and the number of years over which a man's average monthly earnings are calculated, will be the beginning of the year in which he reaches age 62 instead of age 65. The ending point for men will be the same as it is for women under present law.																																												
3. Earnings test.....	No benefits are withheld on annual earnings of \$1,680 or less. For earnings up to \$1,200 above \$1,680 (i.e., \$2,880), \$1 is withheld for each \$2 of earnings, and for additional earnings \$1 is withheld for each \$1 of earnings, except that no benefits are withheld any month in which a person does not earn more than \$140 in wages nor render substantial services in self-employment. No provision for automatic increases.....	No benefits will be withheld on earnings of \$1,800 or less. For earnings up to \$1,200 above \$1,800 (i.e., \$3,000), \$1 would be withheld for each \$2 of earnings, and for additional earnings \$3 would be withheld for each \$4 of earnings, except that no benefits would be withheld for any month in which a person does not earn more than \$150 in wages nor render substantial services in self-employment. Beginning in 1973, the \$1,800 and \$150 amounts specified above would be automatically increased as average earnings levels rise.																																												
4. Parent's benefits.....	Benefits for aged dependent parents of deceased workers only are equal to 82 1/2 percent of the worker's primary insurance amount (or 75 percent of that amount if more than 1 parent is entitled to benefits).	Benefits would be provided for aged dependent parents of retired and disabled workers. The benefit amounts for the parent of a living worker would be equal to 50 percent of the worker's primary insurance amount; actuarially reduced if taken at age 62-65. The benefit amount for parents of deceased workers would continue to be 82 1/2 percent. Would extend noncontributory wage credits of \$100 a month retroactively to 1957.																																												
5. Noncontributory wage credits for military service.....	Noncontributory wage credits of \$100 are provided for each month of military service after 1967.	Would extend noncontributory wage credits of \$100 a month retroactively to 1957.																																												
6. Disability provisions:																																														
(a) Definition of disability.....	Benefits cannot be paid until after a 6-month waiting period, and are payable only if the disability is expected to last for at least 12 months or to result in death.	The waiting period would be reduced from 6 to 3 months, and the requirement that the disability must be expected to last 12 months or to result in death would be eliminated.																																												
(b) Alternative definition for older workers.....	Workers must be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment.	Workers aged 55-64 could qualify if unable to engage in substantial gainful activity (by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment) in their regular work or in any other work in which they have engaged with some regularity in the recent past.																																												
(c) Childhood disability benefits.....	Benefits are payable (if the insured parent dies, becomes disabled, or retires) to an adult son or daughter who becomes totally disabled before he reaches age 18.	Benefits would be payable if such adult son or daughter becomes totally disabled before he reaches age 22.																																												
7. Medicare:																																														
(a) Financing both hospital insurance and supplementary medical insurance on the basis of payroll contributions and general revenues.....	Hospital insurance is financed by contributions from employers, employees, and the self-employed. Supplementary medical insurance is financed by monthly premiums paid by enrollees and matched by the Federal Government. Moneys are deposited in, and benefits and administrative expenses are paid from, 2 separate trust funds. Eligibility for hospital insurance is based on eligibility for cash benefits (except for a special transitional provision) while medical insurance is available to virtually all those over 65.	Would eliminate supplementary medical insurance premiums and provide for financing both hospital and medical insurance programs through contributions of employers, employees, and the self-employed, and a matching contribution by the Federal Government. All moneys would go into a combined trust fund, which would pay the benefits and administrative expenses of both programs. Eligibility requirements for both hospital and medical insurance would be identical to that required under existing law for hospital insurance.																																												
(b) Medicare for the disabled.....	Medicare is available only to people age 65 and over (without regard to disability).	Would extend medicare, under the combined financing approach described above, to people under age 65 entitled to monthly cash disability benefits. Benefits would begin with the 1st month for which the individual is eligible for cash benefits and end 12 months after cash benefits cease.																																												
9. Contribution rate schedule.....	Employer-employee, each (percent):	Employer-employee, each (percent):																																												
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>OASDI</th> <th>HI</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1970.....</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>4.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1971 to 72.....</td> <td>4.60</td> <td>.60</td> <td>5.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1973 to 75.....</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>.65</td> <td>5.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1976 to 79.....</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>.70</td> <td>5.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1980 to 86.....</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>.80</td> <td>5.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1987 and after.....</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>.90</td> <td>5.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	OASDI	HI	Total	1970.....	4.20	0.60	4.80	1971 to 72.....	4.60	.60	5.20	1973 to 75.....	5.00	.65	5.65	1976 to 79.....	5.00	.70	5.70	1980 to 86.....	5.00	.80	5.80	1987 and after.....	5.00	.90	5.90	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>OASDI</th> <th>HI</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1970.....</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>4.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1971 to 72.....</td> <td>4.80</td> <td>.65</td> <td>5.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1973 and after.....</td> <td>5.10</td> <td>.90</td> <td>6.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	OASDI	HI	Total	1970.....	4.20	0.60	4.80	1971 to 72.....	4.80	.65	5.45	1973 and after.....	5.10	.90	6.00
Year	OASDI	HI	Total																																											
1970.....	4.20	0.60	4.80																																											
1971 to 72.....	4.60	.60	5.20																																											
1973 to 75.....	5.00	.65	5.65																																											
1976 to 79.....	5.00	.70	5.70																																											
1980 to 86.....	5.00	.80	5.80																																											
1987 and after.....	5.00	.90	5.90																																											
Year	OASDI	HI	Total																																											
1970.....	4.20	0.60	4.80																																											
1971 to 72.....	4.80	.65	5.45																																											
1973 and after.....	5.10	.90	6.00																																											
	Self-employed (percent):	Self-employed (percent):																																												
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>OASDI</th> <th>HI</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1970.....</td> <td>6.30</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>6.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1971 to 72.....</td> <td>6.90</td> <td>.60</td> <td>7.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1973 to 75.....</td> <td>7.00</td> <td>.65</td> <td>7.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1976 to 79.....</td> <td>7.00</td> <td>.70</td> <td>7.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1980 to 86.....</td> <td>7.00</td> <td>.80</td> <td>7.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1987 and after.....</td> <td>7.00</td> <td>.90</td> <td>7.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	OASDI	HI	Total	1970.....	6.30	0.60	6.90	1971 to 72.....	6.90	.60	7.50	1973 to 75.....	7.00	.65	7.65	1976 to 79.....	7.00	.70	7.70	1980 to 86.....	7.00	.80	7.80	1987 and after.....	7.00	.90	7.90	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>OASDI</th> <th>HI</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1970.....</td> <td>6.30</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>6.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1971 to 72.....</td> <td>6.90</td> <td>.65</td> <td>7.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1973 and after.....</td> <td>7.10</td> <td>.90</td> <td>8.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	OASDI	HI	Total	1970.....	6.30	0.60	6.90	1971 to 72.....	6.90	.65	7.55	1973 and after.....	7.10	.90	8.00
Year	OASDI	HI	Total																																											
1970.....	6.30	0.60	6.90																																											
1971 to 72.....	6.90	.60	7.50																																											
1973 to 75.....	7.00	.65	7.65																																											
1976 to 79.....	7.00	.70	7.70																																											
1980 to 86.....	7.00	.80	7.80																																											
1987 and after.....	7.00	.90	7.90																																											
Year	OASDI	HI	Total																																											
1970.....	6.30	0.60	6.90																																											
1971 to 72.....	6.90	.65	7.55																																											
1973 and after.....	7.10	.90	8.00																																											
10. Federal contributions.....	No provision.....	General revenue contributions gradually increasing over a 10-year period to an amount equal to approximately 1/4 the total cost of the program.																																												

SENATOR CHURCH ON VIETNAM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, introduced into the other body a resolution he cosponsored with his able colleague, Senator MARK HATFIELD, urging an accelerated withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Senator CHURCH's well-reasoned arguments have often granted to his colleagues effective answers to even the

most difficult questions on this subject. Earlier this year I inserted in the RECORD his speech, "U.S.-U.S.S.R.: Twin Sentinels of the Status Quo." I would like to commend him again today for the edification his speeches so regularly provide, and insert into the RECORD the speech he made in support of his Vietnam resolution for the consideration of all the Members of this body.

The text of the speech follows:

VIETNAM: DISENGAGEMENT NOW—THE CASE FOR A SENSE-OF-THE-SENATE RESOLUTION

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, member of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

In the second year of the American Revolution the great William Pitt rose in the House of Lords and spoke words which, in

a less civilized nation, might have been taken for treason. "My lords," he declared, "you cannot conquer America. . . . You may swell every expense and every effort still more extravagantly; pile and accumulate every assistance you can buy or borrow; traffic and barter with every little pitiful German prince that sells and sends his subjects to the shambles. . . . your efforts are forever vain and impotent, doubly so from this mercenary aid on which you rely, for it irritates, to an incurable resentment, the minds of your enemies. . . . If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms—never—never—never!"<sup>1</sup>

The England to which Pitt counseled was not a decrepit nation but a rising empire still

Footnotes at end of article.

approaching the peak of its power. The inglorious end of the American war, from the British point of view, was not followed by a worldwide loss of confidence in Britain's word or Britain's power. Yorktown was followed by Waterloo and in the nineteenth century Great Britain acquired vast new domains, becoming the vital center of world commerce and industry. The real loser of the American Revolutionary War was America's ally, France, whose prodigal waste of resources—all for the sake of humbling England—almost certainly helped bring about the French Revolution of 1789. To compound the irony, when the British Empire finally did disintegrate, it was not in the wake of defeat but of British "victories" in the two World Wars.

The paradox turns back upon us full circle. The victory denied George III by ragtag American rebels fighting to end foreign rule, has now, nearly two centuries later, been denied to us in distant Vietnam by stubborn, native guerrilla fighters equally determined to drive the foreigner from their land.

Faced with their implacable resolve, what kind of "victory" can be won? The "victory" of holding a proud people hostage? The "victory" of inflicting a "favorable kill ratio" upon an enemy who will not quit? The "victory" of maintaining a puppet government in Saigon propped up by the money we lavish on it, and sustained in the field by the troops we send—and others we hire—to fight for it? No, there is no "victory" we can win in Vietnam worthy of the name. President Nixon himself concedes as much when he says: "We have ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield."

In fact, our favored euphemism regarding Vietnam is not victory at all but an "honorable settlement," a term allowing of almost unlimited possibilities of interpretation. In the present circumstances, however, its meaning seems clear enough. On the one hand, we have been unable to suppress the rebellion; on the other hand, we do not wish to acknowledge that fact. We do not wish to acknowledge it to the communists, for fear their appetite for conquest will be whetted. We do not wish to acknowledge it to our allies, for fear their confidence in our power will be diminished. And most of all, we do not wish to acknowledge it ourselves, for fear that our own, surprisingly fragile confidence in ourselves will be undermined. And so we seek an "honorable settlement," an agreement under which no one will say what everyone knows: that the United States of America has made a bad mistake and finds it necessary to liquidate that mistake.

The time has come for the pretense to end; for the prideful nonsense to stop about securing an "honorable settlement" and avoiding a "disguised defeat." The truth is that as long as our troops stay in South Vietnam, we shall occupy a hostile country. There is no way that the United States, as a foreign power and a Western one at that, can win a civil war among the Vietnamese. Even now, five years after we entered the conflict, it remains a struggle between rival factions of Vietnamese for control of the government in Saigon. The outcome rests, now as before, on the Vietnamese themselves.

If we can find the resolution to end our protracted involvement in this war, we shall suffer no lasting injury to our power or prestige. I do not think that the liquidation of our intervention in Vietnam will mean the loss of our global greatness, any more than the loss of the American colonies cost England her greatness in the eighteenth century, or any more than the loss of Algeria and Indochina cost France her national

stature. On the contrary, the end of empire was not a defeat for France but a liberation, in the wake of which a demoralized nation recovered its good name in the world and its own self-esteem. The termination of our war in Vietnam would represent a similar liberation for America, and even a victory of sorts—a victory of principle over pride and of intelligent self-interest over messianic delusion.

#### I. THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The United States Government is not a charity-dispensing institution; its primary obligation is not to the Saigon generals, or to some portion of the Vietnamese people, but to the American people, to their security and well-being. When all is said and done about our "honor" and "commitment," the fact remains that our presence in Vietnam can be justified—if it can be justified—in terms of American interests, correctly defined as the freedom and safety of the American people.

Before anyone can prescribe an American course-of-action for Vietnam, it is necessary to be absolutely explicit about what our interests are in that benighted country and what they are not. I do not agree with President Nixon that, having crossed the bridge of intervention, it is useless to belabor the original issue<sup>2</sup>—as if the presence of half a million American troops and the loss of nearly 40,000 American lives represented an investment that had to be redeemed by sacrificing still more lives, regardless of the wisdom of our continued presence there. It is quite essential that we reexamine the decisions of preceding Administrations, not for the sake of political retribution, or even for the sake of history, but for the express purpose of identifying our interests. Why we intervened in Vietnam in the first place has everything to do with whether and how we should get out.

"A great nation," the President says, "cannot renege on its pledges."<sup>3</sup> What pledges, indeed, have we failed to keep? The amount of money, weapons, ammunition, food, equipment and supplies we have funneled into South Vietnam is beyond belief, vastly exceeding the outside help given North Vietnam and the Vietcong by all the communist governments combined. To fight for the South, we have sent an American expeditionary force of half a million men; no Russians or Chinese have been imported to fight for the North. Hanoi and the Vietcong do their own fighting. I say that Saigon—with larger and better-armed forces in the field than any arrayed against it—must stop relying on us to fight its war. We have kept our pledges, and done far more besides. We didn't undertake to make South Vietnam the 51st American State; we didn't promise to stand guard over the 17th parallel as though it were an American frontier.

But, the President argues, if we were to allow the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to prevail, "the cause of peace might not survive the damage that would be done to other nations' confidence in our reliability." Here Mr. Nixon espouses Mr. Rusk's concept of an exemplary war, which presumably demonstrates to other countries that the United States stands willing to intervene wherever necessary, in order to put down threats of internal communist subversion as well as external communist aggression. Yet the President himself has now announced to the world that the United States has a new policy: in the future, Asian governments must defend themselves against subversion from within, and not look our way again. The motto, "No more Vietnams" cannot be reconciled with the fiction that we are still fighting an exemplary war in that country.

Footnotes at end of article.

Withdrawing from Vietnam, according to President Nixon, "would bring peace now but it would enormously increase the danger of a bigger war later."<sup>4</sup> The assertion that by fighting in Vietnam we prevent other wars is pure speculation, rooted not in evidence but in analogy, the analogy of the thirties when appeasement whetted Nazi Germany's appetite for aggression.

No good historian will buy that analogy. History unfolds more in paradoxes than in parallels. Mark Twain once observed that "We should be careful to get out of an experience only the wisdom that is in it—and stop there; lest we be like the cat that sits down on a hot stove-lid. She will never sit down on a hot stove-lid again—and that is well, but also she will never sit down on a cold one anymore."<sup>5</sup> In the case of Vietnam we would do well to settle for the unwisdom that is in it and stop the sacrifice of real American lives for the sake of saving hypothetical ones in some conjectural war in an unforecastable future.

We dare not, says the President, abandon the South Vietnamese to "a massacre that would shock and dismay everyone in the world who values human life." Here again we are dealing with something that might happen; in the meantime does no one who values human life feel "shock and dismay" by the senseless sacrifice of American lives in endless assaults on useless hilltops and by death tolls of hundreds of GI's every week? Surely there is another way to protect those South Vietnamese who may feel the need for sanctuary, if it comes to that. Better that we open our own gates to them, than keep on sending Americans to die for them in their own land. As for the Saigon generals, there should be ample facilities for them on the French Riviera.

What indeed does Vietnam have to do with the vital interests of the United States, which is to say, with the freedom and safety of the American people? I attempted to define those interests four years ago shortly after our full-scale intervention in Vietnam began. As to freedom, I said:

"Freedom, as a matter of fact, is not really at issue in South Vietnam, unless we so degrade freedom as to confuse it with the mere absence of communism. Two dictatorial regimes, one sitting in Hanoi, the other in Saigon, struggle for control of the country. Whichever prevails the outcome is not going to settle the fate of communism in the world at large, nor the problem of guerrilla wars. They did not begin in Vietnam and will not end there. They will continue to erupt in scattered, farflung places around the globe, wherever adverse conditions within a country permit Communist subversion to take root."

And as to the safety of the American people, I added:

"Nor can it be soundly contended that the security of the United States requires a military decision in South Vietnam. Our presence in the Far East is not anchored there. Saigon does not stand guard over Seattle. We conquered the Pacific Ocean in the Second World War. It is our moat, the broadest on earth, from the Golden Gate to the very shores of China. There is no way for the landlocked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific, there is no need for us to retain a military base on the mainland of Asia."<sup>6</sup>

After four years of futile warfare, I see no reason to alter that evaluation of American interests. The plain fact is that we did not then, and do not now, have a vital interest in the preservation of the Thieu-Ky government, or even in the preservation of a non-communist government, in South Vietnam. Nor do we have a vital interest in whether the two Vietnams are united or divided. We have

preferences, to be sure, and our pride is at stake after committing ourselves so deeply, but preference and pride are sentiments not interests. From the standpoint of our interests, we have been fighting an unnecessary war for five long years, making it possibly the most disastrous mistake in the history of American foreign policy. It can never be vindicated; it can only be liquidated.

#### II. AN UNSUCCESSFUL WAR

The war in Vietnam has been more than unnecessary; it has been unsuccessful as well, and that, in the hard world of politics, is usually the greater crime. The Dominican intervention was unnecessary, illegal, and destructive of our relations with Latin America, but it achieved its immediate objective, the suppression of a revolution, with the result that the issue has not remained to plague and divide us. Had Mr. Rostow and his colleagues been right in 1965 in their supposition that the war in Vietnam could be won with "surgical" air strikes and a few months of ground warfare, the question of the war's necessity would not be the lacerating issue that it is today. But the Vietnam strategists were neither wise or prescient nor lucky. With disastrous insensitivity to the thought processes of an alien culture, and with contemptuous disregard of the warnings offered by some of us in the Senate, they applied their "scientific" theories of warfare in the apparent belief that the Vietnamese would respond to "graduated" degrees of punishment as they themselves would have responded—by weighing immediate costs against prospective gains. But the Vietnamese turned out not to be scientists. They reacted irrationally and unaccountably by refusing to give up. Their calculations of cost and gain turned out to be different from ours; their willingness to endure punishment turned out to be greater than we had thought possible.

Our strategy in Vietnam has failed but neither the Johnson Administration nor—thus far—the Nixon Administration has been willing to acknowledge that failure. In lieu of the tortured rationalizations of the previous Administration, President Nixon experiments with a cautious troop withdrawal tied to the tenuous hope of a growing South Vietnamese military capacity. In their Midway communique Mr. Nixon and Mr. Thieu rejoiced in hamlet elections, in "the failure of the other side to achieve its objectives," and in the new-found strength of the Saigon army, while Mr. Thieu himself recited appropriate lines about the "constant duty" of the Saigon forces "to assume a greater share of the burden in South Vietnam."

Perhaps this time, for the first time, the optimistic prognosis will be borne out, so studiously does it ignore hard issues and well-known facts, that one strongly suspects that what we are confronted with today is not a new strategy but a new "image" for the discredited old strategy, a new device for postponing difficult decisions, a new expedient for holding off the critics of the war. It would appear that President Nixon, like President Johnson, is becoming preoccupied with politics to the neglect of policy.

This, in turn, leads to the frustration which gives rise to a search for scapegoats. In much the same way that the German General Staff—which had actually initiated Germany's surrender in World War I—later perpetuated the myth of defeat by betrayal on the home front, the men who led us into the Vietnam quagmire have sought to place the blame for the catastrophe on their domestic critics, on those of us who said that we never should have entered the quagmire in the first place and who now insist that we ought to get out. The "real battlefield," according to this self-serving doctrine of the architects of failure, is not in Vietnam but

in America, where, if only the critics would be silent, the will of the enemy would supposedly be broken. In its crude form as a spurious, jingoist "patriotism," the argument runs that the war critics are near-traitors, provisioners of "aid and comfort to the enemy." In the scarcely more august language of our last two Presidents, the critics are "nervous nellies" and "neoisolationists"—deriders of patriotism, as Mr. Nixon put it, a "backward fetish."<sup>7</sup>

The critics are also credited with the failure to make progress in over a year of negotiations at Paris. With a cold eye fixed on the agitated state of American opinion, so the argument runs, the enemy is emboldened to resist our "reasonable" proposals. "It's awfully hard to play chess with twenty kibitzers at your elbow," Mr. Kissinger complains, "all of them demanding explanations of the purpose of every move while your opponent listens."<sup>8</sup>

The "kibitzers" who are such an inconvenience to Mr. Kissinger are the very dissenters whose protest finally persuaded President Johnson to stop the escalation of the war and go to the conference table. Had these critics remained silent as the war makers would have had them do, the limited war in Vietnam might by now have escalated into a full-scale war with China. Whatever hope of peace there now is, it is the "kibitzers' gift to the architects of failure. Long may they "kibitz," acting, let it be remembered, on their own concept of patriotism—which is not the patriotism of silent acquiescence in a policy they detest, but the patriotism of Camus, who would have us love our country for what it ought to be, and of Carl Schurz, that "mugwump" dissenter from McKinley imperialism, who proclaimed: "Our country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right."

For all the misjudgment of generals and policy makers—and for all the allegedly disruptive dissent at home—the root cause of failures lies not with ourselves but with our Vietnamese allies. Had an honest and patriotic government ruled in Saigon, it would probably have beaten the Vietcong long ago, with no more than material support from the United States. The Vietnamese people are not lacking in military courage and resourcefulness; the Vietcong have demonstrated that. What is lacking is the ability of the Saigon government to inspire either the confidence of its people or the fighting spirit of its army. There is little mystery as to why this ability is lacking. An American study team made up primarily of prominent churchmen recently reported, after a trip to Vietnam, that the Thieu government ruled by terror, using torture and brutality to suppress political opposition, and that the regime relied "more upon police state tactics and American support to stay in power than upon true representation and popular support."<sup>9</sup>

Of all the misrepresentations which have been perpetrated about Vietnam none has been more insulting to the intelligence and offensive to the moral sensibility of young Americans than the portrayal of the Saigon regime as an upholder of freedom and democracy.

Mr. Clark Clifford, our last Secretary of Defense, who found the courage to tell President Johnson the truth about Vietnam, had this to say of the Saigon generals:

"There is complete callousness about the cost of the war to us. They have no concern over the loss of our men or treasure. They see us as a big, rich country, well able to afford it. They are going one way and we are going another. I see no likelihood of our goals getting closer together. But they have

become very adroit at saying what the American public wants to hear . . . They are sweet talking us."

What's more, I would add, they are exercising a veto over American policy in Vietnam. At his latest press conference, President Nixon reiterated that we were willing to negotiate on anything, except "the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose their own leaders." Then, calling for "internationally supervised elections," Nixon said, "we will accept the result of those elections and the South Vietnamese will as well, even if it is a Communist government. . . ."

Mr. Nixon may think so, but not Mr. Thieu. His immediate rebuttal was plain enough. The Saigon Government, he said, had no intention of accepting a "coalition with the Communists" or "domination by the Communists" under any circumstances whatever. This is hardly surprising, since Mr. Thieu has consistently defied American policy. No sooner had he returned to Saigon from his love-feast with President Nixon at Midway last June, than he proclaimed: "I solemnly declare that there will be no coalition government, no peace cabinet, no transitional government, not even reconciliatory government."<sup>10</sup>

In neither instance, did any disavowal issue from the White House. President Nixon, like his predecessors before him, appears to be manacled to the Saigon generals. Lyndon Johnson flew five times to Mid-Pacific rendezvous with these same men. Now President Nixon has followed in that beater path and emerged, like Mr. Johnson, with the same pretensions of harmony. Lacking either the willingness to depend on their own army or the support of their own people, the Saigon generals have held an ace-in-the-hole which has kept them in power and in command of events: their influence amounting to a veto over America's war policy. Had they anything like the same influence in Vietnam that they have had in Washington, Thieu and Ky would have overpowered the Vietcong long ago.

Well, we have an ace-in-the-hole too: the fact that this war is not now and never was essential to our interests, which is to say, to the freedom and safety of the American people. Pride has cheated us of the power deriving from our own interests, because, in order to gain access to that power, we would have to admit error. That same pride has been Saigon's lever over America's war policy: they survive on it, while Americans die for it.

#### III. THE STRATEGY OF PEACE

Sooner or later, Vietnam will revert to the control of the Vietnamese. Whether on the basis of a negotiated peace or an un-negotiated withdrawal, American forces will eventually have to be removed from Vietnam. When that happens, if not before, the Vietnamese civil war will be settled—as it should and would have been settled long ago but for American intervention—by the interplay of indigenous forces within Vietnam. If a formal settlement comports with the indigenous balance of forces, whatever it may be, the settlement will be a lasting one. If it does not, it will be overthrown.

There are—as we have learned and should have known without this trial by fire—limits to the ability of an alien power to work its will in a hostile environment. Our own Civil War provides an example: after four years of savage warfare and eleven years of military occupation, the Union finally withdrew its forces from the South, allowing that region to revert to the political domination of the same people who had dominated the secessionist Confederacy. Another example is provided by the Boer War, Britain's turn-of-the-century "Vietnam." After more than two years of frustrating warfare against

Footnotes at end of article.

a guerrilla force of provincial rebels—in the course of which the mighty British Empire became an object of universal scorn and detestation—the British finally beat the Boers, organized the Union of South Africa and then, perforce, turned the political control of the country back to the defeated Boers, who have dominated South Africa ever since.

The common factor in the American Civil War, the Boer War and the Vietnam War is that each confronted a dominant alien power with an intolerable dilemma: it could impose its will only by the sustained application of overwhelming force; the alternative was to withdraw that force, leaving the indigenous factions to strike their own natural balance more or less as they would have if the alien power had not intervened in the first place. In the one instance "victory" becomes insupportable, in the other meaningless.

Weighing this dilemma along with the other main considerations I have set forth—that this war is a failure and was never in our interests to begin with—what is to be inferred for a strategy of peace?

The point of departure is the clear, candid acknowledgment of our own lack of vital interest in the internal regimes of the two Vietnams. This means that we must break through the pride barrier which has thus far deterred us from admitting that, from the standpoint of our own interests, this war is and always has been a mistake. The purpose of this admission is not flagellation but freedom—the freedom of action which will only be ours when we end our thralldom to the Saigon generals and begin to act in our own interests and no longer on the basis of theirs.

In recent weeks, there has been increasing talk of changing the military mix in Vietnam by replacing American ground troops with Vietnamese, while retaining American supply and support troops in their combat role. This is not a formula for extricating the United States from Vietnam; it is, rather, a formula for keeping up to 300,000 American troops engaged in Vietnam indefinitely. Its purpose is not to get out, but to stay in.

The imperative is that we get out. This does not mean, of course, that the South Vietnamese Government would have to follow suit, or that it would be helpless in the face of its enemies. It would still have 1,500,000 men under arms as against 135,000 Vietcong and 90,000 North Vietnamese soldiers now in South Vietnam. If the ARVN could be inspired to defend the Saigon government, it would survive; if it could not be so inspired, then the government does not deserve to survive. In any case, we have done enough. We have fought their war for five long years and sacrificed almost 40,000 American lives. It is enough.

The process of disengagement need not be a long, protracted one. We can initiate it immediately by starting to withdraw forces on a significant scale—not the token scale initiated by the Nixon Administration. At the present rate of withdrawal, American troops will be engaged in Vietnam for the next 8 to 10 years!

Nearly everyone now recognizes that our intervention in Vietnam was in error. Two years ago, our political skies were still filled with hawks; today, scarcely a hawk can be seen on the wing. President Nixon himself, once a ferocious hawk, may not openly admit, but he implicitly acknowledges, that this country has no vital interest at stake in Vietnam. Otherwise, we couldn't possibly leave the outcome for others to decide, even in a free election.

But we have our own hang-ups: twenty years of obsession with communism—deeply ingrained in the wormwood of our politics. Mr. Nixon keeps searching for a settlement that will be popular, or at least welcome, here at home. He keeps pushing for an American-style election in Vietnam, presided over

by a special electoral commission composed of all factions, and internationally supervised, and then wonders aloud why so "generous" a proposal should fall on such deaf ears. For an answer, we might ask ourselves how, during our own Civil War, the Union Government would have responded to a British or French proposal for an internationally supervised plebiscite on Southern secession!

A policy wrong from the start can't be made to come out right. Our country is accustomed to imposing unconditional surrender on its enemies; there can be no compromise settlement of the war in Vietnam which will be applauded by the American people. Nor can there be any settlement worthy of reliance, regardless of its terms, for once we have left, no force remains to keep it.

Still, Mr. Nixon stalls for time, trying to pry loose a settlement with modest troop withdrawals. He talks of bringing pressure on Hanoi. But you cannot bring pressure on an enemy by starting to leave! His real purpose is to bring pressure on Saigon to dignify our exit by accepting a transitional arrangement that will make it seem to the American people that the war has not been entirely pointless, that all the sacrifice has not been in vain.

So we wait, month after month, for some miracle to occur in Saigon or Hanoi that will bring the moribund peace talks back to life. We hint to Hanoi that progress at the conference table, or a wind-down of the war, will mean faster withdrawal of American troops, while we tell Saigon that the pace will depend on the demonstrated ability of their forces to replace our own. In the resultant muddle, all we have succeeded in doing is to place the time-table out of our hands into theirs. I say American policy must wait no longer upon the pleasure of either Saigon or Hanoi. It is time to come home!

For our own part, we have neither the need nor the right to sacrifice a single American life for any objective exceeding our own vital interest, which is the preservation of the freedom and safety of the American people. If this be thought ungenerous or unaltruistic, I put it to you that no nation has the moral right to be generous or altruistic with the lives of its own citizens. Perhaps a totalitarian nation, conceiving itself a spiritual entity transcending its individual citizens, may claim that right. A democratic nation cannot: its very existence is for the purpose of protecting and serving its citizens.

That is why it has become so necessary to disengage from Vietnam, leaving it to the indigenous forces in that tortured land to vote, negotiate or fight their civil war through to the conclusion which, but for our intervention, would long ago have been reached.

#### IV. WHY WE MUST GET OUT

We must get out of Vietnam because a process of deterioration has begun in our society which cannot be arrested, much less reversed, until we do get out. Dividing the American people as no issue since the Civil War has divided them, the war in Vietnam has been the cause and catalyst of great domestic ferment in the United States. The crisis it has directly caused is a moral one; the deep offense done to so many Americans by the blatant incompatibility of this war with the traditional values of our society. At the same time, by diverting financial and political resources, and by dividing and demoralizing the American people, the war has incapacitated us for effective action in respect to the worsening crises of race and poverty, crime and urban deterioration, pollution and ecological decay.

None of this has to do with simple war-weariness, or, as President Nixon seems to think, with weariness "of the weight of free world leadership that fell upon us in the wake of World War II."<sup>11</sup> Something more

fundamental than fatigue is involved. Twenty-five years ago the American people were simultaneously fighting two great wars on a vastly greater scale and at an even larger cost than the war in Vietnam, and their spirit never flagged. It is not just the burden of leadership or the exertions of warfare that outrage so many of our citizens, but this war, with its blood-soaked strategy of attrition, its unsavory alliance, and its objectives both irrelevant to our interests and offensive to our principles. Nor is "weariness" in any way descriptive of what the war critics are experiencing; they are not tired but angry—angry about the needless killing and the stubborn pride which has kept us from putting a stop to it.

I recently received a letter from a young man who is deeply troubled by these matters. With your indulgence I will read a portion of my reply:

"The deep disillusionment of young people in their country has its roots in the Vietnam war. When the power of the state is used to force young men to fight a war they believe to be wrongful, under penalty of imprisonment if they refuse, the seeds of sedition are sown. We now reap the bitter harvest, manifested in angry uprisings on campuses from coast to coast . . .

"Whenever the limb is shaken, all the leaves tremble. Once the moral authority of the government is rejected, on an issue so fundamental as a wrongful war, every lesser institution of authority is placed in jeopardy. Every sacred principle, every traditional value, every settled policy becomes a target for ridicule or repudiation. Cauldrons of anarchy soon begin to bubble and boil.

"So it has happened that our country is coming unstuck. The ferment distorts every issue; perspective is lost . . .

"I am convinced we must end the war—or at least our participation in it—before we can begin to stick this country back together again. Then we must have the help of men like you, men who haven't abandoned all faith, and who regard the job as worth doing."

Even now there is one thing in which we can take hope, and that is the great force of our American moral traditions. Out of all the dissent and disruption we have learned something about ourselves—that we still believe in our own values, that Jefferson's idea of liberty and Lincoln's idea of equality and Woodrow Wilson's idea of a world community of law are still capable of moving us and guiding our behavior. We have learned, to be sure, that we are capable of violating our traditional values, but we have also learned that we are not capable of violating them easily, or permanently, or indeed without setting in motion the regenerative forces of protest and moral reassertion.

There will be time enough, when peace is restored, to contemplate the "lessons of Vietnam." Perhaps, if peace comes in the way that I believe it must come, some of our recent and present leaders will take it as the war's "lesson" that America has shown itself unworthy of world leadership. Others will conclude that we must develop more sophisticated techniques of intervention, or that we must improve our "social science," or substitute political and economic for military means of intervention. Still others, at the opposite extreme, will probably judge that we must never again involve ourselves in war on a distant continent. All of these propositions, and variations upon them, will undoubtedly be put forth as the "lessons" of Vietnam, but my own hunch is that none of these will stand as a definitive "lesson" or as a reliable guideline for the future.

It may be that there is no lesson in Vietnam other than the modest one suggested by Jim Thomson of Harvard: "never again to take on the job of trying to defeat a

nationalist anticolonial movement under indigenous communist control in former French Indochina."<sup>12</sup> Or the equally modest lesson: that we have got for a time—not necessarily forever—to tend to neglected matters at home. Or perhaps we will have learned nothing more than that we are a people with a moral tradition, a people who discriminate among their wars and who do not easily act against their own traditional values.

## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> November 20, 1777.  
<sup>2</sup> Address of May 15, 1969.  
<sup>3</sup> Address of May 15, 1969.  
<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*  
<sup>5</sup> Pudd'nhead Wilson: Pudd'nhead Wilson's Calendar, ch. 11.  
<sup>6</sup> "The Vietnam Imbroglia," *Congressional Record*, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., Vol. 111, Part 11, Senate, June 24, 1965, p. 14631.  
<sup>7</sup> Speech at the Air Force Academy, June 4, 1969.  
<sup>8</sup> Quoted by Stewart Alsop in "The Powerful Dr. K.," *Newsweek*, June 16, 1969, p. 108.  
<sup>9</sup> *The Washington Post*, June 11, 1969.  
<sup>10</sup> *The New York Times*, June 10, 1969.  
<sup>11</sup> Air Force Academy Speech, June 5, 1969.  
<sup>12</sup> James C. Thomson, Jr., *No More Vietnams? The War and the Future of American Foreign Policy* (Richard M. Pfeffer, ed., New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 258.

## QUESTIONS GROW ON SUPERSONIC-PLANE PLANS

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article on sonic booms is inserted for the benefit of those who have received agency or Defense Department or other engineering replies advising them that sonic booms do not cause damage, and declining payment. The article indicates the precise amount paid in such tests to specific cities in specific years.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 19, 1969]

#### BOOM QUESTIONS GROW WITH SUPERSONIC-PLANE PLANS

(By Richard W. McManus, staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor)

As President Nixon nears a decision on whether to ask Congress for funds to continue development of a 1,800 m.p.h. supersonic transport (SST) debate swirls around the controversial aircraft.

Both proponents and those totally opposed to the aircraft—financed 90 percent with federal funds—push their views vigorously. "It's inevitable," says one side.

"There is simply no practical way for supersonic travel," says the other.

In the middle stand the governors of the 50 states and a United States congressman. Because they are concerned about the aircraft's jolting sonic boom, they want to have a hand in deciding where the plane—if produced—would fly.

Without a favorable nod from the President, the program would probably collapse through lack of development money after next April, when currently appropriated government funds will have been used up.

#### PRESTIGE AND LEADERSHIP

But long before then, Mr. Nixon will doubtless have reached his decision. Involved in his

present pondering must be the questions of this nation's prestige, its continued world aviation leadership, and its balance of payments. These issues have to be weighed against other priorities nagging for federal attention.

Giving dramatic emphasis to the President's answer may well be the first supersonic flight of the British-French Concorde. The French prototype of this aircraft (another prototype exists in England) is expected to get its first crack at the sound barrier in tests this month.

When this happens, the SST debate in the United States is bound to sharpen. Airlines in this country already have put their names in for Concorde, which are expected to make commercial flights in 1972 or 1973.

Thus long before the SST's inaugural flight could occur in 1978, the American public will have to confront the boom question, say officials of the Federal Aviation Administration. The FAA, a government regulatory agency, is responsible along with private industry for American SST development.

Although the Concorde, carrying up to 132 persons, will be lighter and slower (1,450 m.p.h.) than the 280-passenger SST, it will fly at a lower altitude, so the booms will be comparable. These booms, caused by the aircraft tearing through the atmosphere faster than the air can get out of the way, are measured in pounds per square foot (p.s.f.) of overpressure. Overpressure is pressure in excess of normal atmospheric pressure. Boom severity will range from 1 to 2.5 p.s.f.

A 1966 report by the Aerospace Industries Association of America (a view from the technologist's angle) describes the boom problem this way:

#### RESTRICTIONS OVER LAND?

"Although modern-day community noises are generally taken for granted, the introduction of a new disturbance such as that of the sonic boom will require some human adjustment. It is also true that we will not know, with finality, the degree of public acceptance of the sonic boom until the supersonic transport has been fully tested."

But according to the FAA's top scientific adviser outside of government on the SST project, Prof. Raymond L. Bisplinghoff of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the aircraft's development has always proceeded with the assumption that commercial supersonic flights over land would not be allowed.

The FAA is not so definite. According to its brochure *The United States Supersonic Transport Program*, the agency's position is this: "Because sonic boom annoys people, the SST may be restricted to supersonic flight over the oceans and other unpopulated areas."

Thus, with the start of the supersonic jet age perhaps little more than two years away, those who want to help determine where these sleek sound breakers' will fly are asking to be heard.

#### ADVANTAGES WEIGHED

Early this month all 50 state governors at the National Governors' Conference in Colorado Springs, Colo., took their stand on the issue. The governors unanimously adopted a resolution that "no routine commercial supersonic flights should be permitted over the various states and territories without prior consultation by the federal government with the governors of the states concerned."

"It has not been convincingly shown," said the resolution, "that the advantages to be gained in the operation of supersonic transport would counterbalance the possible adverse environmental noise effects to which the citizens of the various states would be subjected."

Expressing similar concern from the "people" side of the boom debate, Sen. Clifford

P. Case (R) of New Jersey submitted a bill to Congress in February asking for a two-year study of the boom question. During this study all nonmilitary supersonic flights would be banned. Based on the study's results, the ban might continue. But it could be lifted only by congressional action.

According to a spokesman for the Senator, a decision on this question, which will involve the welfare or at least have a bearing on the peace and quiet of so many Americans, should not be left to a regulatory agency. He says this is particularly true since the FAA, which is overseeing the plane's development, will want to insure its economic success.

#### COST SET AT \$1.4 BILLION

It is the contention of some SST detractors that economic pressures of flying this costly aircraft eventually will lead to overland routes.

The costs already are building. The two SST prototypes, which if federal appropriations continue will be ready in 1972, would cost \$1.4 billion. The government, with more than \$600 million already in the project, is paying most of the development costs. The two principal contractors, Boeing Aircraft and General Electric, with some aid from the airlines, are making up the balance.

The FAA estimates that at least 500 SSTs will be sold between the time the plane goes into commercial service in 1978 and 1990. The agency says this predicted market is based on the assumption that the aircraft may be limited to transoceanic operations because of the boom.

Once the two prototypes are completed and have achieved 100 hours of flight testing, the government then expects to pull out of the enterprise.

At this point, says Professor Bisplinghoff, another \$4 billion to \$5 billion will have to be raised from the private sector to put the plane into production.

Private industry will spend this kind of money only if the plane is a success, he says. The government, Boeing, and General Electric will lose if it is not.

And I'm willing to say it's going to be a success, he adds.

#### ONLY CONTACT THROUGH BOOM

How this success might come about is what worries the plane's opponents. Still, one of the outspoken critics of the SST, Prof. William A. Shurcliff of Harvard who is director of the Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom, contends his and other groups' opposition to the project is going to be successful and the SST will be shelved.

"We're being helped," he says, "by the economic pinch, and because of this the government is becoming leery of putting money into this ill-advised project."

"Practically every person you know won't be flying an SST," he adds. "Your only contact will be through hearing the boom. And when it [the SST] hits you with the boom, the plane is already about 30 miles away."

This means, he says, that it would be difficult for a person wishing to make a damage claim to identify the plane that was responsible.

Sonic boom tests that have been carried out over American cities have resulted in these damage payments:

St. Louis (1961-62), \$58,648; Oklahoma City (1964), \$100,000; Chicago (1965), \$114,763.

In the Oklahoma City test a poll showed that 27 percent of the people felt they "could never learn to live with the boom."

Still, B. J. Vierling, the FAA's deputy director for SST development, asks why the majority view shouldn't prevail. He says it still has not been determined, though, what level of public disturbance due to the boom will be acceptable.

## LAWSUITS AND ILL WILL

But, he says, the airlines wouldn't want to involve themselves "from a practical point of view" in sonic-boom damage lawsuits or cause public ill will.

What is not disputed by anyone is that supersonic flight will shrink travel time considerably. The Concorde is to chop flight time between London and Sydney, Australia, from 27 to 12 hours. The American SST would bring these two cities even closer.

"Where it will pay off will be in the vast reaches of the Pacific," says Prof. Bisplinghoff.

When it crosses this ocean, however, it would have to make one or two stops for fuel. Its range would thus be under that of the Boeing 747, the jumbo subsonic jet, which will go into service early next year.

But says Prof. Bisplinghoff: "We'll get that up. It'll take a while." He says the 707 initially didn't have its present range.

So goes the debate. Neither side concedes much to the other.

Some observers, meanwhile, view the coming boom—whether SST or other—as part of an even larger question. They feel the problem is that man may eventually overwhelm himself with his technological advances if these are uncontrolled.

According to a report by a panel of academicians to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics: "The challenge is to discipline technological progress. Nor can this opportunity be forgone without incurring a considerable risk to mankind."

## SOVIET SCENE '69: TRIP UNVEILS U.S.S.R. TODAY

## HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a group of 10 American editors has returned from a visit to the Soviet Union in which they traveled 8,000 miles inside that country in an intensive 16-day tour.

All are members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, invited to the U.S.S.R. by the Soviet Union of Journalists.

Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of Oklahoma's largest newspaper, the Daily Oklahoman, described his visit in a series of articles entitled "Soviet Scene, '69."

He states his aim as follows:

Readers should be aware that the series is based on physical observation of several parts of the Soviet Union, plus many conversations with Soviet newsmen, officials and citizens. Nearly all of the conversations were carried on through interpreters and in group interviews. The aim of the series is simply to present a fresh, first-hand glimpse of a vast country of immense importance to the future of the world in which we live. As far as possible, the writer attempts to present the idea of the Soviet citizens in their own words and from their point of view, not his.

At a time when it is so vital to understand the Soviet Union and its present policies and attitude, I believe this series will be of interest to many Members. I will enter today the first two articles, to be followed by the continuing series:

## TRIP UNVEILS U.S.S.R. TODAY

(By Charles L. Bennett)

An unusual opportunity to see six widely separated areas of the Soviet Union, and to talk with Soviet citizens, newsmen and officials leaves a visitor with an unusually difficult problem: How to sum up his impressions? The answer is that he shouldn't if he wants to avoid over-simplification or the kind of generalities that can be punctured by numberless exceptions.

But a visitor can piece together a mosaic of thousands of brief glimpses of people and things. Passing bits of conversation can be laced into detailed quizzes of high officials. Official statements can be balanced against what the visitor knew, or thought he knew—before he went—about a complicated, puzzling and surprising nation. Or he might recall matching wits with hardnosed, sophisticated Soviet journalists, always trying to extract the one different answer that will shed new light.

I was privileged to be one of ten U.S. editors who, accompanied by an American photographer, ventured into the Soviet for a 16-day expedition.

Our trip had its roots in negotiations, begun several years ago, which ripened into a proposal by the Soviet Union of Journalists for an exchange of visits. They suggested that ten editors designated by the American Society of Newspaper Editors would visit the U.S.S.R. and an equal number of Soviet journalists would come to the United States.

It wasn't that simple, of course. Months of negotiations between the U.S. State Department and the Soviet foreign ministry preceded the trip. Even so, as we flew into Moscow, we did not know what cities we would visit, to whom we would be able to talk, or what we could see.

Now, after 8,000 miles of travel in the U.S.S.R., after hours of talking with all kinds of Soviet citizens and seeing cities, countryside, stores, factories, homes, new and the old, admirable things and distasteful things; after all this, many questions remain. But then, too, thousands of bits of the mosaic fall into place and make memorable, meaningful pictures.

Solemn-faced people file past dramatic reminders of a war that killed 20 million of their countrymen. Vasily Isayev, vice-mayor of Moscow, reminds us that "Sixty-two thousand cities and villages were absolutely wiped off the face of the earth. People lived in earthen huts and they had to completely rebuild their cities."

Asked if, in another generation, Soviet young people might not forget the lessons of World War II a radio journalist comments, "No. This is hammered into them every day."

Accompaniment to the compelling reminders of the war, which are everywhere, is the drumbeat refrain of a theme repeated over and over, in a dozen different ways. The theme is: "No one must ever do this to us again."

One of our companions debates a mathematical term with one of the top scientists at "Science City," the huge educational and research center on the plains of Siberia. It is just outside Novosibirsk, 3300 miles east of Moscow and 1250 miles from the Chinese border.

The mathematical debate rages on, with Joe Adamov, our Moscow radioman interpreter, bridging the language gap as fast as he can talk in Russian and English. Suddenly he pauses for breath, looks up and says with a bemused smile, "You know, I don't understand what I'm saying in either language!"

One of our group says he would like to be able to see and talk with some of the "dissident intellectuals" in the U.S.S.R., men-

tioning the names of jailed Yuli Daniel and Andrei Sinyavsky, among others.

Our host replies with a smile: "If you break one of our laws, you may have a chance to see them!"

"I don't want to see them for that long," our editor decides.

A journalist in Minsk, during a five-hour dinner table talkfest, is irritated by some of our questions. He retaliates with a deadly serious accusation: "Your FBI briefs everyone who wants to come to the U.S.S.R. and threatens them to keep them from coming. Many have told us that, if they do come, they will not be guaranteed their same job when they go back."

We ask the manager of the huge Belaz truck factory in Byelorussia what the reaction was to the Apollo moon landing. Brisk, youthful Ivan Sidorovich says: "Very positive. We were all happy. We are all one world. We were thrilled that man, regardless of nationality, had accomplished this, overcome such difficulties. I am sure that American workers, were just as happy when Yuri Gagarin opened up this space era. There are no boundaries."

We plead with our journalist hosts, for perhaps the tenth time, to arrange for us to go to the Chinese border, to see for ourselves what is going on there. We are in Alma Ata, a lovely city in Kazakhstan and only 250 miles or so from the boundary with Communist China.

"You can't," they reply. "You never know when or where something is going to happen and you might see nothing. There are no accommodations there for you. Besides, it's not safe."

In this city we see a wonderful variety of faces . . . Uzbeks with sun and wind-darkened skin and short-cropped hair under their embroidered skull caps. Russians with smooth, rounded Slavic faces. Blond Ukrainians. The Asiatic faces of Uighurs and Kazakhs and mixtures that show traces of the Mongols, the Golden Horde whose raiders once swept across these steppes on missions of plunder and destruction.

Suddenly, with these faces in front of us, we understand what we've been told in nearly every city—that the U.S.S.R. is made up of at least 20 distinct nationalities, and as many as 170 different ethnic groups.

Atina Zhaketova, the well-rounded and bright-eyed Kazakh editor of a major women's magazine tell us there are 14 major nationalities in this republic alone, including her own people, Russians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Koreans and Uzbeks and Germans and several others. We ask whether there ever were any tensions between the Kazakhs and Russians, or among any of the others.

"We have had no friction at all," she replies. And then we wonder about how that could possibly have happened, and we try to recall the details of recent disturbances in the Crimean region when native nationalists suggested a Russian administrator go home "because you can't even say 'Good Morning' to us in our own language."

We also, suddenly, understand a rather strange letter many of us received when our Soviet trip was announced. An American of Ukrainian extraction had written to each of us. "I wish to point out a common mistake often made by American newsmen," he wrote. "That is calling 'Russian' the non-Russian nationalities like Armenian, Azerbaijani, Byelorussian, Estonian, Georgian, Kazakh, Koryzhiz, Latvian, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Tadjik, Turkmen, Ukrainian, Uzbek and many other autonomous Republics . . . The Soviet Union is not Russia, not a monolithic Russian nation, but an empire comprising many nationalities with their separate cultural, historical, religious and linguistic distinctions."

(All of this explains, as you may have guessed, why we will write in this series of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Union . . . but of Russia and Russians only when we really mean just that part of the Soviet, or just those particular Soviet citizens.)

Another scene shifts into memory and we are at the famed Kirov ballet in Leningrad, that historical museum city which is a must-see for every traveler to the Soviet Union.

Leningrad has pride from its survival of the 900-day siege. It left 600,000 of its citizens dead but frustrated Hitler's vow that he would celebrate Christmas of 1941 in the Hotel Astoria, where our group stayed. Germans finally did enter Leningrad by the thousands, as prisoners of the Red Army when its counter-offensive swept the invaders back to the Baltic.

But today's pride of Leningraders is in this ballet troupe we are watching. To them, the Bolshoi ballet, so familiar to many Americans because of its tours, is just "the Moscow ballet;" first place in the ballet world, they say, belongs to "the Kirov."

They are performing in a different theater while their own is being repaired. The ballet is "Don Quixote" and the Spanish grandee provides only the thinnest of story lines to support the action on the stage. But the story doesn't matter, because the staging, the costumes, the sets and, particularly, the dancing are phenomenal. Exciting, elegant, competitive and beyond anything we ever expected to feel from watching ballet, it is an experience. We join the wildly cheering audience and reluctantly stoll away savoring the thought that here, at least, we have seen true excellence in the Soviet Union.

We see competition and excitement of a far different kind one morning in Novosibirsk. Crowds of people are hurrying to work. An already-jammed bus stops. Ten or fifteen people move toward the bus and it's a silent but grim struggle. No quarter is given or asked, even by or for the women. Finally, somehow, they all squeeze into the bus with the last man in hanging onto the doorstep with toes and a firm grip on the handrail.

Some of us are surprised to learn that 72 per cent of all the doctors in the U.S.S.R. are women, as are 60 per cent of the economists, 27 per cent of the construction workers, 43 per cent of the workers on state farms.

When we discover that women in the Soviet Union, unlike the men, have a choice as to whether they will work or not, someone comments: "That seems like discrimination."

A Soviet women's leader explains: "That's because men have a deficiency. They can't have babies and nurse them. We feel that this maternal function is very important to society."

Travel in the Soviet Union is a guessing game. The crack "Red Arrow" train leaves the Moscow station exactly on time, gives a smooth overnight ride and arrives in Leningrad exactly on time.

One airplane trip leaves exactly on time, proves to be a comfortable and pleasant flight and gets us to our destination on the dot. Another time, we spend 18 hours in the Moscow air terminal—shaving, talking, eating and fitfully sleeping on the benches. We are told not to leave because the plane might be able to go any time; the weather at the other end might clear up. Finally, we are told it will leave at 11:30, board the plane at 12:30 and at 2:05 the plane takes off.

For the Soviet citizens, there still are the notorious queues for many kinds of consumer goods. Usually, now, it appears these are mainly for the scarce items, rather than for run-of-the-mill staples.

Prices on many items seem fairly normal to an American as he translates them into dollars. A television set may cost from 200 to 500 rubles, a man's suit 150, or a pair of women's shoes 25. But then we remember the average

wage of Soviet workers is 120 rubles a month.

Many times, we are asked by the Soviets why we are in Vietnam and what is being done about a settlement there. They know as well as we do what is going on; they just want to hear our answers and, sometimes, to insert a verbal needle about "U.S. aggression." One of our hosts gives the essence of the usual Soviet comment in a few words: "If you came from a smart country, you'd let it peter out."

In Sochi, the resort area along 90 miles of glittering coast of the Black Sea, we try the menthol inhalers at the famous Matsesta baths, dine delightfully in an open-air restaurant atop a mountain that overlooks the former vacation hideaway of Joseph Stalin.

Then we visit a palatial rest home for miners. Perched on a hillside, it looks like a palace and its public rooms are furnished accordingly. As we tour the institution and see that the bedrooms look more like standard Soviet hotel rooms, we hear an explanation of the U.S.S.R. health system. It's given by Dr. Nikolai Stukalov, who lost one leg while serving as an Army surgeon during World War II. He tells about the 26-day leaves, with pay, that are granted to Soviet workers needing the rest-vacation-treatment that the center provides.

He also takes us down the funicular railway to the pebble-covered beach. Bikini-clad miners' wives are there and the miners, engineers and mining executives who make up the clientele of this particular rest center. Many of them appear as portly as the most caricatured capitalist, in barely adequate bathing trunks. They greet the American visitors warmly and, in a matter of minutes, we are surrounded by 25 or so—deep in good-humored debate about Vietnam, their government and ours, and the China situation.

Everywhere we go—city, farm or beach—we ask about China.

Everywhere we ask, we hear almost the same answer. This time it is from Valentin Rogoznikov, a miner from Siberia. We find him sunning with a copy of Pravda covering his face. He arouses himself quickly when we ask what he thinks of the Chinese situation at the border.

"I think our government decided properly to give them a crushing rebuff," he says, "so they won't try to intrude on our peaceful life." He goes on to say that it is a "provocation of the Chinese government. We hope it will be a temporary situation. They are doing it to cover up the deficiencies in their system. We do not blame the Chinese people, but their leaders. We have helped them a great deal in the past. We do not think it will lead to war. Sooner or later they will come to their senses."

It is a familiar response. We hear it every time we ask the question, almost in the same words each time and almost in the same words it has appeared in Pravda and Izvestia.

We ask: "How do you know the reports you hear are true?"

He replies: "I happen to live in the place from which most of the border guards come. Some of them have returned. I have heard them speak on television and tell what happened."

"Do you have any feeling of not getting full information on the subject?"

"No. We get full information on everything. We believe our press and have had confirmation from friends."

Another piece of mosaic. We believe he really does believe his press.

Everywhere we go, our journalist hosts tell us the aim of their newspapers—as well as radio, television and magazines—is "to serve the interests of the country, the Communist party and the people." Alma Ata editor Feodor Mikhailov asks: "Our press and government and people all agree . . . so why would we come out for something against government policy?"

This is how it was. All the time we debated with the Soviets, we were debating with ourselves. Our questions were: "What is the purpose of our being here? What can we learn? What can we believe? What can we make them believe?"

We put the question of why we were invited to Vyacheslav Chernyshev, the energetic and "get it done" secretary of the Soviet Union of Journalists, our official hosts:

"We want a good business relationship with journalists of the U.S.," he said. "We are doing this to get better acquainted and to be better able to inform the people of our countries. This is not a simple thing, but when we have personal contact it helps us to have better knowledge and insight."

"We have a proverb," he added. "It is better to see a thing once than to hear it 1,000 times."

An old Moscow hand and knowledgeable server of the U.S.S.R. scene was asked his idea of why the Soviet journalists had invited us.

"It's part of their trying to project a better image. It's the first anniversary of the Czechoslovakian thing. They want to be viewed as friendly. If they tell you a motive, you can be pretty sure it's not the real one. They want to project the image of stability, happiness, peaceful construction—the idea that they want complete total disarmament, peace . . . to get the U.S. to be peaceful. They feel everyone is against them."

In later parts of this series, the pieces of mosaic will be looked at more closely—the role of women, the major questions of war and peace, housing, agriculture, industry, government, the social scene, health and education, and Soviet citizens as we met and talked with them.

(Second of a Series)

"MAYOR" WHO ISN'T A MAYOR RUNS SHOW IN SOVIET CITIES

(By Charles L. Bennett)

If you have the only show in town, it had better be a good one.

That's the situation faced by the "mayor" of any city in the Soviet Union—because his really IS the only show in town.

The "show" he heads includes every business and industry in the city—all the restaurants, theaters, stores and factories, public transportation, hospitals, hotels, gasoline stations. He's responsible for seeing that there's a job for every man in the city—and most women. He has to see that they have homes, operates their schools and colleges, provides recreation and health care, wedding ceremonies, clubs for the children and dry cleaning.

On top of all this, he furnishes all the usual governmental services of any American city—streets, sewers, water supply, police and fire protection, zoning and city planning and all the rest.

In Moscow or any other Soviet city, the man in charge of the city government isn't a "mayor" at all. He's a man like Vladimir Fedorovich Promyslov and his title is Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Supreme Soviet of the City of Moscow.

Promyslov and his counterparts in all the other cities are executive officers for the Supreme Soviet of the city, an elected body responsible for fixing the broad goals and policies under which the city operates.

Moscow's 6,600,000 people elect the city's Supreme Soviet, made up of 1,140 deputies serving two-year terms on the basis of one deputy for every 6,000 citizens. The deputies work on study commissions and meet once every quarter to discuss major problems.

After those discussions, and in accordance with the long-range plans of the city, the republic in which it's situated, and the national government, it's all up to Promy-

slov and his staff of 230 full-time workers. Under them are the 29 administrative districts of the city, each headed by a district counselor with 200 to 400 deputies. Altogether, there are about 8,000 deputies in the city.

For heading this all-encompassing organization, the urbane and genial Promyslov receives 550 rubles a month. At the official exchange rate, that is about \$605 a month or \$7,260 a year. Of course, he points out, with such additions as the Soviet's free education and health care, his "real pay" is somewhat higher than the dollar figure would indicate.

Our touring group of editors asked Moscow's mayor what his chief concerns were these days.

"Housing still is the number one problem," he said. We learned as we went on to Leningrad, Minsk, Novosibirsk and Alma Ata that every mayor listed housing as the top problem. War damage and population growth, plus the movement of rural people to the cities, have created housing shortages of monumental proportions in most Soviet cities. (The massive efforts to close the housing gap will be detailed in a later story in this series.)

"After that," Promyslov said, "transportation and traffic planning are the second most important." Despite the lack of anything like the number of automobiles seen on American streets, the first faint signs of traffic jams are beginning to appear in Moscow. Trucks appear to equal or surpass the number of passenger cars right now, but those in our group who had visited Moscow before said the increase in the number of cars was one of the things they noticed most.

Soviet Citizens have had to outwait long lines even to apply for a car—and sometimes even the signups have been cut off—and then had to wait up to two years for their automobile. But they're expecting better things now. Soviet factories plan to increase auto production sharply and city officials like Promyslov expect their traffic problems to grow accordingly.

With 1875 miles of major thoroughfares within the city now, Moscow plans to build 800 miles more of major highways to help accommodate the expected traffic increase.

"We are working on a system of centralized, television-operated traffic control for the whole city," Promyslov said. "We have been studying Paris, Munich, London and other cities as part of our preparation." He picked those cities because he saw some of their plans for similar systems at various international exhibits.

Promyslov has been in the United States, too, so he has some first-hand knowledge of what heavy traffic means.

Moscow's arterial highway pattern had an interesting beginning with the circular walls built around the original city, founded on the site of the present Kremlin hill 822 years ago. The tops of the earthen walls were found to be good wagon roads and the circle pattern has been repeated at varying distances from the city's center. Like spokes of a wheel, other highways radiate straight out from the central area, crossing the circular highways.

The outer circular highway is the official boundary of the city, enclosing about 3,420 square miles (about five times the area of Oklahoma City).

Beyond this outer highway and completely surrounding the city is a green belt of more than 400,000 acres. "This provides a zone of pure air around the city," Promyslov said, "and no building can be done there without permission from the city. Generally, it is not permitted.

"Each district of the city has its own rest area within the greenbelt, with sports fields, marine sports and other recreation. Each enterprise, such as a factory of business takes its people to one of the rest areas assigned to it."

Even inside the city, Promyslov said, 25 percent of the total area is in green space and parks "and the plan is that these green areas will remain as they are."

Vasily Isayev, vice chairman of the city Soviet's executive committee, picked up the conversational ball as Promyslov left to catch a plane. "There are now about 80,000 privately owned passenger cars in Moscow," he said. "But most transportation in the city still is public."

The public transportation includes electric trolley busses, taxis and an extensive subway system.

"The public system transports 12 million passengers a day now," Isayev said, "and we are going to have to expand it rapidly."

One-third of that daily load is carried on Moscow's justly famous subway. Clean, well-lighted, tile-walled stations are decorated with statues and murals. The trains look like new and operate on split-second timing.

Isayev stepped to a huge, lighted wall map at one side of the paneled chamber we were in and pointed out the subway lines.

"We now have about 80 miles of parallel, double-tunnel subway lines," he said, "and we plan 120 miles more." He said the average cost of building a kilometer of subway was between 7 million and 8 million rubles. That figures out, for the total additional mileage to more than \$1.65 billion at current exchange rates.

"But the transportation system pays a profit," Isayev assured us. Its income over costs is only one of many revenue sources the city plows back into further improvements.

"Income is always above our expenditures," the city official said. "We normally have 50 million to 100 million rubles profit to use on whatever projects we want to. Housing rent is low and doesn't cover the cost of maintaining the apartments. But the whole transportation system produces profit, along with the industries and other enterprises run by the city, like the hotels, restaurants and movie houses. We have profit from trade, too, and a small tax on trade turnover. There are no other taxes.

"We provide the music, opera and ballet, too, but we don't make any profit on them; we're happy if they even break even."

Total operating income for the city in 1969, he added, will be about 1.5 billion rubles.

What about air and water pollution, we asked.

"On the whole Moscow is a very clean city. We are trying to build large, central heating stations rather than to have numerous small ones around the city. Also, we are using high quality gas that causes less fumes. In the old days, Moscow burned wood, then coal and later fuel oil. The smog was very bad. We also stopped the use of diesel buses to cut down the air pollution.

"Water pollution is a problem. The Moscow River doesn't really satisfy us because it is dirtyish, but much better than it once was and people can still fish and swim in it. To control industrial and business pollution of the river" he said, "we had to make a real Draconian decision.

"We simply ordered the industries to put on the necessary filters for industrial waste, by set dates, or shut down. Our sanitary department has almost unlimited powers to shut down a factory, fine the factory itself, or to fine the manager personally for violation of the pollution rules.

"We have the authority, but much remains to be done. We haven't been able to channel all the surface water of the city and waste into one central system yet. There are some local sewer systems and we still get some illegal dumping of waste. In one recent case we have pinpointed the general area it's coming from, but we haven't found the exact factory yet. We will, though."

(Another source told us later that Soviet officials are considering making industrial

water pollution a criminal, as well as civil, offense. The trouble, this source said, is that some factory managers, trying to make profit records for their plants, have decided it was cheaper to pay the civil fines than to install the necessary filters. That kind of capitalist thinking, this source said, is not likely to be permitted for very long in the Soviet.)

Moscow has no problem with pure drinking water Isayev said. In fact, they are able to provide the same pure water both to industry and for personal use. A canal from the Volga river into the Moscow river and storage reservoirs along the way, have made this possible.

"Our water reserves look okay to the year 2000, but after that we will have to find new sources," Isayev said.

No population explosion is going to trap Soviet city officials in the same kind of urban growth problems American cities face. They project their plans for natural increases but immigration to the cities is strictly controlled. Some plants and other enterprises have been moved out of Moscow simply to prevent overcrowding. No new plants can be built, nor can a factory or other business bring additional people in for its work force without permission from the city Soviet and no Soviet citizen moves from city to city unless he's approved for a job change by the government.

Minsk's chief planner, Victor Chernishov, struggles with most of the same problems we heard about in Moscow. One of his current projects is planning a new surface drainage system for the city. A cloudburst we were caught in at the nearby Belaz truck plant showed us ample evidence of the need.

"It's hard to say what it will cost," Chernishov said, "because it will be built in stages. We know the first stage will cost us 36 million rubles (nearly \$40 million at current exchange rates).

The slow-flowing Svisloch river also was giving him pollution problems but, at the same time, providing the setting for an elaborate plan of parks, recreation areas connected by monorail, and green space through the heart of the city.

In Alma Ata, a city surrounded by snow-capped mountains, city officials are combating a different kind of river problem. A mountain stream, placid and harmless most of the year, produces a roaring flood in springtime—flushing automobile-sized boulders down upon the city. Huge concrete and steel fences have been erected in the stream valley to halt the boulders but that hasn't solved the problem.

Now a 330-foot high earthen dam is being built far back up in the mountains as a "holding pool" for the rocks and debris, with a sluiceway under the dam to let the water through.

"We used 5,000 tons of dynamite to blow off the sides of two mountains, all at once, and drop them into the mouth of the valley," the vice-mayor said. "This dam will last for a thousand years."

Novosibirsk's Gorda Skoblikov, chief architect for this Siberian city of more than a million people, already is talking about the creation of "satellite" communities for industry, to avoid overcrowding of the central city. One satellite already has been created, but this is the famous "Science City"—a modern complex of college, university and research institute centers.

Founded only in 1893, Novosibirsk took just 62 years to grow to a million population. Its growth stemmed, mainly, from purposeful decisions by the Soviet government to move educational, research and industrial enterprises out of Moscow and other cities and to reestablish them on the Siberian plains.

In contrast to the other city offices we visited, Novosibirsk's planner would not permit us to photograph the model of his new city plan; it includes provisions for new bridges across the river that flows through the city.

COMPARISON OF CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROPOSALS

**HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, few of us would argue that there are Americans who are deprived of a

substantially nutritious diet because of low income. But finding an answer to the problem is rather difficult. Fully five different food stamp proposals have been introduced in Congress. On September 24, the McGovern-Javits bill passed the Senate and the House Agriculture Committee is currently holding hearings on food stamps.

I thought it would be helpful to my colleagues to be able to compare the existing law, the Food Stamp Act of

1964, with the proposed legislation—the Senate passed bill, S. 2547; the Nixon administration proposal, introduced by Representative CATHERINE MAY on June 17 as H.R. 12222; the bill I coauthored with Representative TOM FOLEY on August 11, H.R. 13423, and the Poage bill or the Food and Agriculture Act of 1969, introduced by Representative W. R. POAGE on June 25 as H.R. 12430.

The following is a comparison of these proposals:

Item	Present act	Senate substitute (S. 2547)	Nixon-May bill (H.R. 12222)	Foley-Green bill (H.R. 13423)	Poage bill (H.R. 12430)
1. Policy of program.....	Raise levels of nutrition among low-income households.	Permit low-income households to receive a share of food abundance sufficient to provide them with adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition.	Permit low-income households to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet.	Provide adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition among low-income households by permitting them to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet.	No change.
2. Method and level of funding.	Authorization of appropriations: Fiscal 1970, \$340,000,000; fiscal 1971 (1st 6 months only, through Dec. 31, 1970), \$170,000,000.	Authorization of appropriations: Fiscal 1970, \$1,250,000,000; fiscal 1971, \$2,000,000,000; fiscal 1972, \$2,500,000,000.	Authorization of appropriations: Fiscal 1970, \$610,000,000; fiscal 1971-72, such sums as Congress may appropriate.	Food stamps to be a Commodity Credit Corporation-run program with CCC empowered to use up to \$19,500,000,000 in borrowing authority to fund this and various farm programs, followed by appropriations to reimburse CCC for previous year's expenditures.	Authorization of appropriations: Such sums as may be necessary.
3. Carryover of unexpended funds.	None—Unspent funds automatically revert to the Treasury.	Unspent funds continue to remain available until expended.	Unspent funds continue to remain available until expended.	No problem with CCC financing.	No change.
4. Terms of program.....	Ends Dec. 31, 1970.....	Ends June 30, 1972.....	Ends June 30, 1973.....	Ends June 30, 1974.....	Open ended.
5. Territorial coverage.....	50 States only and District of Columbia.	50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, Trust Territories of Pacific.	No change.....	50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.	No change.
6. Individual coverage.....	Group of related or nonrelated individuals living as 1 economic unit sharing cooking facilities and for whom food is customarily purchased in common. Not residents of institutions or boarding houses.	As in Foley-Green bill.....	do.....	Includes persons residing in private nonprofit institutions or in boarding houses (except for persons in fraternities, sororities, or social clubs) as well as persons 65 years or over.	Do.
7. Product coverage.....	Any food or food product except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, imported packaged foods, and imported meats or meat products.	Includes items necessary for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation.	do.....	Includes imported food or food products where Secretary determines that comparable domestic items are not reasonably available; nonfood products which Secretary determines to be essential for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation; meals to residents of private nonprofit institutions or boarding houses and to persons over 65 by private nonprofit organizations or schools.	Do.
8. Store coverage.....	Establishment or house-to-house trade route that sells food to households for home consumption.	As in Foley-Green bill.....	do.....	Same as in present program plus private nonprofit institutions or boarding houses and private nonprofit organizations or schools which provide meals to persons 65 years or over and DOD commissaries for households otherwise eligible to utilize them.	Do.
9. Income eligibility level..	State agency to determine consistent with income standards used in federally aided public assistance programs.	Secretary to set minimum income eligibility level for purchasing adequate diet at no less than \$4,000 for household of 4 or the equivalent as well as maximum income level for participation, with possible regional variations.	Secretary to establish uniform national standards of eligibility in consultation with Secretary of HEW (emergency eligibility standards to help disaster victims on a temporary basis).	Secretary to set eligibility standards with maximum disposable income criteria to be equal to 4 times the cost of the low-cost food plan as varied for household size, composition, 4 regions, and rural-nonrural areas.	Do.
Example: Family of 4 with 2 school-children.	\$1,800 (Virginia) to \$4,140 (Alaska, New York).	\$4,000.....	\$3,600.....	New York City, \$6,530; rural Vermont, \$4,550; Cleveland, \$6,030; rural Iowa, \$4,220; Atlanta, \$5,450; rural Mississippi, \$3,810; Los Angeles, \$6,160; rural Utah, \$4,310.	Do.
10. Resource limitation on eligibility.	State agency to determine.....	State agency to fix subject to Secretary's approval, but no inclusion of income realized through liquidation of resources.	Secretary to establish as part of uniform national eligibility standards.	Secretary to determine maximum value for personal or real property owned by eligible household.	Do.
11. Method of certification..	Determined by State welfare agency (forms and investigation).	Certification solely by execution of affidavit prescribed by Secretary.	No change.....	Certification solely on execution of affidavit prescribed by Secretary.	Do.
12. Challenge to certification.	No provision.....	No change.....	State agency to grant fair hearing and prompt determination to any aggrieved household affected in participation.	Operating agency to have right to challenge information included in affidavit before panel of 3 appointed by Secretary with challenged household to participate on basis of affidavit information during pendency of challenge.	Do.

Item	Present act	Senate substitute (S. 2547)	Nixon-May bill (H.R. 12222)	Foley-Green bill (H.R. 13423)	Page bill (H.R. 12430)
13. Penalties	Criminal offense to knowingly acquire coupons in unauthorized manner.	No prosecution on basis of any information or statements contained in affidavit, except for fraud.	No change	Additional criminal offense for knowingly making a false affidavit; enforcement by special unit within Office of Inspector General known as the Food Stamp Squad.	Do.
14. Interjurisdictional certification.	No provision	As in Foley-Green bill.	do	Certification valid for 60 days if household moves to another political subdivision in which program is operating.	Do.
15. Place of coupon issuance.	Purchase at banks, credit unions, welfare agency offices, poverty agencies, local businesses.	Purchase through post offices, participating retail food stores or other participation insuring convenient manner, including banks, and credit unions.	do	Purchase through operating agency or, if operating agency delegates responsibility, from post offices, banks, credit union, community action agencies, and other public or private non-profit agencies.	Do.
16. Frequency of coupon issuance.	At least monthly	At least weekly	No change from present program.	At least weekly	No change.
17. Method of coupon purchase.	Transfer for cash	Cash or deduction of charge by State from federally aided public assistance payments when household so elects plus permission to purchase portion of full coupon allotment with proportionate reduction in charge.	Cash or deduction of charge by State from federally aided public assistance payments when household so authorizes and Secretaries of USDA and HEW approve.	Cash or deduction of charge by State from federally aided public assistance payments or from Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits by Federal Government when household so authorizes.	Do.
18. Price of coupons	Amount equivalent to household's normal expenditures for food.	No more than 25 percent of household income to be charged any eligible household (test of reasonable investment).	No more than 30 percent of household income to be charged any eligible household.	If income is between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{2}{3}$ of low-cost food plan (\$40 to \$80 a month for average family of 4)—no more than 5 percent of disposable income. If income is between $\frac{2}{3}$ and $1\frac{1}{4}$ of plan (\$80 to \$160 a month)—no more than 10 percent of disposable income. If income is between $1\frac{1}{4}$ and 2 times plan (\$160 to \$240 a month)—no more than 15 percent disposable income. If income is between 2 and 3 times plan (\$240 to \$360 a month)—no more than 25 percent of disposable income.	Do.
19. Free coupons	None, except in 2 counties in South Carolina for families of 3 or less with less than \$20 of income a month and families of 4 or more with less than \$30 of income a month.	To households with income less than $\frac{1}{4}$ the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet (now \$767 or $\frac{1}{2}$ of \$1,534 June 1969 cost of low-cost food plan—approximately \$64 a month).	To households with little or no incomes or other financial resources under standards prescribed by Secretary (less than \$30 a month for family of 4).	If household's disposable income is less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ percent of low-cost food plan applicable to household (\$40 a month for average family of 4).	None, except that properly supervised employment, service, or public work equivalent in value to cost may be substituted therefor.
20. Total value of coupons	Such amount as will provide household with an opportunity more nearly to obtain a low-cost nutritionally adequate diet with a range of from \$58 a month (southern family of 4 with income under \$30 a month) to \$100 (northern family of 4 with income of \$325 a month).	Low-cost food plan or \$127-plus a month for a family of 4 to be equivalent to nutritionally adequate diet, with annual revision.	Economy food plan or \$100 a month for a family of 4 to be equivalent to nutritionally adequate diet.	Low-cost food plan defined as nutritionally adequate, taking into account regional and rural—nonrural food price differentials—(between \$108.80 a month in rural Mississippi and \$135 a month in New York City for a family of 4).	No change
21. Federal administrative responsibility.	Food Stamp Division of Consumer and Marketing Service.	No change	Food Stamp Division transferred to new Food and Nutrition Service.	Commodity Credit Corporation with 7-man Board of Directors (Secretary, Under Secretary, and 5 Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture) to oversee with daily operations by Food Stamp Division in new Food and Nutrition Service.	Do.
22. State and local administrative responsibility.	State agency must request program and set plan of priorities among counties which desire to participate. Possible program revocation by Secretary if State agency fails to comply substantially with act, regulations, or State plan of operation and State fails to correct such failure within reasonable time of notification thereof by Secretary.	Authority for Secretary to operate programs directly or to use other local public or private nonprofit organizations to administer State program if State fails after reasonable period to comply with the law or if Secretary determines that there is a need for the unrequested program or if no program is being operated after Jan. 1, 1971, or if Secretary determines that the ratio of participants to the poor is inadequate to effectuate act's purposes.	State agency must provide for operation of food stamp or commodity distribution program in each of its political subdivisions by June 30, 1970 (or 1971 if Secretary is willing because Governor notifies him of need for State legislative action), or else State cannot continue to participate in either program; State must provide for commodity distribution program until areas can be approved by Secretary for food stamps.	Secretary must directly administer program or administer it through private nonprofit agency when State agency has not submitted plan of operation for program in all of its political subdivisions, but only in nondesignated area. Secretary may so administer program if number of persons participating in an area is less than 50 percent of the OEO-classified number of poor persons in the area for 3 consecutive months after July 1, 1970. If Secretary fails to exercise discretion so to administer, he must report annually to the Congress his reasons for failing to do so and the reasons for the low level of program participation.	Do.
23. Payment of administrative costs.	Federal Government finances cost of bonus coupons and their printing and 62.5 percent of travel and salaries of State personnel engaged in certifying nonassistance households.	Secretary shall pay all issuance costs.	Same as in present program plus 62.5 percent of cost of hearing officials and outreach personnel.	Secretary permitted to pay State agencies 50 percent of their administrative costs including all certification and issuance costs, and up to 100 percent of administrative costs to private nonprofit agencies operating the program or a simultaneous commodity program.	Do.

Item	Present act	Senate substitute (S. 2547)	Nixon-May bill (H.R. 12222)	Foley-Green bill (H.R. 13423)	Poage bill (H.R. 12430)
24. Simultaneous commodity distribution and food stamp issuance.	Not unless emergency situation caused by a national or other disaster as determined by Secretary—interpreted to exclude long-term, nonnatural disasters.	Permitted during temporary emergency; in any county during the transition period from commodity distribution to stamps until food stamp participants exceeds average of commodity participants in 3 most recent prestamp months; and at request of State agency if State agrees to pay distribution costs of program.	Secretary may authorize for whatever period he determines necessary upon State agency request to effect orderly program transition (3 months?) with continued limited Federal payment of administrative costs of both programs or upon State agency request if State agrees to finance all of commodity distribution costs.	Permitted during temporary emergencies; at State agency request in program transition period; at State agency request at any time if State agrees to pay distribution program costs (other than food); and at request of private nonprofit agency which wishes to run distribution program.	Do.
25. Program outreach....	No provision.....	As in Foley-Green bill plus requirement that State make every possible effort to insure that all eligible households are certified.	State agency must undertake effective action to inform poor of program's availability and benefits and insure their participation including use of services of other federally funded organizations.	Potentially eligible households must be informed of program's existence and given aid in making application.	Do.
26. Education.....	No provision other than administrators should take steps, including the coordination of other bodies' informational and educational efforts, to insure that participants obtain needed staple foods, particularly those in abundant or surplus supply.	Participants to be afforded nutrition counseling and home economics services through voluntary cooperation of Federal, State, local, or private agencies.	No change.....	As in Senate substitute.....	No change.

**DRAFTING OF 19 YEAR OLDS**

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with the consideration of H.R. 14001, the

Selective Service Amendment Act of 1969, coming before the membership tomorrow, I feel it is imperative we place in the RECORD and consider the statistics of U.S. casualties in South Vietnam by age and military service as of July 1969. Time and again, I have asked myself, Is 19 years of age the most optimal at which to draft and send our men into combat?

Should 18,116 of our country's best 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old men have been sent into combat, most of whom never having had the opportunity to vote for the men who sent them off to war. I hope my colleagues will give much consideration to the issue of whether we should draft 19-year-olds first.

The tabulation follows:

U.S. CASUALTIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA BY AGE AND MILITARY SERVICE

Attained age	Military service					Total	Attained age	Military service					Total
	USA	USN	USCG	USMC	USAF			USA	USN	USCG	USMC	USAF	
<b>Hostile deaths through July 1969:</b>							<b>Nonhostile deaths through July 1969:</b>						
17.....	7	0	0	2	0	9	17.....	0	1	0	0	0	1
18.....	859	8	0	1,432	7	2,299	18.....	153	12	0	141	0	306
19.....	2,823	93	0	3,096	7	6,019	19.....	417	55	0	292	7	771
20.....	6,345	238	0	3,197	18	9,798	20.....	795	79	0	365	21	1,250
21.....	4,323	215	0	1,625	24	6,187	21.....	693	87	0	194	32	996
22.....	2,164	137	0	765	28	3,094	22.....	370	54	0	71	15	510
23.....	1,696	92	0	472	24	2,284	23.....	269	42	0	49	14	374
24.....	1,296	72	0	310	37	1,715	24.....	198	33	0	45	16	292
25.....	961	65	0	203	46	1,275	25.....	150	36	1	25	16	235
26.....	660	46	0	128	30	864	26.....	98	25	0	26	17	166
27.....	367	23	0	83	41	514	27.....	74	18	1	12	10	115
28.....	276	24	0	70	47	417	28.....	66	15	0	13	15	109
29.....	270	14	0	63	43	390	29.....	58	14	0	8	14	94
30.....	208	22	0	42	38	310	30.....	66	14	0	10	18	108
31.....	229	18	0	50	34	331	31.....	48	12	0	6	8	74
32.....	183	21	0	59	33	296	32.....	58	14	0	5	21	98
33.....	165	11	0	43	39	258	33.....	48	12	0	7	16	83
34.....	179	5	1	35	35	255	34.....	51	11	0	5	21	88
35.....	158	20	0	28	32	238	35.....	47	10	0	8	20	85
36.....	160	14	0	34	26	234	36.....	51	4	0	4	15	74
37.....	138	8	1	39	32	218	37.....	54	14	0	9	18	95
38.....	111	10	0	11	21	153	38.....	33	14	0	4	15	66
39.....	76	11	0	14	17	118	39.....	46	7	0	6	7	66
40.....	61	10	0	7	10	88	40.....	22	9	0	3	7	41
41.....	38	3	0	7	12	60	41.....	19	1	0	3	6	29
42.....	25	4	0	8	4	41	42.....	21	7	0	3	4	35
43.....	25	1	0	5	3	34	43.....	13	3	0	3	10	29
44.....	18	1	0	1	5	25	44.....	19	0	0	1	4	24
45.....	9	1	0	2	4	16	45.....	10	2	0	3	5	18
46.....	3	0	0	1	4	8	46.....	16	2	0	1	3	22
47.....	8	1	0	3	5	17	47.....	3	2	0	1	5	11
48.....	7	0	0	3	2	12	48.....	9	0	0	1	4	14
49.....	2	0	0	0	0	2	49.....	10	2	0	2	2	16
50.....	3	0	0	1	1	5	50.....	7	0	0	0	2	9
51 and over.....	4	1	0	1	2	8	51 and over.....	13	2	0	2	5	22
Unknown.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unknown.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total, all ages.....	23,857	1,189	2	11,840	704	37,592	Total, all ages.....	3,985	611	2	1,335	393	6,326

**THE \$20,000 FARM PAYMENTS LIMITATION**

**HON. PAUL FINDLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture appropriations bill for 1970 is

now being considered by a Senate-House conference. One of the most important decisions to be made by the conferees is whether to retain the \$20,000 limitation on payments to individual farmers which the House included in the bill. Because of the misinformation which exists on this question, I am including the text of my letter of today to Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin. As my letter indicates, it would be beneficial to both

the American farmer and the taxpayer to retain the payments limitation in the final bill.

Text of letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
October 29, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,  
Secretary of Agriculture.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the interest of better income for cotton farmers as well as the

broader interests of all taxpayers I urge that you take the unusual but thoroughly justified step of rescinding your decisions of October 15 and October 17 calling for an increase of one million acres planted to cotton for the 1970 crop.

In this letter and the tabulation attached I will set forth the reasons for this recommendation. In summary, it would appear indefensible for the Department of Agriculture to call for increased cotton production in 1970 just a few weeks after you had warned the Congress of a costly buildup of unneeded cotton inventory if the \$20,000 payment limitation feature is retained in the appropriation bill for agriculture, now in conference.

A further reason to drop plans for increased acreage arises from the administrative cost of going through the adjustment and notification procedure. This procedure, which has not been gone through for years because the allotment has remained unchanged, will add needless expense to the operation of the ASCS offices. Because the procedure is necessarily involved and requires time to carry out, I feel confident that the cancellation of plans for the larger allotment can still be accomplished.

I therefore urge that the Department of Agriculture maintain the 1970 acreage allotment for cotton at the present level of 16.2 million acres, as was originally set, rather than lifting it to 17.15 million acres. This would permit the Senate and House conferees on the 1970 Agriculture Appropriations bill to retain the \$20,000 payments limitation amendment voted by the House and at the same time, according to the Department's own figures, save taxpayers \$63 million over projected expenditures for 1970 and increase income to cotton farmers by \$172 million compared with 1969.

The only reason to increase the acreage allotment for cotton is "to assure the maintenance of adequate stocks in the United States to provide a continuous and stable supply of the different qualities of cotton needed in the U.S. and in foreign cotton-consuming countries." (USDA Bulletin 3215-69.) When you testified before the Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 4, 1969, you asserted that the "snapback provision" of the cotton program which would be activated by the payments limitation would result in additional cotton production which would have to be purchased by the government to the extent that it would cost the taxpayer an additional \$160 million over the cost of the projected program.

However, events since then have proved that the assumptions upon which your staff based this calculation were grossly inaccurate. The chief miscalculation was the prediction that under snapback the 1970 cotton crop would yield 550 pounds per acre. This yield was based upon the then projected 1969 cotton crop yield of 520 pounds per acre. In fact, the actual yield for this year is now estimated at only 450 pounds per acre—a downward adjustment of 70 pounds per acre or 777 million pounds for the 1969 cotton crop. In fact, this adjustment was given as the reason for the call for increased production of cotton next year.

This substantial change in forecasting cotton production prompted me to request the Department to revise its forecast for next year's cotton crop, upon which you based your conclusion that snapback would cost an additional \$160 million.

I have just received the revised figures from the Department. After reviewing them, one must conclude that, rather than increasing the acreage allotment to assure an adequate

supply of cotton, the Department should maintain it at the original 1970 level and accept the snapback provision and the \$20,000 payments limitation.

If this were done, according to the Department's own figures, under snapback cotton production would only slightly exceed the revised 1970 level of production forecast if 17.15 million acres are planted. This would assure the maintenance of adequate stocks of cotton, while at the same time, again according to the Department's own figures, save the American taxpayer approximately \$63 million over what the Department now proposes to spend for the cotton program next year. This savings would result because the total expenditure for inventory buildup, storage, payments, and loans under snapback would amount to only \$987 million, while the Department now anticipates a cost of \$1,050 million with an acreage allotment of over 17 million acres.

In addition, it should be pointed out, that the largest item making up this expenditure—\$590 million for CCC cotton inventory—cannot truly be considered a "cost", as you have maintained. Based on long experience, this inventory would be resold at an average price of \$120 per bale, thereby even further reducing the cost of the cotton program under snapback.

What is significant, however, is that if the Department of Agriculture maintains the acreage allotment at the originally announced 1970 level of 16.2 million acres, according to the Department's own figures it will actually cost less under a \$20,000 payments limitation—not more—than the cotton program the Department is presently planning.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,  
Representative in Congress.

TABLE 5.—UPLAND COTTON: ESTIMATES OF BASIC DATA FOR 1968 THROUGH 1970 CROPS (BASED ON PRESENT PROGRAM) AND 1970 UNDER THE SNAPBACK PROVISION

Item	1968 crop	1979 crop	Revised 1969 crop <sup>1</sup>	1970 crop, present program	Revised 1970 crop, present program <sup>1</sup>	1970 crop, snapback	Revised 1970 crop, snapback <sup>1</sup>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
<b>Acreage (thousands):</b>							
Allotted.....	16.2	16.2	16.2	16.2	17.15	16.2	17.15
CAP, CR, adjustment, etc.....	1.0	.9	.9	.9	1.0	.9	1.0
Diverted for payment.....	3.2					2.4	2.5
Planted.....	10.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	12.5	12.7	13.4
Harvested.....	10.1	11.1	11.1	11.2	11.6	12.1	12.7
Field: Pound per acre harvested.....	515	520	450	530	500	550	520
<b>Supply and utilization (1,000 bales):</b>							
Production (including imports and city crop).....	10.9	12.1	10.5	12.5	12.2	14.0	13.8
Beginning stocks (including pre-season ginnings).....	6.3	6.6	6.4	7.2	6.1	7.2	6.1
Domestic disappearance.....	8.1	8.3	8.1	8.4	8.3	8.4	8.3
Exports.....	2.5	3.2	2.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Ending stocks.....	6.6	7.2	6.1	7.8	6.5	9.3	8.1
CCC stocks, July 31.....	3.0	3.6	3.1	4.2	3.5	6.3	5.1
Support price per pound (middling 1 in.) (cents).....	20.25	20.25	20.25	20.25	20.25	32.0	32.0
Support price per pound (average of crop) (cents).....	19.69	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.90	31.25	31.25
Price support payment rate (cents).....	12.24	14.73	14.73	17.31	17.19		
Diversion payment rate (cents).....						* 10	* 10
<b>Producer payments.....</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>922</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>Farm value of production (million dollars).....</b>	<b>1,192</b>	<b>1,290</b>	<b>1,139</b>	<b>1,302</b>	<b>1,240</b>	<b>2,172</b>	<b>2,141</b>
<b>Total (million dollars).....</b>	<b>1,976</b>	<b>2,116</b>	<b>1,965</b>	<b>2,268</b>	<b>2,162</b>	<b>2,328</b>	<b>2,297</b>
<b>Major receipts or expenditures (million dollars):</b>							
Net change in stocks at loan rate.....	-230	-60	-30	-60	-40	-432	-313
Storage, handling, and loan settlement.....	-3	-18	-18	-20	-18	-30	-27
Producer payments.....	-742	-826	-826	-966	-922	-156	-156
Snapback loss on sales or loan repayments.....						-595	-590
Subtotal, price support expenditures.....	-975	-904	-874	-1,046	-980	-1,213	-1,086
Public Law 480.....	-82	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70
Estimated major expenditures.....	-1,057	-974	-944	-1,116	-1,050	-1,283	-1,156
Change in CCC stocks (million ba. es from June 30 of prior year).....	+2.2	+6	+3	+6	.4	+2.7	2.0

<sup>1</sup> Revised by USDA, October 24, to reflect 17,150,000-acre allotment, reduced yield, and current outlook.

<sup>2</sup> 10.76 plus 6 cents.

<sup>3</sup> Volume.

<sup>4</sup> Fiscal year.

**THE 1970 UPLAND COTTON QUOTA AND ALLOTMENT INCREASED AND ADDITIONAL DETAILS OF THE 1970 UPLAND COTTON PROGRAM ANNOUNCED**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced a revised national marketing

quota of 16,008,333 bales (standard bales of 500 pounds, gross weight) and a revised national acreage allotment of 17 million acres for the 1970 crop of upland cotton. This represents an increase of 941,666 bales in the quota and an increase of one million acres in

the allotment from that announced on October 1, 1969 (USDA 3046-69).

The increase is brought about by the declining 1969 crop prospects caused primarily by abnormal weather conditions throughout much of the Cotton Belt. The September 8

Crop Report, on which the original determinations were made, indicated a 1969 crop of 10,984,000 bales. The current report indicates production of 10,428,000 bales. The increase in the quota and allotment is necessary in order to assure the maintenance of adequate stocks in the United States to provide a continuous and stable supply of the different qualities of cotton needed in the U.S. and in foreign cotton-consuming countries.

Revised State allotments for the 1970 crop will be announced within a few days.

Also announced today were the following additional provisions of the 1970-crop program for upland cotton.

**DOMESTIC ACREAGE ALLOTMENT**

For the 1970 crop, the farm domestic acreage allotment has been set at 65 percent of the farm acreage allotment, the minimum authorized by law. Farmers who sign up to participate in the program and who plant at least 90 percent of their farm's domestic acreage allotment, but not in excess of the permitted acreage for the farm, will be eligible for price-support loans and, for price-support payments on the farm domestic allotment.

**SKIP-ROW RULES**

The skip-row rules which were in effect for the 1969 crop will be applicable to the 1970 crop. In general, under these rules, only the land actually planted to cotton is counted as cotton land in determining compliance with the program provisions.

**LEASE AND SALE OF ALLOTMENTS**

The final date for filing applications for the transfer of cotton allotments is December 31, 1969. Producers in 381 cotton-producing counties in the U.S. have approved for 1970 the transfer of allotments to farms outside the county. Allotments, however, cannot be transferred from one State to another.

**PROJECTED YIELDS**

A projected national yield of 500 pounds per acre has been established for the 1970 crop, a reduction of 45 pounds per acre from that set for the last three crop years.

The reduction announced today reflects the failure of cotton yields to realize the levels expected on the basis of trends a few years ago. The projected yield for 1967-68-69 crops was established at 545 pounds because of previous upward trend. During the past four years, yields have been leveling off and have trended down since 1965. The 1970 national projected yield is based on 1964-68 harvested yields (497 pounds average per acre), adjusted for abnormal weather, for trends, and for changes in production practices.

Projected State yields will be announced within a few days.

**USDA ANNOUNCES STATE PROJECTED YIELDS, REVISED ALLOTMENTS FOR 1970 UPLAND COTTON**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced revised State acreage allotments for the 1970 crop of upland cotton. Also announced were State projected yields.

The new State acreage allotments result from the USDA announcement Oct. 15 (Press Release USDA 3215-69) that the national acreage allotment for 1970 upland cotton had been increased from the 16 million acres set earlier to the new allotment of 17 million acres. The increase was brought about by declining 1969-crop prospects.

Figures on the State projected yields, released today, average out to the 500 pound-per-acre national yield announced on Oct. 15. The State yields are apportioned among cotton-growing counties and are used in calculating price-support payments under the cotton program.

The national projected yield is down 45 pounds per acre from last year and reflects

the failure of cotton yields to realize levels expected on the basis of trends a few years ago.

Other details of the 1970 upland cotton

program—such as price-support loan and payment levels—will be announced later.

Following are State acreage allotments and projected yields:

State	1970 State's share of national allotment (acres)	1970 State's share of national reserve (acres)	1970 total allotment available for States (acres)	1969 total allotment available for States (acres)
Alabama.....	1,002,040	21,260	1,023,300	971,351
Arizona.....	352,807	417	353,224	332,659
Arkansas.....	1,411,605	3,759	1,415,364	1,331,705
California.....	785,097	1,525	786,622	741,085
Florida.....	33,116	2,405	35,521	34,543
Georgia.....	860,703	16,666	877,369	833,157
Illinois.....	2,946	16	2,962	2,990
Kansas.....	13	2	15	15
Kentucky.....	7,266	186	7,452	7,104
Louisiana.....	592,079	6,866	598,945	566,333
Mississippi.....	1,626,299	15,918	1,642,217	1,549,884
Missouri.....	379,796	1,328	381,124	358,735
Nevada.....	2,690	1,000	3,690	3,533
New Mexico.....	183,042	428	183,470	172,682
North Carolina.....	462,493	17,149	479,642	458,253
Oklahoma.....	790,253	7,754	798,007	754,266
South Carolina.....	705,975	13,491	719,466	682,669
Tennessee.....	564,828	11,664	576,492	546,807
Texas.....	7,220,502	26,986	7,247,488	6,835,134
Virginia.....	16,450	1,180	17,630	17,095
U.S. total.....	17,000,000	150,000	17,150,000	16,200,000

**1970 PROJECTED YIELDS**

State	Amount
Alabama.....	465
Arizona.....	1,104
Arkansas.....	517
California.....	1,045
Florida.....	340
Georgia.....	447
Illinois.....	434
Kansas.....	216
Kentucky.....	577
Louisiana.....	614
Mississippi.....	689
Missouri.....	529
Nevada.....	835
New Mexico.....	691
North Carolina.....	354
Oklahoma.....	285
South Carolina.....	467
Tennessee.....	552
Texas.....	395
Virginia.....	320

**THE MIRACLE METS**

**HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, the New York Mets defied the sports-writers, the oddsmakers, and the Baltimore Orioles to become baseball's world champions.

Their victory sent the city of New York into a state of euphoria. All New Yorkers share the feelings of immense pride and joy in the Mets' victory and in the realization of their impossible dream.

I salute and congratulate the amazing Mets on their tremendous victory.

I am inserting in the RECORD the following editorial which was broadcast over WINS radio in New York on October 17 and October 18:

**THE MIRACLE METS**

(By Peter E. Schruth)

Rarely has New York City seen the kind of wild eyed enthusiasm and joy that swept through this normally reserved town the moment the Mets clinched the World Series. Strangers greeted each other and danced in the streets. Tons of ticker tape and any other form of paper that was dispensable and near

at hand came pouring out of office windows. It was like Christmas, New Year's and the Fourth of July all rolled up into one.

What caused this tremendous outpouring? We suspect that millions of New Yorkers have been waiting for this moment ever since the Dodgers and Giants followed the gold rush trail to California. It was eminently right that when the Mets reached the pinnacle of glory that had so long seemed beyond their grasp, they should be led by former Dodger Gil Hodges.

The rags-to-riches story of the Mets is the American dream translated into real life. To those who hope for a better life, a better world, a better day tomorrow, the Mets are proof positive that such things are possible. If there is one thing everyone can learn from the Mets and their legions of loyal fans, it is that faith and perseverance still pay off.

WINS joins millions of Mets fans in saluting our local baseball heroes who are now Baseball Champions of the World. They've given New Yorkers something that we can all get together and cheer about—a gift for which all of us are deeply grateful.

**THE MORATORIUM—ITS QUESTIONABLE RESULTS**

**HON. J. HERBERT BURKE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the critics of the Vietnam war have removed their gloves and have come out swinging.

As questions pro and con build, we must pause and reflect rather than jump to conclusions as to the honest result of the recent moratorium. It is true that many of those who supported the movement are Americans who sincerely believe that the United States should withdraw its forces from a war which they feel it cannot or is not trying to win.

I am sure, however, that all people in this country, whether they supported the moratorium or not, favor peace and do not advocate war; but by the same token,

we must remember that Rennie Davis, one of the eight revolutionaries on trial in Chicago for inciting riots during the Democratic Convention last year, told a rally in Grant Park at that time that North Vietnam has a "secret weapon," which secret weapon is a "revolutionary people." He said that there would be no peace, therefore, in this country until every soldier is brought out of Vietnam and that our system, which he called "the imperialist system," must be destroyed.

He and the other anarchists in this country, who unfortunately are being supported by many well-meaning Americans, argue that a Communist takeover in South Vietnam, either through the imposition of a transition coalition regime or by a military victory, would at least be a Vietnamese settlement and that this type of settlement would preclude our interfering further in Vietnam.

It is strange that these people, who view our part in the war as utterly immoral, forget the mass graves of the civilians in Hue, the ancient capital after its temporary occupation by the Communists, or the blood bath that will follow a complete American pullout.

Certainly, no matter how many marched in the moratorium, they cannot honestly fault President Nixon with regard to his efforts to end the war in Vietnam. He has taken significant steps to end our American involvement. He has reduced the number of American troops there and has promised to reduce them still further.

As a nation, we have always been a peace-loving and freedom-loving country and have never been satisfied with one unless we had the other—not only for ourselves but for the other peoples of the world, who share our love for peace and freedom.

Less than a year ago, the American people went to the polls, as our system of government provides, and in an orderly process, elected a new President. The American people spoke and changes in our position in Vietnam are being made. And, while perhaps there has not been as much progress as many, myself included, would have liked, in my opinion, there has been progress made and more will be made.

The real question, however, is how or in what manner shall we close our involvement in Vietnam?

Those who supported the moratorium in the House of Representatives, one after another, debated their position long into the night the evening before the moratorium. I, as one listener, came to the conclusion that although they spoke in opposition to the war, yet they really had no better answer to solve the problem than the course which the administration is trying to follow; namely, for gradual, meaningful withdrawal of our troops and orderly disengagement from the conflict, without complete surrender.

When the speeches which were made and the results of the moratorium itself have been analyzed, I can but come to the conclusion that the debate has come, after full cycle, back to the only conclusion—that is, the constitutional respon-

sibility for bringing the conflict to an end rests with the President of the United States.

The President has stated that a negotiated settlement must include withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces from Cambodia and Laos. A unilateral withdrawal by the United States would leave Communist forces undisturbed, and the North Vietnamese have at least 50,000 troops in Laos, even though they pledged to respect neutrality and territorial integrity, under the 1960 Geneva accord.

No matter what our feeling is about the war, let us not forget that the real truth is that without American assistance, Laos would fall to the Communists.

There are those opponents of the war who argue that the United States has no vital interest in Southeast Asia. Although I do not agree with this contention, we should remember that even if it were true, we have committed ourselves to an obligation and we must ask ourselves what will happen to the credibility of our military prowess and our will to defend if we allow ourselves to withdraw unilaterally from Southeast Asia.

We would be considered a weak sister and such a mistaken view could be an open invitation to more serious agitation all over the world, and which could result in world war III.

If we honestly analyze this question, then we must admit that all hope of stability and peace would vanish from the earth. Certainly, an American defeat in Vietnam would also give the revolutionaries in this country a tremendous purpose to redouble their efforts to destroy our American system of government.

The point that I am driving at is that we cannot be successful in having a secured peace unless we indicate our strength of purpose to preserve freedom in the world, if we are to preserve our own. Impatience can be the word that may well lead us to destruction, for certainly it must be apparent that the Communist influence in the past was halted only when we have proudly, as a nation, said to them "We have had enough."

Surely, we must recognize that the preservation of freedom will not come by our capitulation to communism, nor will peace come unless the Communists themselves are sincerely interested in a movement for world peace.

The answer then as to what the results of the moratorium are still remains unanswered. Certainly, it did not constitute an ultimatum that we surrender. To me, if it was an ultimatum at all, it was one for our political leaders to work for peace—but still for a peace with honor and without surrender. We must guarantee to the American people that our Nation will remain strong, free, and with the hope, for ourselves and our children and their children, that peace will ultimately be a reality throughout the world.

I cannot, however, take the same position that some do in our country—that we are the bad guys, nor can I put blinkers on my eyes and presume that our Nation does not have enemies without as well as within.

I feel strongly that the road to peace is a bumpy one and that it can be achieved, but only if those nations which have instigated trouble throughout the world, namely, the Communist nations, accept a dual responsibility with us as peacemakers.

Those that took part in the moratorium have a right to oppose war. I want peace in the United States. We all want peace, but that has always been our Nation's goal.

So, why not ask the Communists what their goal is. Yes, you know that their goal is world communism, but we should remember that only the United States and its allies stand in the way.

#### SWEDEN CUTS AUTO REPAIR COSTS

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the spiraling costs of automobile repairs coupled with the shortage of qualified mechanics have become an ever increasing problem in the United States. But we do not fret by ourselves. Among other countries, Sweden has studied this matter thoroughly.

The Swedes have the highest number of automobiles per person in Europe. Thus, they have had a real stake in reducing repair costs. As a matter of fact, they have done just that. In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Mr. Dag Wedmalm, second vice president of the Folksam Insurance Group, stated that Sweden has reduced auto repair costs by as much as 15 percent.

What made this possible? Apparently one reason was that insurance company schedules prompted auto manufacturers to produce cars that could be insured at lower rates. The schedules themselves were not devised in a vacuum either. The Folksam Group itself operates a repair shop and thus learns firsthand how simplified design can lead to fewer, simpler repairs and greater traffic safety. It also finds out what rates are appropriate for given cars.

Though Sweden has a somewhat different economic structure from the United States, perhaps our auto manufacturers, insurance companies, repair companies, and consumers alike could profit from a study of Mr. Wedmalm's testimony.

The text of his remarks follow:

#### STATEMENT OF DAG WEDMALM

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: My name is Dag Wedmalm. I am the second vice president in charge of automobile insurance of The Folksam Group in Sweden.

Folksam is a cooperative insurance company which operates entirely without private profit objectives. The democratic administration of Folksam is a guarantee of the company's efforts to serve the policy holders. In automobile insurance we have grown rapidly to become the leading firm in Sweden in this branch. Close to 30 per cent of motor vehicles in Sweden are insured by Folksam.

We consider that this development is largely a result of our active premium policy and our efforts in the interests of motorists. Incidentally, every second Swede has an insurance of some kind with Folksam.

Sweden has had a very rapid development of motoring during the 1950s. In 1950 there was 1 car to every 20 persons, in 1960 1 to every 5.5 and, we estimate, in 1970 there will be 1 car to every 3 inhabitants. At present Sweden has the highest percentage of automobiles in Europe.

This rapid evolution created problems, in that highways and streets for example, were not improved at a corresponding rate. These problems were felt by the Swedish insurance companies—not only through the rapidly increasing numbers of claims but also because costs for automobile repairs rose more steeply than the cost of other goods and services. As a measure of this, I can note that between 1955 and 1964 the index for car repairs rose from 100 to 232, while the general consumer price index rose only to 136. These figures must be considered clear evidence that the automobile trade was out of step with the general pattern of development.

The unfavorable pattern of auto repair prices was the main reason why Folksam started its own repair business, in 1964. Another reason was the desire to gain insight into traffic safety as affected by repairs and design aspects.

In our desire to study the way in which other countries tackle automobile repairing it was natural that we should look to the U.S.—the home of motoring. A study group—of which I was a member—visited the U.S. in 1964 and studied the methods which American insurance companies and auto repair shops applied to the problems which we were facing. This trip inspired many important cost cutting initiatives in the field of damage repairs.

Our experience of shop work and what we saw in the U.S. soon told us that efficiency was not sufficiently high in the Swedish automobile repair trade. The question was, how should we attack the problem in order to achieve greater efficiency and thereby reduce costs. After an examination of statistics, especially the frequency of various types of repair, we gave priority to those cost cutting measures which would give a speedy result.

Discussion with Folksam brought forward the viewpoint that Folksam, despite its size as an automobile insurance company, could not alone influence the trade to a desirable degree. When Folksam put out the first feelers towards cooperation in 1965 this resulted in the formation of the Insurance Companies' Automobile Damage Repair Committee. The fact that insurance companies cooperated in matters of common interest, in this case the high cost of damage repairs, was not considered to affect their ability or will to compete in the premium sector. Events have proved the correctness of this assumption.

The work of The Automobile Damage Repair Committee towards cost cutting measures in the automobile repair field led to the thought that motorists ought to pay premiums based on different grounds to those adopted earlier. This train of thought suggested a tariff which took into account cost of repairs to a given make of car and also other significant factors, such as the frequency of claims. Such a system would give fairer premiums and also give the automobile manufacturer an interest in cost reduction measures, since a lower premium class should make a car easier to sell.

It was against this background that the insurance companies formed an Automobile Classification Committee in 1965, with the job of preparing a classification system that all companies would adopt. In Sweden we have basically three types of coverage: *third party liability insurance* which is compul-

sory, *comprehensive* which includes collision, fire, glass breakage and theft and *partial coverage* including only fire, glass breakage and theft.

In 1965 there were statistics giving average claims and claim frequency, related to the compulsory third party insurance, but these were not differentiated in a way that permitted the distinctions of different makes and models.

The first job, therefore, was to design a pattern for the classification of standard cars which took account of the factors that affect claim frequency. For the basic classification, engine power and the weight of the car were selected. The product of these two figures determined the placing of the car in one of nine premium classes. The jump in premium between each class was 15% of the basic premium.

Sports cars and tuned standard cars were given a penalty of 1 to 4 classes in view of their character and the increased risks. Each model of car was allocated a special code to facilitate the checking and statistical follow-up of the basic classification.

As regards collision insurance the basic classification was made mainly according to cost of repairs. Underlying this was knowledge of those parts on a car which are most susceptible to frequent damage. Information on this aspect was obtained from claim assessments by the insurance company assessors. After data processing, this material indicated which components on the car were responsible for the major portion of damage repair costs due to their frequency of damage and/or high repair costs. These components were selected for the calculation of the relative cost of repairs to each car model. The pattern, or "standard claim" that was thus built up was used to allocate each car to its appropriate collision insurance claim class. It was decided that there should be 26 such classes. The jump in premium between each class was to be 10% of the basic premium.

A standard model—the Volkswagen 1300—was chosen and this was given class code 10. The standard claim cost for each of the other models was then compared with that for the Volkswagen and class allocation was then made according to the predetermined increments in premium. This meant that, if a car carried a standard claim cost that was 10% above that for the Volkswagen then it would be placed in class 11, if the cost increase was 20% it would go in class 12, and so on. In the basic classification we also took account of the likelihood of a car being more frequently involved in claims than the average car. This might then result in it being placed in a higher class.

Partial coverage—that is fire, glass breakage and theft—was classified in the same way as collision. According to our experience, there exists close correlation between the relative costs of these types of coverages.

A computer program was designed, for common statistical processing, to provide a check on the correctness of the basic classification.

Given the very extensive and highly reliable statistical data, it is possible to alter the classification for such cars which may have been incorrectly placed. Furthermore it gives us an opportunity to modify the pattern for basic classification. This is a very important part of the work, since a dependable basic classification which requires correction only in exceptional cases is essential if the policyholders are to have full confidence in the system. At present, the classification is undergoing review on the basis of 1968 figures.

When the classification system and the classification of all models had been completed, the automobile manufacturers and their main distributors were informed as to the construction of the system and the factors which influence classification. Those companies which found that their models had

lost in consumer attraction compared with other models regarding insurance costs at once showed interest in the ways whereby they could reduce the classification of their products. The ensuing negotiations with the Automobile Classification Committee gave good results. As an example, General Motors cut their parts prices by 25%, Renault by 28%, Mercedes by 10-25% and Peugeot by 10%.

In order to further reduce repair costs a number of auto companies made efforts to increase the efficiency of the repair work. Manufacturers have also carried out design modifications in order to secure a lower premium class. On the Opel Kadett, for example, the front fender has been altered from welded to bolted design.

The effects of these measures on the premiums could be directly estimated as the Automobile Classification Committee knew the distribution of the cost of repairs and the frequency of damages on various parts of the car.

The system of classification of cars has meant that all the Swedish insurance companies now have a common system, whereby the relation between premiums for different cars is the same for all insurance companies. Cooperation in this sector has not prevented or restricted the ability or will to compete on premiums. Within the framework of the system, there is wide scope for competition between the insurance companies. For the companies, the system has offered a chance to effectively influence those costs which are most significant in premium fixing, i.e. damage repair costs, the tendency of a given car to result in personal injury claims, and the claims frequency for a given car. The costcutting efforts are, of course, of benefit to the consumer in that he pays lower insurance premiums.

At the Folksam repair shop we have consistently tried to reduce the cost of repairs. Efficient work methods, the right tools, careful planning of workplaces and materials handling—these are all important factors in the efficient operation of a repair business. We have carried out extensive experiments and trials, to some extent in cooperation with leading makers of tools. For a summary of the results, I would refer to the written reports of your hearings in December 1968.

We have found that running a repair business of our own has been beneficial in ways which include the following:

1. We have gained insight into the trade, which is particularly valuable in our central negotiations on pricing and in other ways.
2. We have the knowledge regarding which efficiency measures are necessary and feasible. By pointing to our own achievements we are able to influence the repair trade.
3. We are able to study repair techniques and methods from the traffic safety aspect. By passing on our observations to the trade we can prevent claims resulting from incorrectly performed repair work.
4. We can keep a check on the standard of repairs by regular dealers, by carrying out random inspections.

The proposals for efficiency measures and cost reductions that have emanated from the Folksam shop have been very well received by the trade. It may be appropriate to note that we have enjoyed particularly good cooperation with the Opel Division of General Motors.

In the field of traffic safety the Folksam repair shop has from April 1 this year commenced investigations of the internal safety of cars. As an insurance company, and through our workshop, we have access both to the damaged car and to details of any personal injuries that may have occurred. To secure correct medical assessments, we have started cooperation with appropriate experts.

I would here express the hope that we can establish cooperation with experts in

your country in the traffic safety sector. The exchange of experiences in this field would perhaps reduce the unfortunate consequences of driving.

In Sweden, certain makes of cars are covered by a 5-year collision warranty that includes the repair of damage to the car. As a rule, these warranties are re-insured with the Swedish insurance companies, who also undertake claim adjustment. Thus the insurance companies are able to guard the interests of the consumer as regards both premiums and quality.

The common classification system, the efforts of Folksan, and the work of the Automobile Damage Repair Committee towards greater efficiency and lower costs have resulted in the annual reduction of damage repair costs by about SKr 70 million (about 14 million dollars) for the Swedish insurance companies. This corresponds to some 15% of the annual claims costs for car repairs.

Cooperation on these matters is of the greatest significance. The Automobile Damage Repair Committee currently cooperates with similar committees in all the other Scandinavian countries and in several other European countries. These committees were formed after contacts with the Swedish committee. The problems in this field are international, and a common voice is more likely to win the ear of the auto manufacturers—e.g. in respect to design modifications which would lead to simplified repair methods and greater traffic safety.

#### FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the OEO family planning projects have been some of their most successful and I am pleased that this administration is giving them additional financial muscle by increasing their funds 50 percent—from \$15 million to \$22 million. There is no question that these services are badly needed.

This increased effort by Director Rumsfeld is part of this administration's goal to reach in the next 5 years the 5 million women in need of these services. The Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, has been studying this problem of administering family planning services to these 5 million women who want but cannot afford them or do not even know how or where to get them. The task force commends Director Rumsfeld for his recognition of this sorry situation and his rapid action to overcome the problem.

One needs only to look quickly at the report prepared by the Planned Parenthood-World Population Research Department to see how ineffective Federal, State, and local governments have been in providing such necessary services. There is certainly nothing new about the fact that unwanted pregnancies of our poor and near-poor women keep the incidence of infant mortality and mental retardation in America at one of the highest levels of all the developed countries.

President Nixon in his population message to the Congress in July stressed the need for action in this area. It seems to me that this fast response on the part of OEO and the fast action taken by Secretary Finch in establishing a new unit on family planning within the Health Services and Mental Health Administration is indicative of an intrinsic interest in our poor and near-poor citizens, and not just mere rhetoric.

#### NIAGARA FRONTIER GROWERS CO-OPERATIVE MARKET SERVES THE BUFFALO AREA WELL

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the farmers markets of a few years ago are passing from the scene in our cities and towns. They provide produce right from the fields—no cellophane wrapping.

For many years, we in Buffalo, N.Y., had the Broadway Market. Now that is gone.

We are fortunate, however, in still having the Niagara Growers Co-Operative Market, located at Bailey Avenue and Clinton Street.

Here, the farmers from the surrounding area bring their wares in the early morning and make them available for sale to our people. Some 550 farmers participate in this market.

When they arrive in the wee hours—lights starts going on about 3 o'clock in the morning—the farmers have a choice: They can sell their produce directly to the home consumers, or they can sell to a middleman who in turn resells to the consumers.

The Niagara Growers is headed by Henry Marquart of Orchard Park, N.Y. The Buffalo Produce Exchange is the credit, billing and standard-setting agency for the Niagara Frontier Food Terminal of which Edward A. Waters is executive secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo Evening News has captured the drama and the human relations of the Niagara Growers market in Buffalo in an excellent story in its October 18 edition, as follows:

#### FRUITS OF THE HARVEST POUR FROM FARMLAND TO MARKET

A day at the Niagara Frontier Growers Co-Operative Market starts when the stars are out.

On the fertile farms of Western New York, farmers like Floyd Salisbury of Wilson, load trucks with the fruits and vegetables of their acres and head toward Buffalo.

The sky—is still caped in black when Mr. Salisbury arrives at his stall.

All winter long, he and his wife, Hazel, have pruned the trees in their orchards.

"It's like a perfume factory when they blossom," he'll tell you, smiling at the heady May memory.

Now, at the market, as he arranges baskets of golden pears and ruddy apples with a large tender hand, is the climax:

The triumph over poor weather, insects, blight and perhaps, most threatening of all,

the temptation of the small farmer to abandon the land for city work.

But the day's battle for Floyd—"These fellows are rugged individualists," says Carlton S. Raines, market manager—is not won yet.

Upon his arrival at the 10-acre market place, Farmer Salisbury has two choices: to sell his produce himself, or to dispose of it through a middleman, who in turn, will resell it at a marked-up price.

Hucksters or "street curb brokers," as farmers who both raise and sell their crops call the middleman, with a faint curl of the lip, today compose about half of the stall operators on "Farmer's Walk": The teeming fruit, vegetable, flower, honey and cider-lined thoroughfare where about 550 farmers sell the harvest of their hearts and hands.

But the middleman does give the farmer some advantage; he enables him to dispose of his produce and return to the farm by sunup. In a day when farm labor is scarce, this helps.

Floyd Salisbury, however, a plaid beret on his head, and his face like an old portrait, stands his ground, as his father, Harry, and his grandfather, Guy, did before him. Only Guy ploughed his fields with oxen.

Around him, as the sky lightens in the east, the fruit of plant and vine shine and glow in exultant color. The "20-ounce" apples, the saffron squash, the lacey broccoli, the glossy peppers and the crimson tomatoes.

The mist of basil, the transparency of onions and the majestic purple grapes.

Against the backdrop, the drama of America's free enterprise system unfolds for Western New York farmers who each year bring about 30,000 loads of produce to the market.

Barter is the essence of the market, which does a \$3 million annual basis. Each man can demand his own price, based on the quality of his harvest and his own wits, guided of course, by State Department of Agriculture & Markets reports he has read or heard over the radio, which give the latest "going" rate.

Over-all, however, hovers both a catalyst and a threat: Produce is perishable, and must be sold while it's fresh.

As the sun streams down on the stalls, Farmer Salisbury pits his love of the land against reality.

Cross the street to the Niagara Frontier Food Terminal and see the wholesale side of the market business.

The long, low yellow brick buildings with their green, red, and pink and blue sheds have a carnival air.

Day starts with the greetings of locomotive whistles, bringing freight cars from across the country onto the terminal's dozen tracks.

About 3 AM the lights begin to go on in the 40 stalls of the "commission men," the wholesale dealers who roll up a \$30 million annual business.

The damp air becomes saturated with the scent of produce from around the world as stalls are readied for chain store and independent supermarket buyers, and individual grocers.

When local crops are in harvest, the wholesalers also buy from Western New York farmers who come trekking in with their loads. A farmer may split his load, selling half at the terminal and half at the farmers' market.

Many of the wholesale men are of the second and even third generation in the business.

Grandfather or father started off simply, sometimes with a pushcart. It was a steep climb up, but now they're at the top:

The patriarch of the market, Louis J. DiCarlo, 56 years in the business, and his son, Jack, a UB graduate.

The father and son team of Joseph and Joseph Jr., Scandurra, another college lad.

Biggest of all—Bronstein & Rovner, a three-generation corporation.

James Desiderio and his namesake offering fancy imports such as kiwi fruit, Italian figs and chestnuts from Italy and more recently "soul" food such as sugar cane, okra and purple hull peas.

M. & T. Chirico Inc., whose name is synonymous with celery.

The third or fourth generation is inclined to leave the market.

"My grandfather and father were in it," says William Bernhard of Bronstein & Rovner. "I went to UB, and decided to stay here. It's an exciting business, and it gets in your blood. But my son, now he's a pre-medical student at Harvard."

It is an exciting business, in which the odds are supply and demand; weather conditions; railroad schedules; and always perishableness. A day can be a race or wrestle with any or all.

But underneath these mercurial and fluctuating factors of a highly competitive enterprise, whose *modus operandi* is bargaining, the cornerstone is the simple word "trust."

"It's people who make a market," says general Jay H. Wattles, terminal president, who with his brother J. B. runs their family's butter and egg business. "It's one's personality, and how sharp one is in dealing with the growers that makes or breaks a person here."

"You see, no money is exchanged when an order is placed. A dealer telephones a grower in California—"Send me a carload of oranges, Joe." And Joe sends it on trust.

"The whole thing is a matter of confidence in people who know you, and people you know. It's been that way since this business began. Your word is really your bond."

Before daybreak, these far flung orders—based on trust—start rolling in to the terminal by train or truck; 4000 carloads or their equivalent in truck tonnage arrive annually at the terminal from out of the state.

Aluminum trucks, some 40-foot long, hitched three in a row; red trucks, orange trucks, stakes (slat-sided vehicles) and vans fill the terminal in the morning light.

The place is filled with them, dwarfing the smaller conveyors—the electric fork lifts, the pallets, skate-wheel conveyors and wheeled handtrucks which haul the produce up or down to the bartering level.

Generally speaking, on both sides of the road, the bargaining is done quietly.

Mingling among the farmers and merchants, representatives of the Department of Agriculture gather the results.

By noon, the great central parking lot of the food terminal is deserted with only a food handler or two lounging against a stall post—a ghost town until tomorrow.

And Farmer Floyd Salisbury boards his empty truck and drives back to Wilson, thanking God he lives in the country.

ice. Ed Rees was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service where he rendered a great service and was also the sponsor of legislation changing Armistice Day to Veterans Day thereby honoring veterans of all wars in which American servicemen participated.

Ed Rees was well known as one of the outstanding Members of the House during his time of service, and on one occasion received an award as Outstanding Congressman of the Year.

He will be greatly missed by his friends, and I take this means of extending this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Rees and other members of the Rees family.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON  
MERCHANT MARINE

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, October 23, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, campaign promises have a way of being forgotten the day after a successful election. Those of us in Congress who have worked to maintain a strong merchant marine have grown accustomed to campaign oratory that is never implemented.

On September 25, 1968, President Nixon delivered a careful analysis of the impending demise of our merchant marine. He concluded his remarks with the following words:

The old ways have failed, to the detriment of the seaman, the businessman, the balance of payments and the national defense. The time has come for new departures, new solutions and new vitality for American ships and American crews on the high seas of the world.

On October 23, 1969, President Nixon fulfilled the pledge which he made a year ago in Seattle. His message to the Congress does, in fact, offer new departures and new solutions which will indeed challenge the American shipbuilding industry, ship operators, and labor. After years of being treated as a stepchild of the economy, the leaders of maritime industry and labor now have been called upon to demonstrate that the President's confidence is well-founded.

All major programs are the result of the work of many people, and the President's maritime recommendations are no exception. President Nixon is fortunate in having such a capable team within the Department of Commerce. Recognition of the efforts of the Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans, the Under Secretary Rocco Siciliano, and the Maritime Administrator Andrew Gibson is certainly due. Their dedicated efforts will not be forgotten by the American merchant marine.

Congress must now fashion the legislative framework for the President's maritime program. I am sure our responsibility will be carried out promptly.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the demand for air pollution control in this country can be measured by the growth of public opposition to the Justice Department's decision to drop the antitrust charges brought in Federal court in Los Angeles against automobile manufacturers. The suits allege that car makers have conspired to prevent the development of smog control devices.

The case has national significance. And because of this, it is receiving broad support across the Nation.

I was proud to see that two outstanding mayors from my home State, Pennsylvania, have filed briefs urging public access to the important information gathered in this case and vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws.

I am inserting in the RECORD the comments filed by Mayors Thomas J. Monaghan of Lancaster, and Louis J. Tullio of Erie:

[U.S. District Court, Central District of California]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF V. AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL., DEFENDANTS—CIVIL ACTION No. 69-75-JWC

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMMENTS

Mayor Thomas J. Monaghan of Lancaster, Pennsylvania and Mayor Louis J. Tullio of Erie, Pennsylvania (hereinafter "Movants") by their attorneys, hereby respectfully request this Honorable Court for leave to file the attached Comments opposing the entry of the Consent Decree proposed by the parties in the above-captioned case. In support of this request, Movants allege as follows:

1. The Cities of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Erie, Pennsylvania, have a direct interest in the resolution of this vital litigation. The Cities of Lancaster and Erie are the focal points of large and expanding metropolitan regions, with combined in-city populations of approximately 200,000, and a combined metropolitan regional population of approximately 549,000. Both Cities, in addition, experience significant problems of air pollution. As is the case with all large cities, the major portion of these problems in the Cities of Lancaster and Erie may be traced directly to the operation of motor vehicles. The allegations of the Complaint filed by the United States in this case, if proved, would establish that the Defendants have been responsible over a period of at least 15 years for preventing development of effective air pollution controls for such motor vehicles. As such, a full public trial in this case would serve the public interest by establishing the responsibility, both moral and legal, of the Defendants for the damages resulting to the citizens of Lancaster and Erie, Pennsylvania, from automobile air pollution.

2. Movants first learned of this Honorable Court's Order of September 17 upon receipt in the mail on October 3 of the September 30 daily edition of the *Congressional Record*, in which Representative Brown of California reprinted the said Order on Page E7979. Promptly thereafter, Movants prepared the attached Comments, and are presently sub-

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE  
EDWARD H. REES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the congressional delegation from Kansas and other colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the late Representative Edward H. Rees who retired from the House in 1960 after 24 years of outstanding serv-

mitting them to this Honorable Court for consideration.

3. No prejudice will result either to the parties to this litigation or to the Honorable Court if Movants are permitted leave to file the attached Comments. Movants will not oppose an extension of time until October 23 for any Defendant who might wish to file a Response to the attached Comments. Such an extension would neither inconvenience nor require the postponement of the Hearing presently set for October 28 on the proposed Consent Decree, and all Comments and Responses would be thus filed with this Honorable Court well in advance of that date.

Wherefore, Movants respectfully request that this Honorable Court enter an Order granting them leave to file the attached Comments of Mayor Thomas J. Monaghan of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Mayor Louis J. Tullio of Erie, Pennsylvania.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN M. ELLIOTT,

EDWARD F. MANNINO,

Attorneys for Movants: Thomas J. Monaghan, Mayor of Lancaster, Pa., and Louis J. Tullio, Mayor of Erie, Pa.

[U.S. District Court, Central District of California]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF V. AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL., DEFENDANTS—CIVIL ACTION NO. 69-75-JWC

(Comments of Mayor Thomas J. Monaghan, of Lancaster, Pa., and Mayor Louis J. Tullio, of Erie, Pa.)

Pursuant to this Honorable Court's Order of September 17, 1969, inviting submission of "the views of all interested persons and public bodies," Mayor Thomas J. Monaghan of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Mayor Louis J. Tullio of Erie, Pennsylvania, hereby submit, through their attorneys, the following Comments in opposition to the Consent Decree proposed by the parties in this case on September 11, 1969:

1. These Comments are filed on behalf of Mayor Thomas J. Monaghan of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Mayor Louis J. Tullio of Erie, Pennsylvania. The Cities of Lancaster and Erie are the focal points of large and expanding metropolitan regions in Pennsylvania, with combined in-city population of approximately 200,000, and a combined metropolitan regional population of approximately 549,000. Both Cities experience significant problems of air pollution. As with all metropolitan areas, the major portion of these problems in Lancaster and Erie may be traced directly to the operation of motor vehicles. Indeed, the gravity of the automobile air pollution problem in Pennsylvania has recently been affirmed by the Joint State Government Commission of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which, after study, has concluded that "At the present time [1967], the air pollution originating with the motor vehicle is virtually uncontrolled in Pennsylvania." *Supplemental Report on Automotive Air Pollution*, pg. 12.

2. The substantial dangers to health posed by automobile air pollution have repeatedly been documented by state and federal agencies vested with the responsibility of safeguarding the public health and welfare. Thus, in his First Report to the United States Congress pursuant to the Air Quality Act of 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare reported (S. Doc. No. 92, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. (1968), at pp. 15-17):

"In terms of the total quantity of pollutants, the automobile represents the most important single source of air pollution in the United States today. The nationwide contribution of the motor vehicle to five

major air contaminants is shown in figure 4. It is the prime source of two of these pollutants, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, and it produces nearly half the total nitrogen oxides released. Carbon monoxide, which impairs the oxygen-carrying ability of the blood, can reduce visual acuity and motor ability in small concentrations and is fatal in large doses. Many of the hydrocarbons react with nitrogen oxides in the presence of sunlight to form secondary products which irritate the eyes and throat and can alter physical function and enhance respiratory disease." (Footnote and Figure omitted.)

3. The potential catastrophic impact of unchecked automobile air pollution is illustrated by numerous and increasingly recurring air pollution crises in metropolitan areas. In Donora, Pennsylvania, in 1948, for example, 20 people died and 6,000 were rendered seriously ill by air pollution, while in November 1966, a large portion of Southeastern Pennsylvania was victimized by a severe photochemical inversion. At this same time, the deaths of 100 citizens of New York City were directly related to air pollution.

4. Damage to property from air pollution is also of great magnitude. For example, cash crop losses related to air pollution are estimated to be on the order of \$6 to \$10 million annually in California alone, with \$13 billion annual property damage from corrosive pollutants. *The Automobile and Air Pollution: A Program for Progress, Report of the Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles to the United States Department of Commerce* (October 1967), at pp. 13, 15.

5. The allegations of the Complaint in this action, if proved, would establish that the Defendants had exhibited a callous and cynical disregard for human life and property rights by unlawfully conspiring to prevent development of effective air pollution controls for the motor vehicles they manufactured over the past 15 years. As such, this is not an ordinary antitrust case, and an informed decision by this Honorable Court on whether to approve the proposed Consent Decree cannot be made without regard to the uniquely special context of this case.

6. Movants respectfully submit that approval of the proposed Consent Decree would run contrary to sharply defined and vital policies underlying state and federal air pollution legislation, discussed below, and also would violate settled federal policies, also discussed in detail below, in favor of vigorous enforcement of the federal antitrust laws.

7. The proposed Consent Decree is fatally defective in three major areas: (a) it fails to make available to potential public and private litigants the evidence gathered against the Defendants in the two-year investigation by the United States in the present case; (b) it deprives potential public and private antitrust treble-damage Plaintiffs of the collateral estoppel effect of a potential judgment in favor of the United States in this action; and (c) it imposes no adequate penalties upon Defendants commensurate with the allegations of the Complaint.

8. The vital interest in safeguarding the right of the public to clean air and a generally safe environment is manifested by the state and federal legislation set out in the following paragraphs.

9. It is clear that the United States is suing here not merely in its capacity as guardian of the public interest under the antitrust laws, but also to vindicate the important federal rights of all citizens of the United States to clean air, and to a generally safe environment. Thus, in the Air Quality Act of 1967, 42 U.S.C. § 1857(a)(2), Congress specifically found: "that the growth in the amount of complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial

development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, including injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation."

Moreover, Subchapter 2 of the Air Quality Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1857f-1-7, in recognition of the substantial acceleration of the air pollution hazard by the operation of motor vehicles, provides for motor vehicle emission standards, vesting the authority to prescribe such standards in the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

10. A parallel policy determination has likewise been made by the legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in a series of acts, *inter alia*:

(a) The Air Pollution Control Act of 1960, as amended, 35 Purdon's Pa. Stat. Annot. § 4001, *et seq.*, § 4002 of which broadens the definition of vehicular and other air pollution to include the discharge of any matter which may be inimical to the public health, safety, or welfare.

(b) The Metropolitan Transportation Authorities Act of 1963, as amended, 66 P.S. 2001, *et seq.*, clearly recognizes that potentially lethal air pollution is the by-product of traffic congestion and serious mass transportation problems, harmful to the economic and social well-being of the community. The Legislature mandated the sound replanning of metropolitan transportation systems and specifically manifested its concern that said replanning to the "maximum extent possible avoid vehicular air pollution." [See 66 Purdon's § 2004(28).]

(c) The Pennsylvania Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Law of 1967 [Act #8, 1968] found a further intensification of the traffic congestion, and attendant conditions against which the 1963 Act was directed—*inter alia*, automobile air pollution—and accordingly, for the first time funded mass transportation programs in the Commonwealth.

11. Even if the proposed Consent Decree is to be tested under ordinary principles of antitrust law, it is clear that it is inadequate to discharge the responsibilities of the United States in its capacity as trustee for potential private and public treble-damage Plaintiffs. The government has thus far expended two years and substantial sums of money in the investigation of this case. Yet the proposed Consent Decree is wasteful and ineffective in that it does not make any evidence thus gathered available to public or private bodies in subsequent litigation. In addition, said Decree would deprive such bodies of the collateral estoppel effect of a possible government judgment under Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(a).

12. The significant federal interest in encouraging the enforcement of the antitrust laws by Plaintiffs' treble-damage actions has long been recognized by both Congress and the Courts. It is this interest which underlies the very treble-damage provision itself, which has been an integral part of the antitrust laws since 1890 (Section 7 of the original Sherman Act, 26 Stat. 210) and is presently codified in Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15. The legislative determination in 1955 to vest the United States with the right to receive actual damages plus the costs of suit from antitrust violators for harm sustained as a result of such violations further testifies to the importance of permitting effective enforcement of the antitrust laws by actions for damages. (Section 4 (A) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15a.)

13. In addition to these clear Congressional mandates, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws by private and public treble-damage litigation has repeatedly been sanc-

tioned by the Supreme Court as an effective deterrent to violations. See, e.g., *Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. New Jersey Wood Finishing Co.*, 381 U.S. 311, 318-19 (1965); *Radovich v. National Football League*, 352 U.S. 445, 453-54 (1957); *Emich Motors Corp. v. General Motors Corp.*, 340 U.S. 558, 567-68 (1951); *Bruce's Juices, Inc. v. American Can Co.*, 330 U.S. 743, 751-52 (1947).

14. The importance for potential private and public treble-damage litigants of a prior judgment after full trial by the United States against antitrust violators stems from the fact that Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(a), makes such judgments *prima facie* evidence of all matters covered therein in a subsequent treble-damage action, and this obviates the necessity for time-consuming and costly discovery procedures. Recognizing this policy of lightening the burden for the private litigant, the Courts have repeatedly articulated an expansive view of the collateral estoppel effect accorded such judgments. Thus, in *Emich Motors Corp. v. General Motors Corp.*, 340 U.S. 558, 568-569 (1951), a criminal judgment was held available to subsequent private litigants as *prima facie* evidence of "all matters of fact and law necessarily decided by the conviction and the verdict, 'since Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act was viewed as articulating a legislative policy 'to confer, subject only to a defendant's enjoyment of his day in court against a new party, as large an advantage as the estoppel doctrine had the Government brought suit'". In addition, in the recent *Hanover Shoe* litigation, the Supreme Court declared that the prior government decree was available to establish not merely the precise points enumerated in the decree, but could be used also as proof of any issue "actually adjudicated" in an antitrust suit brought by the Government, provided that such issue could be shown to have been adjudicated "by reference to the findings, opinion, and decree," *Hanover Shoe, Inc. v. United Shoe Machinery Corp.*, 392 U.S. 481, 485 (1968).

15. The possibility in a complicated case such as the present one of a successful private prosecution under the antitrust laws, absent a government decree entitled to collateral estoppel effect under Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, is extremely unlikely. In *Hanover Shoe*, for example, the private and public treble-damage Plaintiff eventually recovered \$4,239,609 in damages, plus \$650,000 in counsel fees. In that litigation, Hanover relied upon the government decree in the prior *United Shoe* case to establish the violations of the antitrust laws. *Hanover Shoe, Inc. v. United Shoe Machinery Corp.*, 392 U.S. 481 (1968). The complexity of the government case suggesting the virtual impossibility of a private party establishing liability absent a government decree, is suggested by the trial judge's opinion in the government action against *United Shoe*:

"[T]he hearings took 121 days and covered 14,194 pages of transcript and included the offer of 5512 exhibits totalling 26,474 pages (in addition to approximately 150,000 pages of OMR's [records concerning machines in shoe factories as of a certain date] and over 6,000 soft copies of patents) and 47 depositions covering 2122 pages. At the close of the evidence, the Court asked for briefs and requested findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Government offered briefs totalling 653 pages and requests totalling 66 pages. United submitted briefs totalling 1240 pages, and requests totalling 499 pages." *United States v. United Shoe Machinery Corp.*, 110 F. Supp. 295, 299 (D. Mass. 1953), *aff'd*, 347 U.S. 521 (1954).

In order to properly implement the significant federal interest in vigorous private enforcement of the antitrust laws, your

Movants respectfully submit that this Honorable Court should refuse to approve the Consent Decree proposed in this case and order the United States to proceed to trial, since such decree as presently formulated (a) would not be entitled to collateral estoppel effect under Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, and (b) would prevent access by potential private and public treble-damage Plaintiffs to the extensive evidence thus far gathered by the United States in the two years it has spent on the present case.

In the alternative, if the Consent Decree is approved, your Movants respectfully submit that this Honorable Court should either order that all evidence gathered by the United States be made available to any private or public treble-damage litigant, once such litigant has withstood a Motion to Dismiss its Complaint on the merits, and has established a class, thus demonstrating its intent to vindicate the rights of the public in this vital litigation, or incorporate in the Consent Decree a provision declaring that Defendants have unlawfully conspired for 15 years to retard the development of effective air pollution controls for automobiles, and making such adjudication *prima facie* evidence of an antitrust violation for any subsequent treble-damage suits. See, e.g., *United States v. Lake Asphalt & Petroleum Co.*, 1960 Trade Cases ¶69,835 (D. Mass. 1960); *United States v. Bituminous Concrete Ass'n, Inc.*, 1960 Trade Cases ¶69,878 (D. Mass. 1960); *United States v. Allied Chemical Corp.*, 1961 Trade Cases ¶69,923 (D. Mass. 1960).

Respectfully submitted,  
JOHN M. ELLIOTT,  
EDWARD F. MANNING,  
Attorneys for Movants: Thomas J. Monaghan, Mayor of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Louis J. Tullio, Mayor of Erie, Pennsylvania.

#### OUR DAY OF SHAME

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, from the Panama City Herald of Tuesday, October 21, I submit an impressive editorial, which I feel carries a very significant message for every Member of Congress and every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

#### OUR DAY OF SHAME

Last Wednesday's so-called Vietnam Moratorium caused the vast majority of Americans to hang their heads in shame, but most of them kept their thoughts to themselves.

The tragic event was a great victory for world communism and probably killed any hope of America achieving an honorable peace in Vietnam.

The communists have been unable to win on the field of battle and their only hope for victory lies in the weakness of the American people. It now appears that they will win, thanks to the internal assistance being rendered in this country.

The same elements that spawned the Moratorium have many more such demonstrations planned in coming months, according to informed sources.

This latest national debacle is another example of a strong, militant, vocal minority speaking for the entire nation. Considerably less than five per cent of the population was involved in the Moratorium, according to

one estimate, yet it appeared to the rest of the world that the entire country was participating in the demonstrations.

National news media is mainly responsible for creating this erroneous impression. The wire services, Associated Press and United Press, and the national television networks played the Moratorium up like it was one of the great news events of the century. This went on for days.

The silent majority, as usual, pretty much kept mum and was largely ignored. It's the troublemakers that inspire news copy.

The truth of the matter is that a handful of hippies, beatniks, draft dodgers, communists and other such trash conceived the idea. They received assistance from liberal politicians, but it was the wire services and networks that really put the show over for the agitators.

We're opposed to the Vietnam war, but not to the extent of selling out our country to the communists or betraying our boys now engaged in the Asian conflict. The communists will never listen to any realistic peace proposals so long as they think they have the American people on their side.

While it is a foregone conclusion that our involvement in Vietnam was a great mistake, we have too much at stake and the price we've paid is too high to give in completely to the communists. Too many American boys have died for this to happen.

In the meantime, every anti-war demonstration is a blow for the communist enemy. Their strategy always has been to divide and conquer and the demonstrators are doing a nice job of making it come true.

Regardless of the motivation behind the Moratorium, to us it meant desecrating the memory of some 40,000 American boys who have paid the supreme sacrifice for their country in a remote corner of the world known as Vietnam.

Yes, Wednesday truly was a day of shame for America.

HANSON RAY SISK—EMISSARY  
WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Washington all too often imagine that the foreign relations of this country are totally a product of the decisions made here by the President, the State Department, and the Congress. Of course, this is not true. The standing of this country in the eyes of other countries is a product of many forces, including the actions of American businessmen in their dealings with businessmen abroad, the actions of American tourists, the friendliness of our citizens to visitors from abroad, and the conduct of Americans who live along our borders and deal every day with our neighbors from across the line.

One such American who helped shape our foreign relations with Mexico for many years was Hanson Ray Sisk, the respected editor and publisher of the Nogales Herald in Nogales, Ariz. Mr. Sisk died last Thursday at the age of 77, having published his daily newspaper since 1918. In recent years his son, Alvin, served as editor and manager of the newspaper, but Mr. Sisk continued to

write a column and help put out the paper until just a few weeks ago. Thus his career ended as it began in a news-room getting out the day's news.

Through the years Mr. Sisk's influence was felt on both sides of the border, in Sonora as well as in Arizona. And I would say he was a very good emissary for our country in the way he conducted himself as a responsible editor dealing with many issues, large and small, affecting our relations with the people of Mexico and their government—Federal, state, and local.

Hanson Ray Sisk was a responsible, perceptive, and very independent sort of journalist who made a real contribution to the international community in which he lived. He was a warm, sensible, and delightful person to know. It was my privilege to know him as a friend.

Last Friday the Arizona Republic reviewed some of the highlights of his life, including Mr. Sisk's work as an Associated Press reporter "chasing revolutionaries" like Pancho Villa in the days just before America's entry into World War I. It is an interesting account which I commend to my colleagues. The Republic article of October 24 follows:

**NOGALES HERALD PUBLISHER SISK DIES**  
(By Alma Ready)

NOGALES.—Hanson Ray Sisk, one of the most colorful newspapermen in Arizona and editor-publisher of the Nogales Herald since 1918, died yesterday.

Sisk, 77, suffered a heart attack Wednesday while he was reading a morning newspaper. He died yesterday at St. Joseph's Hospital here.

Sisk was the recipient of the first annual Master Editor-Publisher Award in 1963 presented by the Arizona Newspapers Association. He operated his paper continuously for more years than any other present publisher in Arizona. He had been a member of the Associated Press for more than 50 years and had been chairman of the AP in Arizona.

He had been in the newspaper business since he left his home in Madisonville, Ky., to join the staff of an Indianapolis newspaper at the age of 17.

In 1914, he joined the Associated Press. He then joined the El Paso Herald and was assigned to Mexico at a time when the sympathies of that country's populace were divided between President Carranza and the rebel leader Pancho Villa.

Sisk spent most of a year in the states of Chihuahua and Durango "chasing revolutionaries."

Later he liked to recall those exciting days. He remembered sitting at a desk in the Herald building behind a window that commanded a view of the hilltop in Nogales, Sonora, and watching two nations in action.

That was after the United States had become involved in protecting Americans from bullets that occasionally strayed across the border.

Camp Stephen D. Little had been established near Nogales and, after an American soldier was accidentally shot, Gen. John Pershing was sent here to take charge of the situation.

Sisk also became personally acquainted with Villa and later with the Mexican general Alvaro Obregon, who eventually overthrew Carranza.

When Obregon, who had married a Nogales girl, visited here in 1924, Sisk had two copies of his newspaper of the day of the visit printed on silk. He presented one to the general.

Sisk had become business manager of the Herald at the conclusion of his Mexican jaunt. He purchased the paper two years later from R. L. O'Neal, who later became a local justice of the peace.

Sisk married Dorothy Poole, a Nogales girl. The couple built a modest home here, which they still occupied at the time of his death.

For the past several years, Sisk's son, Alvin, has been editor and manager of the newspaper. The elder Sisk continued to put in a day at the office until just a few weeks ago when he and his wife spent a vacation in California and Nevada. He suffered a mild heart attack during the trip, but insisted it was nothing and continued to visit the office to write his daily front page editorial.

He maintained his interest in community affairs and recently attended a meeting of local businessmen called to discuss the effect of Operation Intercept on the local economy.

He also continued to attend special meetings of the school board and the city board of aldermen, although he complained occasionally to friends that he didn't know "some of these new people."

Sisk knew all the older people in town, however, and the stories of their ancestors.

He had been a member of the Pimeria Alta Historical Society for many years and was considered by many to be an authority on the history of the area.

Occasionally, in his daily column, "Views and Interviews," he retold some of the historical highlights.

Sisk had served two terms as president of the chamber of commerce, was a life member of the Elks Club and had held a state office in the Knights of Pythias. For many years, he was active in affairs of the Republican Party.

According to Craig Pottinger, editor-publisher of Nogales International, the area weekly newspaper, at the time of his death, Sisk had been a publisher in Arizona longer than any man living.

Pottinger himself began his Nogales career by working for Sisk.

He was visiting Nogales with a friend from Phoenix, Pottinger recalled, when they met Sisk on the street.

When he learned that Pottinger was also "in the business," Sisk offered him a job.

Pottinger stayed with the Herald for 1½ years before leaving to run a printing business "for a bunch of Democrats." In 1925, he began publishing the International.

Another of Sisk's early employes was Robert Berrellez, prize-winning Associated Press international correspondent who started with the Herald as a newsboy and worked up to an editorial desk job before joining the AP.

Survivors include his wife, Dorothy; his son, Alvin; two daughters, Mrs. William Graham Bell, Tucson, and Mrs. Rush Watkins Dozier, Madisonville, Ky.; a brother and two sisters out of state; three grandsons and two great-grandchildren.

Memorial services will be at 7:30 p.m. today at the United Fellowship Church. Private burial will be tomorrow in Nogales City Cemetery. Carroon Mortuary is in charge of arrangements.

**THE INAUGURATION OF DR.  
THEODORE POWELL**

**HON. ABNER J. MIKVA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there are few more demanding or more challeng-

ing offices, especially today, than that of a college or university president. Thus, I believe that when a man rises to accept such a challenge he deserves our enthusiastic support. I would therefore like to extend my best wishes to Dr. Theodore Powell as he assumes the presidency of the Southeast and Fenger campuses of the Chicago City College.

In his inaugural address on October 11, 1969, Dr. Powell showed that he understands the needs of our time. His remarks revealed a desire to implement constructive changes in educational institutions. In rejecting both the instigation of violence and the suppression of dissent, he has charted a proper course. Dr. Powell's vision of a community based on harmony, understanding, and love should be the goal of all Americans.

I insert Dr. Powell's timely and instructive remarks at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The remarks referred to follow:

**THE AGE OF AQUARIUS**

On this day nine years ago, at the corner of Lenox Avenue and One Hundred Twenty-Fifth Street in New York City, I listened to the quick, insistent, challenging speech of Senator John F. Kennedy. This Catholic, who was striving to overcome the traditional bias of the American voter in presidential elections, spoke to his Harlem audience of the need for long-overdue action against another kind of bias that afflicted the American community.

That day, like this one, was most thrilling for me and will live in my memory. Yet, on that day, as on this one, I was in a city that was suffering from our inability to see and understand each other as human beings. Our urban communities, like our college communities, have been torn by dissension and violence. We have learned since, if we did not know it then, that in any community where the people have indulged themselves in the immorality of racial or religious bigotry, the wages of such sin will be paid by all of us—yep, even unto the third and fourth generation.

Now, since we have not heeded and acted upon the words of men of good will of earlier years, since we have failed to fulfill adequately the promise of a society with liberty and opportunity for all, this generation, in confusion, faces an era of violence. The exciting promises of nine years ago, although no less appealing today, now seem to be a very distant dream.

For my own education, and to remind myself that I was once involved with important matters like ideas and scholarship, before my spirit was benumbed and my mind dulled by an endless daily diet of memos, budgets, and committee meetings, to remind myself of those earlier days, and also to become better acquainted with the history of my newly-adopted city, I have been reading the classic sociological study, Harvey Zorbaugh's *The Gold Coast and the Slum*. Forty years ago Chicago was described as "a place of unusual interest" but lacking the unity and charm of a place in which "the common view is set forth in laws, customs and all the arts of life." The laws were not a communal product, and there was no organized public opinion which supported and contributed to their enforcement.

This was our City in the 1920's: a metropolis—but not a community. This is our City today: an even greater metropolis—and even farther from being a community. This is the City in which we must try to build our college.

In many respects, Chicago is still as Sand-burg saw it:

"Hog-butcher for the world,  
Tool-maker, stacker of wheat,  
Player with railroads and the nation's  
freight-handler,  
Stormy, husky, brawling  
City of the big shoulders."

It is still very much a vigorous city and a toddlin' town. Physically, it is changed from the city described in *The Gold Coast and the Slum*. There are now the broad expressways stretching out like long fingers from the huge maw of the central city. It is served by the busiest airport in the world. And it presents in splendid variety some of the nation's best—and worst—architecture. The newcomer is quickly enraptured by the beauty of Lake Shore Drive and the twilight or the midnight magic of the lights along the shore; or in the hot summer days, the placid beauty of the little white triangles of sails scattered across the blue waters (well, almost-blue waters) of Lake Michigan. He is also impressed by the extent and the seeming success of urban renewal as he views the display of clean, shining, new apartments gleaming in the sunlight.

Despite all of this exciting appeal, the newcomer quickly learns that it cannot be said of this revitalized "alabaster" city that it is undimmed by human tears. Behind the glittering new apartments still lie the rat-infested houses of the slums. Beyond the thousands of people busily and profitably engaged in the commercial activities of the Loop, or in the industrial production of our own south side, are thousands of others, isolated from the major employment opportunities of the City. Outside of the much-admired and proudly publicized Circle Campus of the University of Illinois, and outside of the gothic spires and ivied walls of this splendid institution, the University of Chicago, there are more than thirty thousand less fortunate students, striving for their higher education in the makeshift arrangements provided at the several campuses of Chicago City College.

With such great disparity between what our City offers to some of its citizens, and in what it offers to others, it should be no surprise and no puzzle that Chicago maintains its reputation as a city of violence.

What can we expect as the product of economic deprivation? What can we expect as the result of educational disadvantage? What can we expect as the product of bigotry? These crimes of earlier generations have given us this heritage of seemingly meaningless violence that bloodies the pages of every daily newspaper. The guerrilla war now carried on in our streets is almost inevitable in a dynamic metropolis which is not supported by a sense of community. How can there be order, if the laws by which the system really operates are not a communal product? How can there be order, if there is no common view of laws and customs, and no public opinion which supports and contributes to their observance?

We are all too painfully aware that a real sense of community does not exist in our City. I am most keenly aware that it does not, unfortunately, exist in our College.

In the months ahead, we shall be planning to merge Southeast and Fenger into a single college. We shall be busily engaged in planning for construction of the temporary facilities that will provide us a much-needed home of our own. We shall also be concerned with review and improvement of the educational programs we offer our students. We must develop new programs to provide greater variety of opportunities to meet the different needs and interests of all who seek our services. We must also give attention to the question of what services the College might provide to our region of the City.

Each of these tasks is important to the

development of a real community college. Their success will require contributions by faculty, staff, students, and residents of the region. The greatest task we face, however, is that of creating the environment which will make our institution not merely a college, but also a community. What kind of community shall our college be?

Sometimes I feel our students know better than they realize the kind of institution they desire. I do not mean their fervent denunciations of the machine, or the administration, or the establishment. Those unrestrained, sophomoric repetitions of the dogmas they acquired from diligent but indiscriminating studies of such scholarly publications as the *Village Voice*, the *Berkeley Barb*, and *Ramparts Magazine*, are good fun, exciting and stimulating, if not always illuminating. But—what kind of a college, what kind of a community, what kind of a world, do our students really want?

My best insights are obtained not from their recitations of the overheated paragraphs that seem to be products of some else's mind, but from their soulful chants of those songs which impress me as a faithful expression of their own hearts. What do you hear them sing that is relevant for the kind of college we might be?

"I've gotta be me. I've gotta be me."

"What the world needs now is love, sweet love."

"This is the dawning of the Age of the Age of Aquarius . . . Harmony and understanding. Harmony and understanding."

"Come on, people now, Smile on your brother. Everybody get together. Try to love one another, Right now, right now, right now."

I know full well from recent experience that student demands can be stated with rhetoric that is excessive, or in language that is offensive, but we need not let that close our ears to this other, more important, message which comes from their hearts.

Their denunciations of the establishment should not be ignored, of course. The administration of any institution, or of any community, needs occasional stirring up if it is not to become stagnant. I know of no way to operate a college or a community without some administrative machinery. And I know of no sure way to escape completely those ills of bureaucracy which afflict any administration. They can be minimized or remedied, however, by an alert constituency and judicious criticism.

My own preference is that such criticism, as far possible, should be kindly, constructive and private—at least, in the first attempt. I am not yet willing to accept the view that all policy decisions must be made on the basis of public confrontation, to the accompaniment of certain succinct Anglo-Saxon nouns and adjectives which raise questions about one's ancestry and private habits. It seems to me unproductive and unrealistic to assume that the fellows on the other side all have dishonorable motivations, and are agents of the devil. If that be the case, how could we ever hope to resolve our differences? I prefer it to be assumed that the other fellow is a man of integrity and good will, and that he might be influenced by listening to my side of the problem.

Perhaps these assumptions and principles are outmoded; this style of administration may be old-fashioned. Yet I shall keep trying to persuade our students that these can be effective methods for seeking change. If I succeed with the students, it may give me enough courage to try to persuade the rest of the college community. If we are to be, in fact, a college community, there must be a sense of sharing, some agreement on basic values, and a disposition toward true communication. We must strive to talk honestly with one another.

This was a key problem reported by the sociologist who looked at our city forty years ago. The inner city was afflicted not merely by size, not merely by numbers of population, but by the handicap of social distances: the isolation of one population group from another the superficiality of their contacts. "Over large areas of the city," wrote Dr. Zorbaugh, "'community' is little more than a geographical expression."

This is, of course, still true, perhaps even more true in our own day. The violence that we now know is really the most emphatic means a man can use when he believes he is not being heard; or, if he is heard, his voice is ignored. This era of violence was predicted for us by James Baldwin in his moving, powerful, and portentous essay, *The Fire Next Time*.

One must acknowledge—indeed, how could one ignore?—that decades of injustice, whose cold cruelty has been more deeply refrigerated by icebergs of public indifference, have given overpowering impulse to reach for the torch of fire as the ultimate remedy. While acknowledging the cause of violence (I will not say justification), it must still be asked of those who seek solution through violence, what heritage will you leave for your children and grandchildren? Will you ask them to pay for *your* sins, as we are required to pay for the sins of our grandfathers?

There was a leader who tried to teach us that if we rely upon the rightness of our cause, we shall overcome injustice with love. But that young Moses did not lead us to the promised land quickly enough; so we were ready to abandon him even before the foul, hidden assassin cut him down. Dr. King has been dead only a little more than one year; we can still remember his voice; but we have forgotten his teachings and his dream.

There are some, I know, who contend that the dream has lost its utility and should be forgotten. They suggest, instead, that one turn only to those, like himself, whose voices and views are familiar, who share the experiences and values of the same clan.

The idea of a clan, in or out of costume, has never appealed to me; and my knowledge of American history gives me no reason to believe that such cultural isolation will reduce violence or advance social progress. Rather, I believe, that all of us in this city, and in other urban centers of the nation, must approach with candor, and tackle with energy, the central problem of our day, the lack of a sense of community among ourselves.

The urban community college offers an excellent means for achieving that sense of community in the various regions of the city. A college that is large enough to draw from a diversity of neighborhoods, yet small enough so that students and faculty may know one another—such a college can provide democratic experiences that will promote understanding and communication among the various population groups of the city. Availability of college facilities for community activities and cultural events open to area residents, can also contribute to that sense of community through shared experiences. The very existence and operation of the college as an institution open to all, where students from every neighborhood and family background may attend to improve their skills, develop their talents, and expand their knowledge, will be a symbolic representation of the best values of our society.

When we merge Southeast and Fenger, the combined enrollment will be approximately five thousand. It is especially intriguing to me that the size of the ideal city-state, according to Plato, was five thousand forty households. Shall our college, then, be close to the perfect size for the ideal community? It is worth noting, surely, that Plato's stu-

dent, Aristotle, disagreed with him (additional evidence that there is nothing new about student dissention). A more general definition of the size of the city-state prescribed that it should not be so large that the individual could not be known. Certainly, this must be a guiding principle in our planning—that there be room and a chance for recognition of each individual.

Still another definition of the ideal size of the city-state is buried in the depths of my memory and, despite the vast resources of scholarship available to a college president, its source remains unknown. Yet, I clearly recall having read that someone once said that the size of a city-state should not exceed the number of persons who could be assembled within range of a man's voice. I am not certain of the practical validity of this definition, but I believe more deeply in its symbolic truth. We must have a college in which we can hear each other's voice. If ever we cannot, or will not, listen to one another, the life of our college, the very meaning of academic community, will be in very serious danger.

If our college is to be worthy of recognition as an academic community, it is crucial that we hold on to those principles which ought to govern rational inquiry and civil discussion.

In the halls and classrooms of our college, can we not create an environment where each one feels he is heard by others; is free to declare his own ideas and sentiments, and where he hears voices that convey different accents, rhythms, and ideas? In hearing these voices, he will learn more about his neighbors; in learning more about his neighbors, he will learn more about himself.

From such knowledge will come understanding; and from mutual understanding, multiplied five thousand times and more, there may be developed an ability for true communication among us, a sense of community that will prevent destruction by the vast glaciers of indifference for one another or by the furious fires of frustration and hate.

Those inequities of which John Kennedy spoke still exist; and Dr. King's dream is still far from realization. We still carry our terrible inherited burden of all kinds of bigotry. How can we be a community? Bigotry is the antithesis of community. How can we have communication across a barrier of prejudice—if one rejects another because of his name, or his face, or his skin? The poet, Stephen Benet, told us, years ago:

Remember that when you say—

"I will have none of this exile and this stranger

For his face is not like my face and his speech is strange"

You have denied America with that word. It is my deep conviction that the dream of one society open to all, is not dead; and that our college, as well as our City, must be based on that principle, and committed to that dream. For this is essential if we are to have not merely a great metropolis, but a good community.

This is the appeal I make both to those who would resort to violent means, and those who seek to suppress it. You cannot govern or control merely by physical force, because a community is not merely a physical entity. It is something more than a unit of government.

A community, a real community, is an atmosphere, an environment. Community, in truth, is spiritual. It is a psychic relation among men. It is a reaching out of mind and heart. It is the reception and comprehension of the beliefs, the joys, the sorrows, and aspirations of the mind and heart of your neighbor. Community, in short, is the product of communion among men.

To the establishment of such a college, I hereby pledge myself. This is the task for which I solicit your help, the mission to which I ask your commitment of mind and heart, let us create among ourselves, and among those we serve, a true community based on harmony, understanding, and love.

"PROGRESS THROUGH PEOPLE"—  
COOPERATIVE MONTH, 1969

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, nearly a third of the families in this Nation belong to a cooperative of one kind or another. Some families—especially those in rural areas—belong to several. "Progress Through People," the theme as they observe Co-op Month during October, is well chosen to describe the aims and the achievements of these customer-owned businesses.

During this month it is appropriate, therefore, that we call the attention of all Americans to the significant contribution that cooperatives have made to the building of our Nation, particularly our rural economy. Cooperatives can play an even more important part in the future, not only in revitalizing rural America but in eliminating some of the root causes of urban problems.

In proclaiming October as Cooperative Month, 1969, President Nixon said:

Because I have seen the progress people have made by acting together I have pledged assistance to cooperative programs for farm and rural people. I believe cooperative self-help effort is a vital element in improving the economic position of farm families and expanding opportunity throughout rural America.

Many millions of people have put in money and energy to buy, sell, and obtain services through cooperatives. They have done this for good and valid economic reasons: to try to get better markets, credit, housing, and insurance as well as to improve purchasing opportunities and electrical, telephone, and health services.

The farmer of today finds himself engulfed in a world of big business and big labor. He finds himself with an ever-increasing need to band together with his neighbors to try to achieve equal footing in the marketplace. They still have a long way to go, but each year they get millions of dollars more for their products through these cooperatives, both through better prices and by sharing each year's net business margins.

Cooperatives remain the best bet to anchor the drifting economy of Small Town U.S.A. They are truly home owned. Owned by the customers themselves. Co-ops provide jobs for hometown people and keep money circulating in the community. Co-op refunds ring cash registers up and down Main Street. In many a rural community it is the cooperative that stands as a pillar of strength in the local economy. Yes, and very often you will find the cooperative is the community's biggest taxpayer.

Congress has enacted several laws over the years to assist people who wanted to help themselves through cooperatives. I hope we will continue to pursue this policy of encouraging self-help type of enterprises.

In this regard, farmers and other co-op members are rightfully disturbed over a section of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 which the House approved in August. The section relating to cooperatives is grossly unfair, unnecessary and unwise. It would permit the Federal Government to regulate the manner in which co-op members elect to distribute their earnings each year. This runs contrary to the very basic principles of private enterprise. The Senate Finance Committee used good judgment in deleting this section from the bill. I hope that this action will be upheld by the House-Senate conference committee.

One of the greatest unmet needs of this country today is to help people rediscover rural America. We must bring them out of the sagging cities, help them find homes, jobs, and the comforts of life in the countryside.

It has been said that cooperatives "offer the high adventure of business to ordinary citizens." Maybe it was that high adventure that they were seeking when they left rural America in the first place. If so, we must help them build bigger and better facilities that will offer the same satisfactions in the smaller towns and rural areas.

Cooperatives can and should lead the way. Rural electric provide the light and power. Farm credit institutions serve a wide range of farmer borrowing needs. Marketing co-ops handle about one-fourth of our food and fiber. Purchasing co-ops furnish about one-fifth of the farmer's production supplies. Credit unions, housing, insurance, and health cooperatives serve not just farmers but anyone with a need.

Idaho is among the States observing Cooperative Month. Agriculture is, and in the foreseeable future will continue to be, Idaho's No. 1 industry. Cooperatives have played an important part in the growth and development of the State's agricultural economy.

Having grown up on a farm in Idaho and worked closely with cooperatives for many years, I know firsthand the benefits that come to farmers from membership in the cooperatives. Cooperatives have provided the tools of self-help, enabling farmers to process and market their products, and to obtain the services and supplies. Cooperatives provide the farmer's best hope to gain sufficient bargaining strength in the marketplace to obtain a fair price for his product. They are the most effective instruments to improve the American farmer's economic condition by helping him to earn a fair share of the national income. Public policy should, therefore, encourage cooperative enterprise.

Cooperatives are an important part of American capitalistic private enterprise system. Cooperatives are owned by their individual members who seek through their membership a better living by increasing their income or getting better service.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a letter from Cecil L. Griggs, secretary of the Idaho Cooperative Council, an article by J. Phil Campbell, Under Secretary of Agriculture, reprinted from the October News for Farmer Cooperatives, and an article by David W. Angevine, administrator, Farmer Cooperatives Service, USDA, entitled "Cooperatives: Progress Through People":

OCTOBER 8, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANSEN: "Progress Through People" is the slogan for Cooperative Month—October 1969 presently being recognized throughout the Nation. We approach a new decade aware that we are confronted by some exceedingly baffling circumstances:

That there is hunger in a land which produces food in such abundance as there is in the U.S.

That a technological revolution in food production has crowded millions of people off American farms and away from rural communities, to create stresses in urban centers already plagued with the problems of the ghettos, urban renewal, decentralization of industry, crowded schools and environmental pollution.

That the packages in which food is sold, the cost of distributing food to the consumer, the advertising needed to attract consumers' attention to brand names, the cost of processing food in unique forms—each of these, item by item, in many cases account for a larger share of the housewives' food dollar than the farmer receives.

That industrial firms and affluent individuals are attracted to agricultural production as a tax shelter and a hedge against inflation at a time when the "family farms" are diminishing in number, thus compounding the economic and social problems of rural America.

That cooperative self-help enterprises, designed to process and market agricultural products and obtain services and supplies, initiated, financed and operated by rural people, are so often the target of restraint-of-trade prosecution, attacks on rural educational services, and covert attempts to undermine the financial stability of cooperatives as exemplified in Section 531 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 now before Congress.

And also, that an industry of the magnitude of Agriculture with a record of such a magnificent response in producing abundant food and fiber in times of war and peace must depend on government subsidies and grants-in-aid to keep body and soul together.

We are mindful and appreciative of your statement at our annual meeting in 1968, Mr. Congressman, when you said, "Our goal should be a strong rural America. We are confronted with a paradox; agricultural producers are fewer, the need for leadership is growing greater. The solution does not rely on the supply-vs-demand ratio, nor will population growth be the answer; it will take economic muscle."

We are likewise indebted to our own Governor, the Hon. Don Samuelson, who recognized publicly that agriculture is the basis for a great share of Idaho's economic activity, providing income from crops exported from the state, raw materials for numerous processing plants likewise engaged in exporting food products, employment of labor on farms and in handling and processing materials and products, and providing abundant food for its population. Further, that every citizen of Idaho benefits from the production of its farms by either sharing in the economic activity directly or indirectly or as a consumer of products. He commended Idaho citizens for forming their own strong, efficient cooperative business organizations and further emphasized that cooperatives not only contribute mightily to economic

progress but play a role as community builders through their typically democratic form of organization.

During Cooperative Month—October 1969 it is timely to review the progress of U.S. Cooperation to date. For example, five out of six farmers use farmer marketing supply or service cooperatives to market about a fourth of the food and fiber raised, and obtain a fifth of farm supplies used. The U.S.D.A. Farmers Cooperative Service states that 5,560 co-ops market \$13.3 billion worth of produce; 6,340 co-ops obtain supplies worth \$3.5 billion yearly.

Farmers now completely own the cooperative farm credit system which supplies one million farmers \$12 billion in capital annually through 3000 land banks and production credit associations and loans to cooperative association. Rural electric cooperatives provide light and power service through 900 associations serving six million users, and 230 telephone co-ops have 650,000 subscribers supplying service to more than 2 million people.

Bargaining cooperatives act as farmers' agents to negotiate market prices and terms of sale, with 300 associations bargaining for \$2 billion worth of crops produced by 200,000 growers annually. A variety of cooperative-type services such as farm labor housing, rural water and sewer systems, recreational facilities and grazing associations get credit and grants from the Farmers Home Administration. Mutual irrigation companies, 7,700 of them, provide water for nine million acres on 150,000 farms—about a fourth of all irrigated land.

Cooperation is not limited to agriculture. Credit unions make loans to both rural and urban people, accounting for \$11.9 billion in loans made from \$12.8 billion savings accumulated by 20.8 million members. Co-op oriented insurance companies have 12 million members who get more than \$776 million worth of insurance, and 1,350 farmers' mutual fire insurance companies provide service to three million members.

In the field of group health care, 7 million U.S. citizens are said to be enrolled in 180 plans with gross annual income of \$200 million. Consumer goods societies surveyed by Farmers Cooperative Service produce \$480 million worth of food and home supplies through 500 centers to 400,000 members annually. One hundred fishery cooperatives are reported to have 10,000 fisherman-members who operate 7,500 vessels.

We know that you, like other people in Idaho who are descended from the pioneers who reclaimed its rich agricultural lands as the frontiers moved westward, are deeply concerned about the problems of agriculture as well as those of our people in general. We do, indeed, wish to share the abundance produced from our natural and human resources. The principles and techniques of Cooperation have proved their worth within the structure of our capitalistic economy. We commend them to you as a Member of Congress, trusting that they will receive sympathetic attention as you and your fellow legislators seek "Progress Through People."

Sincerely,

CECIL L. GRIGGS,  
Secretary, Idaho Cooperative Council.

—  
MOVE FORWARD TOGETHER THROUGH  
COOPERATIVES

(By J. Phil Campbell, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture and Steering Committee Chairman for Co-op Month, 1969)

Like yesterday's farmer, today's farmer is in a weak bargaining position. Unlike yesterday's farmer, today's farmer must make huge and increasing capital investments in his farm, and he is no longer a captive of the land.

These three factors—one old, the others

new—have brought the family farm operator to a crossroads. Unless he can find ways to finance his operation and unless he gets enough voice in the market to assure himself parity of income, he may decide to let huge, absentee-owned, stock-selling corporations take over farming.

If he does, his decision will have the gravest consequences for the nation's consumers, for our natural environment and resources, for rural America, for the cities, and indeed for the world.

Therefore, we have some responsibility to help farmers find ways to finance their operations and to strengthen their bargaining position in the marketplace. The cooperative technique, which has served farmers so well, can help, as we pursue both objectives.

Credit Choices Confronting Farmers.—For example, in the field of financing, I'm sure many farmers will continue to depend on their credit cooperatives—the Federal land bank associations and production credit associations—to get the loans that they need and that they will repay with interest.

This is the traditional pattern of farm financing. Each farmer strives to build up his capital investment over a period of years, accumulating equity as he repays his loan. Yet I'm not sure it will suffice, as farm investment needs quadruple or, perhaps, increase ten-fold.

More farmers probably will lease land, as a means of dampening the total capital that's involved in a farm operation. Others may turn to joint ownership of farm machinery through small, 3-, 4-, or 5-member cooperatives. Still others may lease or rent machinery—perhaps that they and their neighbors own cooperatively.

And still others will turn increasingly to their cooperatives for custom services such as plowing, cultivating, spraying, and harvesting their crops.

Some farmers may decide to incorporate and sell shares in their corporations. Yet unless a farmer is willing to pass ownership and management of his farm into other hands, this is risky business. The American farmer has worked too long and too hard to climb the economic ladder of ownership to go back to being a corporate hired hand. For him, this is—in the parlance of the day—non-negotiable.

Another alternative—and one that has great possibilities—is an arrangement under which farm people pay interest throughout their lives to some continuing outside source of permanent credit, both for real estate and for operating capital. The farm operator would have title to the land and the property, but he would finance it by hiring capital, much as he hires labor.

He would not repay the loan, for the loan would never come due. It would be permanent credit.

Let's face it. This is a system of perpetual debt. Yet some of our biggest corporations are using it successfully. I'm wondering if farmers' credit cooperatives—as well as other financial organizations—can devise ways to provide this permanent credit and, at the same time, to leave the farmer's ownership and management of his farm relatively unimpaired.

Problems In The Market Place.—When farmers enter the market as individuals, they are in a weak position. On the one hand, they are so numerous and their individual output so small that no one of them can have much effect on total output or average price. On the other hand, the food industry, which buys their products, is concentrated in the hands of a relatively few firms.

In the manufacture of breakfast cereals, for example, the top four firms have 85 percent of the business. In food retailing, the four largest retailers in a city typically have 50 percent of the business. Twenty firms account for more than half the output of the canning industry. Twenty firms account for

more than two-thirds of the output of the frozen food industry.

To strengthen their bargaining position, farmers are turning instinctively to their cooperatives.

The Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 authorizes farmers to "act together in associations" to market their crops and livestock products. Congress prescribed no limits, save only that, if this cooperative action "unduly enhances" the price of any farm product, the Secretary of Agriculture may enter a complaint, hold a public hearing, and order the cooperative to cease such action.

In the ensuing years, farmers have used this authority to market, process, merchandise, and distribute the products of agriculture. Their cooperatives have proved themselves an effective instrument in enabling farmers to speak with greater authority in the marketplace.

Farmers haven't made full use of the authority Congress granted them nearly a half-century ago. One farm leader recently estimated that farmers are getting only one-fourth of the potential benefit of the Capper-Volstead Act. That may well be an overestimate.

Yet farmers today are moving. Lane Palmer, editor of *Farm Journal*, said recently, "Progress toward more effective marketing of farm products . . . (is) led by the cooperatives. Not in my lifetime have I been more encouraged by the trend of events."

What Is Needed.—If farmers are to use their cooperatives so as to be heard in the marketplace, they will need leadership, willingness to pay for the most expert management, sound planning, adequate financing, and determination. The Department of Agriculture can help, and we are eager to do so.

Co-op Month is an opportunity to look back over the past 12 months, to measure our "progress through people", and to stake out new objectives for the ensuing year.

The technology of agriculture is changing rapidly, is dynamic. Yet we hope to maintain the structure of agriculture, which is predominantly the family farm. Cooperatives have much to contribute, both to advanced technology and to structural stability. Let us move forward together.

#### COOPERATIVES: PROGRESS THROUGH PEOPLE

(By David W. Angevine, Administrator, Farmer Cooperative Service, USDA, and Executive Director, Co-op Month, 1969)

As the Nation observes Co-op Month 1969 this October, cooperatives take on a special meaning, one this year's theme describes—"Cooperatives: Progress through People."

Cooperatives give people a chance to do things for themselves—a chance to be more, to have more, to advance.

By owning their cooperative businesses, people progress in four areas—in the business world, in better communities, in personal growth, in international understanding.

Accomplishments in any one of these areas often carry over into the others.

All kinds of people use all kinds of cooperatives to progress—rural people with marketing, farm supply, electric, telephone, farm credit, and irrigation associations; urban people with housing, consumer goods, and health associations; and both rural and urban people with mutual insurance companies, buying clubs, and credit unions.

#### I. PROGRESS IN THE BUSINESS WORLD

Cooperatives are first of all businesses. Persons who use them own them and control them.

Cooperatives are a basic form of business in our free enterprise system. Through them more than a third of the families in this country have an individual, financial interest in enterprises handling billions of dollars worth of goods and services each year.

Through them these families add to their incomes, secure needed services, and have a voice in the conduct of American business.

Cooperatives offer the high adventure of business to ordinary citizens.

Farmers use marketing cooperatives to establish their right of way in the marketplace where food and fiber they produce is sold, processed, packaged, and moved on to consumers. Each year they get millions of dollars more for their products through these cooperatives, both through better prices and by sharing each year's net business margins.

People have organized nearly 23,000 credit unions so they can borrow when they need to from savings they and others have accumulated.

As the result of years of credit union effort, last July the Federal truth-in-lending law became effective. Now every borrower and every credit user knows the true annual rate of interest before he enters into a business transaction.

Cooperatives, also have another foot in the business world, handling food, drugs, petroleum, furniture, and a long line of services from preschooling to funerals.

Rural electric co-ops, in addition to bringing light and power to rural Americans, have created a billion-dollar-a-year rural market for electric appliances and equipment. This means jobs for workers and dividends for stockholders of businesses that manufacture these. Co-op refunds ring cash registers up and down Main Street.

One upper Midwest farm supply cooperative recently exhibited the 23,000 items of merchandise it handles for its farmer-members. Besides items it manufactures itself, these came from 300 different suppliers.

#### II. PROGRESS IN BETTER COMMUNITIES

What's good for the people in them is good for the communities where they live and work. Housing cooperatives help families acquire ownership and a stake in the community, put down roots, and stabilize their lives.

Thousands of cooperatives hire many thousands of workers—managers, bookkeepers, skilled agriculturists, marketing and purchasing experts, distribution and transportation specialists, architects and builders, economists and writers. They add to the business drive of the community. Often the co-op is the leading business in town. One farmers' co-op, for example, is the largest industrial corporation headquartered in a city of half a million.

Co-op businesses pay local, State, and Federal taxes of all kinds, push community campaigns, and encourage members to shoulder their full responsibilities as citizens in a democracy.

Farmer Cooperative Service surveys show that marketing and farm supply co-ops have invested \$306 million in major plants and facilities over the past 18 months. These mean jobs—jobs to build the plants, jobs to make the equipment, jobs to operate them, jobs to supply and maintain these plants, jobs to serve the plants' employees.

#### III. PROGRESS IN PERSONAL GROWTH

Over and above their business and economic contributions, cooperatives give people a chance to grow, to develop, to learn, to use untapped talents and knowledge, to "be somebody."

Members learn to think, to speak, to analyze their cooperative businesses at regular meetings. They learn to merge their interests in a common interest. They gain faith in themselves, faith in their neighborhoods, competence to take on other community responsibilities. They learn to conduct meetings, to convey ideas, to deal with others. They become leaders.

Many of those who accept greater leadership become directors of these cooperatives, and their opportunities to make meaning-

ful decisions expand tremendous. On their judgments may hang jobs, the community's welfare, the quality of the environment, and the satisfactions of men and women who live there.

#### IV. PROGRESS IN INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Visitors from overseas are often surprised to see people here use cooperatives and use them in such infinite variety. They tell us that cooperatives are a link in the chain of friendly relations among peoples.

U.S. cooperative specialists who work overseas help others better understand who Americans really are, and we learn a great deal from them.

These cooperative specialists have helped organize rural electric co-ops, credit unions, housing co-ops, farmers' marketing, purchasing, and credit co-ops. They have helped overseas governments establish agencies to develop cooperatives, write co-op laws, found co-op training centers, and organize banks for cooperatives.

As they return to the U.S., they often bring with them new techniques for developing cooperatives here, new insights into cooperatives' internal functioning, and keener appreciation of members' needs.

### CZECHOSLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, though they are suffering under an implacable and unrelenting totalitarianism in their homeland, the Czechoslovak people today mark the 51st anniversary of their independence.

It was on October 28, 1918, that the Czechoslovak National Council in Prague proclaimed the independence of the Czechs and Slovaks and establishment of the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

This was the culmination of the centuries-old struggle which these sturdy and stout-hearted people carried on against the overlords of their historic homeland.

Czechoslovaks enjoyed their hard-won freedom for only two decades, for the catastrophic events beginning in 1938 proved disastrous. First, their country was dismembered. They then were robbed of their freedom and, with the beginning of World War II, their fate was in the hands of the Nazis.

We all know what has been their lot since the end of World War II, especially since 1948, when they were forced to submit to Communist totalitarianism.

And in August 1968, the Soviet juggernaut rolled over defenseless Czechoslovakia, snuffing out its "liberalization movement."

Just last month, the Soviets purged reformer Alexander Dubcek and many of his followers to further tighten their grip. It is my hope that one day Czechoslovakia will again enjoy independence.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the July-August issue of *Assembly of Captive European Nations—ACEN—News*:

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA: 1 YEAR LATER

A year ago this August, the Soviet juggernaut rolled over the hopes and aspirations of defenseless Czechoslovakia. During the ensuing months, the fresh air of the "Czechoslovak Spring" was gradually but systematically polluted by the suffocating, noxious fumes of neo-Stalinism. The uncertain flicker of freedom sought in vain a harbor from the gusts of repression emanating from the Kremlin; the once daring and imaginative press, radio and television were reconverted into droning instruments of the regime; dissent was muzzled; and the Czechs and the Slovaks were seemingly once more condemned to a drab, monotonous existence.

Yet the dark post-August 1968 days have also brought to the surface a number of built-in weaknesses of totalitarian rule. The USSR had believed that the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia would nip all heretical tendencies in the bud. A closer look at today's Czechoslovakia belies such unqualified "optimism."

True, the new regime in Czechoslovakia appears to be firmly in control, and there are ominous indications of new, far-reaching purges of "liberals" and "reformers." The country, however, is not nearly as docile as the Soviets had hoped.

There are no free elections, but the workers are "voting" with slowdowns. In many plants, they have stopped paying union dues. Party cards are being returned or torn up. According to regime spokesmen, the drop in productivity has reached alarming proportions. Discussions in factory canteens focus on personal problems and outside interests; a conversation on "building Socialism" is considered in bad taste and a waste of time. In brief, the worker is serving notice on the regime that he is prepared to use all the tools at his disposal to prevent a return to the conditions existing before January 1968 when the Dubcek regime assumed power.

The voices of the students and writers may have been temporarily muted by censorship and intimidation, but the flame of dissent has not been extinguished. As one observer puts it, you cannot show a man a ray of hope and later tell him it was a mirage. The Soviets and hard-line Communists in general indulge in the wishful thinking that they can always turn back the clock, that the memories of a greater measure of freedom will wane with time. Repressive policies may at times arrest the revolution of rising expectations that has been sweeping the world. History attests, however, that any attempt to reestablish a *status quo ante* ends in failure. Time is rarely on the side of tyranny, and empires—even one as closely policed as that of the Soviet Union's—are subject to centrifugal forces that weaken their outer core and hasten their disintegration.

The proponents of neo-Stalinism are also underestimating the human element. Dominik Tatarka, one of the leading Slovak writers, wrote in the January 1969 issue of *Reporter*—then one of the most outspoken voices of dissent:

"To be human is not a calculated end; man cannot be used as building material for the construction of history . . . It is quite possible for whole armies, armed to the teeth, suddenly to disintegrate, as if they had been destroyed from inside by white ants. Even in the biggest tanks, under the strongest armor, in every uniform, there are human beings. Sooner or later they must behave like human beings . . ."

The men and women of East and Central Europe have lived in an age of darkness for over two decades. They, and their children—now grown to manhood—look at the past and shudder. Where are the promises of yesterday? What has become of the earthly paradise the advent of Communist rule was to bring into existence? Why is captive Europe merely plodding along while the rest of the

world is making significant strides in so many areas of human endeavor? And what has become of man's right to free choice, personal dignity, and the pursuit of happiness?

Are the Communist leaders serious in believing that they can make people forget the sorry record of their misrule and guide them back into yet another era of Big Brotherism, with no regard as to the individual's dreams and legitimate aspirations? The neo-Stalinists should have their ear closer to the ground. Young people in their twenties and thirties view communism as the most reactionary of ideologies. They have had firsthand experience with applied Marxism-Leninism, as "updated" by Stalin and his successors. They have found it obsolete, retrogressive, and unresponsive to man's fundamental needs and desires. To this younger generation, communism is no wave of the future; it is only a symbol of a wasted past.

Thus orthodox Communists and the sundry opportunists who have latched onto their coattails are little more than relics of the past. They still cling to their monopoly of power; they still can cow or terrorize the vast majority into outward submission. But they are the dinosaurs of today; the body has grown to gigantic proportions, but the head has not adapted to change. They may possess the means for protecting their vested interests, but once again—as in Stalin's time—they must spend their nights wondering about their future. Surely, in the rigid society they are trying to reinstall, someone will inevitably appear who will "out-orthodox" their orthodoxy and claim their place.

August 1968 was indeed a crushing blow for all who had hoped the "Czechoslovak Spring" would usher in a new era, not only for the Czechs and the Slovaks, but eventually for the other captive peoples of East and Central Europe as well. The forces of retrogression, however, may have won a Pyrrhic victory. They have tightened their hold on power, but they have alienated further the people over whom they rule. Their cycle, as that of the dinosaur, is bound to come to an end. They have lived on borrowed time long enough.

## BOB CROMIE—NEW COLUMNIST FOR THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

## HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune welcomed a new columnist to its pages this week—Bob Cromie, a longtime newsman and observer of the world and local scene.

As the Tribune commented in an editorial, Mr. Cromie has pretty definite views about a lot of things, and he intends to discuss them in print.

We in Chicago welcome him as well to the ranks of professional scriveners who enliven our city and provoke us to think a little more deeply—about everything.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cromie's first column for the Tribune follows:

WHERE I STAND  
(By Bob Cromie)

Because this is a first column it seems only sporting to warn you what to expect in this space in the future.

I am middle-aged somewhat overweight, admittedly prejudiced. I do not care for French cooking, curling, the John Birch society, or most modern poetry.

I am very fond of children, dogs, sunsets,

koala bears, books, some mothers, and apple pie if tart. Also of the writings of Saki, James Thurber, Peter Beagle, and Charles Lamb, of baked beans, old shoes, loafing in the sun, watching someone else work, any golf course, of pretending not to hear the telephone ring and of Dick Cavett.

I believe that an integrated society is the only hope for this country, that dignity and a chance for gainful employment are everyone's inherent right and that the Edsel wasn't any more of a mistake than the Spiro. I like Ernie Banks, Pete Seeger, the poems of Kenneth Fearing, Wrigley field, Studs Terkel, Jim Conway, the view of the skyline from the Planetarium, Ellington's "Sophisticated Lady," Vincent Starett, and a bowling ball nosing into the 1-3 pocket.

I do not care for extremists of the right or left, Texas millionaires who lavish money on un-American causes, bugging, wire tapping, people who hit other people, loud mouths, bigots, bores, cottage cheese, wide neckties, bullfighting, big-game hunting, "Silas Marner," censorship, the color pink, mud, dust, rain on Fridays, formal wear, coral snakes (except at a distance) or bread with calcium propionate added to retard spoilage.

I favor the dissemination of birth control information, the fluoridation of water, sex education in the schools, and equal rights for everyone, without exception and without delay. I do not consider any of these things part of a communist conspiracy.

I believed in M-Day and was very impressed with the quietly effective way it was observed on the campus of the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill—at least those portions of the demonstration which I saw. I was not impressed by Mr. Agnew's reaction to this nation-wide observance, even to his statement, plus those of Atty. Gen. Mitchell in another context, led to one of my favorite remarks:

"Never," a friend of mine said last week, "have I seen so many bulls in the same china shop."

I am tired of hearing about the bridge at Chappaquiddick, the unhappy about the murk which still appears to conceal the truth about that tragedy, and equally weary of talk about Judge Haynsworth, George Wallace, the St. Louis Browns Fan club, Sen. Eastland, and kids who consider violence a substitute for intelligent action. This is not to be construed as an attack on long hair or hippies. Everyone should be allowed to dress as he pleases and wear his hair at any length he likes.

Finally, and I admit this summary of my likes and dislikes is sketchy and incomplete, I am sick of listening to people who judge their fellows by color instead of content, of reading about the Mets, and those who want to know what's wrong with the Bears. There's nothing wrong with the Bears. They're just having a bad season.

See you around.

## THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

## HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the statement on the Tax Reform Act of 1969—H.R. 13270—presented to the Senate Finance Committee by Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Bernard College, Columbia University, made quite an impression on me.

I agree with Professor Saulnier's view that "there is a danger of it being en-

acted without an adequate evaluation of its potential overall effects." So that all may be aware of some of the problems this legislation presents, I have requested that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this time. It follows:

MEMORANDUM ON H.R. 13270: THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

(Prepared by Raymond J. Saulnier)

This proposed legislation is so long (368 pages), so complex (26 major sections with 63 subsections) and so deeply affected by loophole emotionalism that there is a danger of its being enacted without an adequate evaluation of its potential overall effects. Yet it should be clear even to a casual reader of press summaries that, as it is found in H.R. 13270, the Tax Reform Act of 1969 would be seriously counterproductive.

The object of H.R. 13270 is to correct certain inequities in the federal tax code but, whatever it would do in that connection, it would have seriously adverse side effects on two other matters that must be coordinated in importance with equity in the design of our tax laws, namely the nation's capability for achieving vigorous economic growth and the balance between private and public effort in our society.

Specifically, the bill would impair the nation's capability for achieving vigorous economic growth by a number of provisions that would reduce incentives to save and invest, including the proposed treatment of capital gains and the reduction of incentives to invest in real estate and in minerals resources. It would further inhibit growth by reducing—in some cases eliminating altogether—ways in which business concerns reward management achievement under present tax law. And the balance of its revenue effect, which would become increasingly negative between 1970 and 1972, would favor consumption at the expense of investment, thereby weakening government efforts to overcome inflation as well as impeding economic growth. The Treasury estimates that, under the bill as it stands, the net long-term shift in the tax burden would be to raise taxes on corporations by \$4.9 billion while lowering taxes on individuals by \$7.3 billion.

In addition, H.R. 13270 would have a number of unfortunate effects on the structure of American institutions. It would impair the ability of state and local governments to finance public facilities independently and, in so doing, weaken their position in our present governmental structure. It would seriously impair the ability of private non-profit institutions—colleges and universities, museums, hospitals, etc.—to obtain the private gifts on which they rely heavily, in some case entirely, for the extension and improvement of their activities. And as this memorandum will show, it would weaken the enterprise system—the means through which this country has achieved a standard of living unparalleled elsewhere in the world and through which America, from its beginnings, has offered opportunity for personal development and improvement unmatched anywhere.

In doing all this, and more, some of the bill's major provisions offend one's sensibility by—

Being in a number of instances seriously, unnecessarily and punitively retroactive;

Violating the long-respected distinction between capital and income in their treatment by the tax laws;

Deviating from the established principle of taxing income when it is actually received; and

Deleting a whole series of still valid and justifiable incentives on the ground, apparently, that yesterday's incentive is today's loophole.

The justification for this wholesale re-

writing of the tax code is that a small group of individuals in the \$200,000-and-over income bracket—154 in number—had no federal tax liability in 1966. Whatever the merits of the case against these individuals, it must be recognized that they represent only one percent of the taxpayers in this income class. Yet in order to reach 154 individuals, H.R. 13270 would adversely affect the tax status of hundreds of thousands of taxpayers, corporate as well as individual, would affect every citizen through higher prices and rents, would imperil every nonprofit, gift-supported institution in the country. It is hard to imagine a bill from which the fallout threat would be greater.

As for the 154, how much federal tax they paid in other years is typically overlooked, as is the taxes they paid over the years to state and local governments. Typically, no account is taken of the income these individuals chose to forego in achieving tax exemption, nor the amount of capital or income they gave away, etc., etc. Nor is there an adequate evaluation in the public dialogue on these questions of what it will cost the nation in the impairment of its productive institutions to correct such genuine inequities as exist under present tax law by the methods proposed. There surely must be a better and fairer way to do it. One is impressed again and again that what we have here is a massive example of throwing the baby out with the bathwater—in this case a whole family of babies, with a few cups of bathwater.

Although H.R. 13270 has been described as a milestone in tax legislation by the Secretary of the Treasury, there are valid objectives of tax reform—long recognized inside and outside of government—that it does nothing to achieve. Notable among these are simplification of the tax code and revisions to promote growth. Value-added taxation, a major subject of tax discussion these past few years, is nowhere in this bill. Nor is fiscal responsibility a part of it. The fact that the bill would burden the finances of the federal government—in amounts estimated as high as \$4.1 billion in 1972—by tax cuts that more than offset the increased revenue involved in tax reform and in repeal of the investment tax credit, has already been commented on. In short, H.R. 13270 deserves not a mere patching-up but a thorough overhaul. One thing is certain: if it is passed, even with the changes proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury (many of which go in the right direction but others, in the opinion of this writer, do not), no true tax reformer need fear he has been done out of a job. Actually, the tax reform problem would be rendered more difficult.

It would be impossible for any one individual—and certainly not in one brief memorandum—to present a full critique of this lengthy and complex bill. The fact that many provisions are not commented on here is not to be construed as meaning anything, one way or the other, *pro* or *con*, with respect to their specific merits. Limitations of space, time and energy have required concentration on only a few of the bill's major provisions. It is hoped, however, that the selection is of those most in need of critical comment.

Let us begin with certain of the bill's provisions that affect capital investment and thus the nation's potential for economic growth.

1. PERMANENT REPEAL OF THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Permanent repeal of the investment tax credit, as H.R. 13270 proposes, would remove an incentive to capital expansion and improvement that from its inception has been a constructive provision of the tax code. There may be abuses here and, if so, they should be corrected, but not by the wildest stretch of the imagination can the invest-

ment credit be regarded as a loophole in any meaningful sense. Its permanent repeal would have to be regarded as a blow at the ordinary, everyday business of improving the nation's productive plant. Certainly, if this provision is enacted the Congress should find some means—presumably through depreciation liberalization—to make the volume of investible funds generated internally by businesses more nearly consistent with what is required for capital investment. Otherwise, the productivity and international competitiveness of American industry will suffer a damaging setback.

Finally, although an on-again off-again handling of the investment credit deserves, in my opinion, no place in stabilization policy—planning for capital expansion and improvement needs and deserves a more stable framework of taxation—the anti-inflation purpose (for which there is a reasonable argument) would be better served by suspension than by permanent repeal, if that has to be the choice.

2. LIMITATION OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION PRIVILEGES IN REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT

Despite the well-known tendency for investment in new construction (notably, new residential construction) to lag behind other types of investment, and despite the widely-recognized and increasingly critical shortage of residential facilities, H.R. 13270 would reduce certain incentives which Congress on earlier occasions deliberately incorporated into the tax law to encourage construction and rehabilitation of real property. Under the House bill:

(a) accelerated depreciation—previously allowed on all new construction on the 200% declining balance and sum-of-the-years digits methods—would henceforth be restricted to the recovery of capital invested in new residential building;

(b) despite the fact that the incentive to invest in new construction depends heavily on an active market for used structures, straight line depreciation would be required on the latter (residential and nonresidential) in place of the 150% declining balance method presently allowed;

(c) although new nonresidential construction is crucial to the creation of a satisfactory total environment, it would be allowed a slower (150% declining balance) depreciation in place of the accelerated rate presently allowed;

(d) the excess of accelerated over straight-line depreciation would be recaptured as ordinary income on the sale of real property of any type, with no amelioration of this effect (as provided in present law) depending on how long the property was held, thus aborting the initial effect of fast writeoff; and

(e) the right to depreciate rehabilitation expenditures on a straightline basis over 20 months would be restricted to projects where additions or improvements have a useful life of 5 years or more, where they constitute low cost housing for nontransient use (declared eligible for such treatment by HUD) and where rehabilitation cost per unit is not less than \$3,000 or more than \$15,000.

These proposals—which treat accelerated depreciation as if it were a device for non-payment of taxes rather than a deliberate, congressionally-designed arrangement for the deferral of taxes—are almost certainly destined to result in (i) a smaller increase in total housing supply than would be produced by wider availability of faster depreciation; (ii) a reduced availability of housing for low- and middle-income families; (iii) inadequate nonresidential facilities needed for a balanced total neighborhood environment; (iv) less rehabilitation of existing housing, further limiting total supply; and (v) increased rents. There must be a

way to prevent the tax-shelter uses of real estate—by what must be a very limited number of individuals—without these adverse and untimely effects on the whole construction and real estate industry.

### 3. HEAVIER TAXATION OF CAPITAL GAINS

It is a long established feature of tax law everywhere to tax capital gains less heavily than current income. In so doing, legislators have had in mind that if there is a gain from capital in terms of appreciation of principal value, it is (i) a gain from investment of income already taxed to the individual before it could be saved and invested; (ii) that it often reflects in whole or in part, the plowback of undistributed profits already taxed to the corporation; (iii) that the income from capital is also fully taxed as received; (iv) that capital gains are built up over time—frequently over a long time—and, with tax rates typically rising, an equitable and proper averaging process should put the capital gains tax at a lower level than the tax on current income; and (v) that a capital gains tax is levied, in any case, against an increase in principal value which, the world being what it is, is typically a result largely of inflation. No tax code can deal severely with investment gains without discouraging the investment process itself, either by lowering the potential return or limiting liquidity, or both—and to discourage investment is to inhibit growth and everything that growth means for the creation of jobs and the enhancement of well-being for everyone. Yet H.R. 13270 would make present taxation of capital gains more severe by:

(a) extending the holding period required to distinguish between capital gain and income from ordinary transactions from six months to one year;

(b) eliminating the alternative tax rate for longterm capital gains, thus raising the upper limit of the effective tax on such gains for taxpayers with a marginal tax rate above 50% from the present 27½% (including surtax) to 38½% or by 40%;

(c) raising the alternative rate for corporate taxpayers to 33% (including surtax) from the present 27½%; and

(d) permitting only 50% of an individual's net longterm capital losses to be offset against ordinary income, up to the \$1,000 limitation, in place of the full deductibility presently allowed.

In addition to making invested funds more illiquid and discouraging both saving and investment, H.R. 13270's proposed treatment of capital gains would be clearly retroactive in effect, constituting an unanticipated capital levy not just on the 154 but on many thousands of unsuspecting Americans.

### 4. REDUCTION OF DEPLETION ALLOWANCE AND OTHER PROPOSALS AFFECTING MINERALS INDUSTRIES

One of the most capital-intensive and risk-affected industries in the United States—oil, gas and other mineral resources—would be dealt with especially severely by H.R. 13270. Apart from the adverse effect on these industries from repeal of the investment tax credit and the heavier taxation of capital gains, the proposed legislation—in the case of oil and gas—would (i) reduce percentage depletion allowances from 27½% to 20% on domestic properties; (ii) eliminate depletion allowances altogether on overseas properties; and (iii) treat production payments as loans.

Among the likely effects of these proposals are the following:

(a) the cost to U.S. companies of oil development would be increased substantially and, if there is anything at all to the shifting of taxes (and there must be in this case, since the profitability of oil companies in 1968 was only about the same as that of manufacturing concerns generally), the cost

of gasoline at the local gas pump would be increased;

(b) the cost to US companies of oil development conducted overseas would be increased: (i) in all probability without increasing US tax revenues; (ii) with predictably adverse effects on the strategic position of the United States in world affairs; and (iii) with adverse effects, certainly in any longterm perspective, on the US balance of international payments; and

(c) with a lower after-tax cash flow, oil producing companies would need to depend more heavily on external financing for oil development, a necessity that would be felt most severely by individual developers and small companies.

### 5. REDUCED OPPORTUNITIES TO REWARD MANAGEMENT ACHIEVEMENT

The opportunity to reward a business executive for making a success of a company's affairs cannot possibly be anything but constructive in promoting economic growth. In this respect, the proposed 50% upper limit on taxation of earned income moves in the right direction; on the other hand, those provisions of H.R. 13270 that would limit opportunities to provide rewards other than by current income would be an obstacle to growth. Specifically, this criticism applies to:

(a) the bill's treatment of deferred compensation payments, a type of forward income-averaging which, under these proposals, would be taxed not at the rate applicable to the taxpayer in the year the income was actually received but at a rate calculated, *ex post*, as what would have been applicable in the years in which the income was earned;

(b) allowing the deduction of interest only to the extent of investment income and long-term capital gain (plus \$25,000) for the acquisition of stock (for example) under a stock option program, even though the interest is a cost incurred to make an investment, the income and capital gain from which (if there is any) will be taxable in due course;

(c) taxing as compensation the value of stock received in lieu of salary under restricted stock plans (except where the employee's interest is subject to substantial risk of forfeiture) despite the fact that in many instances the stock continues under restriction which prevents its sale to raise funds to pay the tax.

### 6. REDUCING TAX EXEMPTION OF INTEREST ON STATE AND LOCAL (MUNICIPAL) BONDS

H.R. 13270 would reduce the tax exemption accorded interest paid on state and local government securities (municipals), an exemption going back to the introduction in 1913 of the federal income tax and grounded in constitutional considerations, by:

(a) allowing an individual to count as tax preference income (in the limited tax preference—LTP—rule) an amount not to exceed 50% of total income (adjusted gross income plus tax preference income) regardless of the actual proportion of taxable to nontaxable income, thus treating some tax-exempt income as taxable;

(b) requiring that deductions be allocated to nontaxable income (in the allocation of deductions—ADR—rule) in the proportion of nontaxable income to total income, thus making some part of the deductions ineffective in the role for which they were originally granted.

Also, the bill would further restrict the availability and raise the cost of municipal debt financing by:

(c) making capital gains on debt securities held by financial institutions taxable at the income tax rate rather than (as now) at the capital gains rate.

Having thus taken away with one hand at

least part of the tax exemption explicitly offered with the other, and having reduced the incentive for financial institutions to continue investing in municipals (commercial banks hold nearly 40% of the outstanding supply), the bill then says that if a state or local government chooses to finance on a taxable basis the federal treasury will provide a subsidy calculated to offset the higher cost of borrowing without benefit of tax exemption.

Quite apart from the constitutional questions raised by these proposals—which have to do with reciprocal tax immunity as a principle essential to desirable federal-state-local relations—there are a variety of important economic questions involved. Thus:

(a) again if there is anything at all to the shifting of taxes, this proposed erosion of tax exemption will raise the cost of financing to state and local governments and require an increase in tax rates at the state and local level; a measure of this effect can be judged from the fact that in recent markets tax-exempt securities sold at yields as much as 2 percentage points below those obtainable on taxable securities;

(b) to the extent that an erosion of the tax-exemption privilege induces state and local governments to elect the alternative of issuing taxable securities, the proposed legislation will require the federal government to undertake a new and conceivably large and growing function in administering interest rate subventions;

(c) the market for municipal securities is bound to be dislocated, indeed is already seriously dislocated, at a time when (most would agree) capital improvement programs at the local level are needed more urgently than ever before; already, the yield spread between taxable and nontaxable securities has narrowed by close to ½ of a percentage point.

Again, all this is done apparently to cut back on the use of tax-exempt municipal bond income to avoid tax liability, when the evidence indicates that this type of income is of major consequence to only a small minority of all high-income individuals.

### 7. TREATMENT OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

Finally, there are the provisions of H.R. 13270 that would significantly alter the balance of private *v.* government effort in various sectors of our society. It would do this by hampering the gift-raising capability of private nonprofit institutions on which every community in the nation, in one way or another, depends heavily for educational, cultural, medical and other facilities. It is especially serious that this would be done at a time when these institutions, with few exceptions, are operating under increasingly serious financial difficulties and when demands on them by the community are heavier than ever before.

The proposed increase from 30 to 50% in the general limitation on an individual's charitable contribution deduction would be a constructive and important change, but in a number of other provisions H.R. 13270 would be so technically complicated and so severe in its treatment of acts of charity and philanthropy that prospective donors would likely withdraw in bafflement if not in anguish as fund-raising personnel attempt to explain the tax implications of prospective gifts. Features of the proposed legislation that would make life more difficult for gift-supported institutions include:

(a) eliminating the unlimited charitable contribution deduction now available to donors, thus making it more difficult to obtain the large gifts that frequently are the events that make a success of ambitious fund-raising programs;

(b) treating as taxable the appreciation (unrealized, at that) of charitable contributions of appreciated property;

(c) placing what appear to be severe limi-

tations on the deduction available to donors in charitable remainder trusts, and charitable income trusts the remainder of which goes to a beneficiary other than a charity;

(d) requiring that in so-called bargain-sales to charitable organizations costs be allocated between the portion sold and the portion given, rather than allowed in full as a charitable contribution deduction;

(e) eliminating the rule that makes possible the so-called two-year charitable trust;

(f) eliminating the presently unlimited set-aside deduction available to nonexempt trusts and estates; and

(g) disallowing charitable deductions for gifts less than the donor's full interest in the property involved.

#### CONCLUSION

Without attempting to evaluate all the possible effects of H.R. 13270, the conclusion must be that, as it stands, it would—

Impair the nation's capability for achieving economic growth and improvement;

Reduce in particular the incentive to invest in new construction, in all probability doing little if anything to promote investment in new low-income housing;

Raise rents;

Raise the price of gasoline and mineral products generally;

Raise local taxes;

Create the need for a new federal program to help state and local governments finance public facilities;

Create the need for new federal programs to aid private gift-supported institutions; and

Hamper the fight against inflation.

#### THE TREASURY'S SEPTEMBER 4, 1969, PROPOSALS

The maleffects of H.R. 13270 would be ameliorated in part but not entirely by proposals made September 4, 1969, by the Secretary of the Treasury, in particular by his proposals for:

Cutting the estimated 1979 revenue shortfall from \$2.4 to \$1.3 billion;

Reducing the corporate tax rate by one percentage point in 1971 and an additional point in 1972;

Retaining the six-month holding period for capital gains and, with some exceptions, retaining the maximum 25% rate on such gains;

Excluding charitable donations of appreciated property from LTP and ADR;

Reducing the proposed tax on foundations from 7½ to 2% of income;

Excluding tax-exempt municipal bond interest from LTP;

Eliminating that section of H.R. 13270 that puts a limit on the deductibility of interest on indebtedness incurred to purchase or carry investment assets; and

Deleting that provision of the bill (Section 331) relating to deferred compensation.

However, the Secretary's proposals would leave unchanged or make even more severe certain sections of the proposed bill which, in the judgment of this writer, would have a counterproductive economic effect. Specifically, the Treasury's proposals would, among other things—

Leave the treatment of real estate investment as in the House bill except for the suggestion that commercial banks, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations be allowed a special tax deduction of 5% against gross income from loans to finance residential construction (also for guaranteed loans to college students and loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration);

Accept the reduction of percentage depletion for the minerals industries (though not a part of the administration's initial recommendations) and the inclusion of both depletion and intangible drilling costs in ADR

(as initially suggested to the House) but would go beyond H.R. 13270 by proposing (as the administration did initially, but as the House did not) that both depletion and intangible drilling costs be included in LTP, though the latter not for taxpayers deriving 60% or more of their income from oil and gas operations;

Continue the limitation (as originally proposed by the administration) on restricted stock plans;

Accept the House proposals regarding charitable contributions, except the inclusion of donations of appreciated property in LTP and ADR;

Include tax-exempt interest in ADR (as does the House bill) but—with potentially damaging effect—without the ten-year phase-in which the bill provides;

Apparently employ an arrangement (to be disclosed later) such as an urban development bank in lieu of interest subsidies to state and local governments that elect to issue taxable securities; and

Retain the retroactivity of any change in the taxation of capital gains.

Clearly, there is a great deal still to be done to make H.R. 13270 consistent with all the goals of constructive tax reform.

Nothing said above is meant to disparage in the least the importance of efforts to check genuine abuses of the present tax code. No one can make a case for retreating from that task. The point is we must be sure that in the cleaning-up process it is bathwater and not babies that is thrown out, and that there is no exchange of new inequities for old ones. We need a tax code that is fair and equitable. But we also need a code that bolsters incentive to work, to save, to invest, to take risks (and heavy risks at that) and a code that will have the kind of effect on the institutional structure of our country—the place of private enterprise in the production process, the balance of state and local v. federal power, and the role of private nonprofit, gift-supported institutions—that will strengthen not weaken the democratic qualities in American life.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD H. REES

#### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed saddened to learn of the passing of the Honorable Edward H. Rees who for 24 years represented Kansas' Fourth Congressional District here in the House of Representatives. Ed Rees and I became very good friends and I, like so many of my colleagues here, feel his loss deeply. He was a wonderfully warm and gentle man, yet a man with firm convictions. Some of these I did not personally agree with but had to admire his devotion to them. I recall with pleasure some of the exchange of ideas we had; Ed was never at a loss for words. During his years in the House of Representatives Ed Rees served 16 of them on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and twice was the chairman of that distinguished committee. He was devoted to economy but worked hard and long to improve the lot of Federal employees

for whom he had high regard. He was also the sponsor of legislation which made November 11 Veterans Day—an annual observance dedicated to the veterans of all of our country's wars. Ed's life of public service was a long one starting back in 1912 in his home State and ending with his retirement from the House of Representatives in 1960. Throughout that long span he was known and loved by all who came in contact with him. To his lovely wife, Agnes, his son and family I extend our deepest sympathy at this sad time.

#### JOHN STEINBECK WRITES TO FRIENDS OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

#### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam still drags on. Thank goodness, the level of casualties is mercifully down.

The objectives and the tactics of the Communists have not changed—only the tempo is different. The objective is still domination of South Vietnam; the tactics are still terroristic. Terrorist atrocities continue daily. This type of guerrilla war is the most difficult of all known warfare with which to cope. It is the most difficult for those removed from the scene to understand.

The famous author, John Steinbeck, was born and buried in my hometown of Salinas, Calif. The liberal press has always given Mr. Steinbeck high marks for his reportorial skill and his descriptive writing.

He toured South Vietnam in 1967 and wrote a letter from Saigon, which I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD.

He made several points which deserve to be remembered as we try again to negotiate with the North Vietnamese Communists and their Vietcong collaborators. One is significant in respect to some current attitudes toward the South Vietnamese Government. No refugees are moving to the north or to Vietcong centers to avoid brutality, terror, or deprivation of liberty. Hopefully, any peace agreement or settlement will protect the South Vietnamese from the terrorism and deprivation of liberties now so flagrant in North Vietnam and among the Vietcong.

I urge the re-reading of John Steinbeck's poignant letter:

SAIGON.—Do you remember my telling you that any mistakes might be beauties but they would be my own? Well, I've only been two weeks in Vietnam but of that time I have spent 10 days out of 14 in the field from base camp to forward position, to patrol, to assault operation. I've covered a lot of country and have seen many things ugly and/or beautiful with my own eyes. I haven't been to the Delta yet.

Anyway I'm cocked and set to make some generalities which the home guard com-

mandos can shoot down if they wish. In New York, in other places and in those full-page advertisements in the New York Times as well as in political speeches aimed at U.S. foreign policy, I have heard and read that we are interfering with the internal affairs of a foreign country—that this is essentially a civil war and that the Vietnamese people should be allowed to settle it for themselves, that the V.C. is an organized army of Boy Scouts, selling their lives to free people from the intolerable pressure of a ruling class backed up by the brutal and imperialist soldiery which delights to kill and maim women and children.

My first generality item is that this is pure horse manure, and I base this on what I myself have seen.

The V.C. has much the same selfless impulse, the same gentle democratic direction and uses the same methods for gaining his ends as the Mafia does in Sicily. The parallel is very close. Terror and torture are his weapons. He bleeds the people he is saving of everything movable, kidnaps whole villages for forced labor, recruits the young men and holds the parents hostage. He murders any opposition noisily or secretly. He impales living bodies on sharpened stakes, slashes stomachs so that a man drags his intestines on the ground before he dies. He tosses grenades in markets where poor people gather to buy food.

If a village refuses to pay his tax (the Mafia or Cosa Nostra would call it protection) he burns the houses. And lately he has a refinement. A man suspected of communicating, only suspected, is taken to a village center. His neighbors are forced to look on while he is taken apart little by little, starting with fingers and toes but carefully so that bleeding will not give him quick release, and when they have finished, he is a ghastly mound of butcher's meat. You don't believe it? I could show you photographs but no American paper would dare print them for fear of disturbing the comfortable self-satisfaction of its readers.

I wish I could take the people who have written me hate-letters calling me murderer, through some of the sweet and tender activities of the National Liberation Front which is what Charley calls himself. But I suspect their stomachs couldn't stand it.

I would like them to see the refugee camps we help to build and help to maintain. These people did not run from us. They ran to us. Doesn't it make any impression that there are no reverse refugees. Nobody runs north to escape the brutality of the South Vietnamese and the brutal Americans. Why is that?

Of course this is a most complicated situation. The new party-line word in so many of my hate letters is simplistic. Well if this is simplistic, comrades, make the most of it. Charley is a pure SOB. His purpose is domination of the land and the minds of poor people and he will stop at no horror, no lie, no trick to achieve it.

This is a simplistic generalization. I can go into its complicating opposite if you wish, but meanwhile, if you hear someone celebrating the misunderstood and mistreated V.C., just punch him in the nose for me, will you?

But this is not a pretty war and Charley sets the pace. Our kids are learning to fight back. But how I would like to run a protest parade down a V.C. trail. Charley puts paddy peasants over a suspected path before he goes in. Maybe the Peace Marchers might like to serve in this capacity. Sorry to be so vehement but I've seen a boy with punji wounds.

Yours,

JOHN.

## DAVID LAWRENCE ON NARCOTICS PARLEY

### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 27 in the Washington Evening Star, Columnist David Lawrence discusses the recent conference held by President Nixon and congressional leaders of both parties. The narcotics addiction and drug abuse problem according to the President is "just as important as the defense of our country." Mr. Lawrence presents an informative summary of the conference and the significant points made at it.

For my colleagues who may have missed the column, I am here including the text of it into the RECORD. Since I am sure many of you are as concerned as I am about this terrible problem, Mr. Lawrence's article should prove informative and worth reading. The column follows:

#### DOPE PARLEY MADE TELLING POINTS

(By David Lawrence)

What was the piece of news most important to the American people in the last few days?

It was the two-hour conference between President Nixon, leaders of both parties in Congress and the officials of our government who are dealing with the "dope" problem in the world today. The President said the subject is "just as important as the defense of our country."

More than 20,000 words were released to the press covering the two conferences. The first was a discussion between the President, the secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the director of the Bureau of Narcotics, members of Congress and Art Linkletter, the TV star, whose daughter committed suicide two weeks ago after struggling with a problem created by drugs. Subsequently a separate meeting was held with the newsmen at which the head of the narcotics bureau and Mr. Art Linkletter spoke at length.

The presentation of this subject at the White House conferences might well have been on the television and radio. Here is a summary of the most significant points made, as revealed in the official transcript:

1. The President first emphasized that the subject was "completely above partisan consideration." He said that the country has too little information on the subject and that "there is too much ignorance" of its scope.

2. The director of the narcotic bureau, John E. Ingersoll, revealed that "Operation Intercept" on the Mexican border was very successful and that a system of cooperation between the United States and Mexico to prevent the smuggling of drugs has begun to function effectively. But he added that the principal sources of drugs brought into the United States were Turkey and France.

3. Mr. Ingersoll told of an important meeting just held by the International Organization of Criminal Police (Interpol) which has recommended that member countries make drugs available on prescriptions only, that governments supervise all transactions from production to retail distribution that all producers be licensed, that trade be limited to authorized persons, and, finally, that nonauthorized possession for distribution purposes be prohibited.

4. It was suggested that a distinction be

made between mere users of narcotics and those persons involved in the illicit trade. New laws are being drafted for Congress to pass and for the states to enact. Tighter controls are urged not only on international traffic but over sales inside the United States.

5. It was disclosed also that some of the government's own agents become involved in the drug traffic. Mr. Ingersoll said he had the unhappy job of separating from the service more than 50 persons, indicting about 14 or 15 agents and former agents for federal offenses, including traffic in narcotics. He said the investigative workers are confronted with "the most fantastic temptations" because of the terrific profit in the drug trade.

6. Considerable discussion was devoted to the length of prison penalties. The argument was made that the professionals engaged in the drug business should receive longer prison terms than the users, and the latter should be given light sentence and more treatment of the rehabilitation kind.

7. The director of the narcotics bureau spoke of drug traffic within the armed forces, and said "the principal problem lies in Vietnam." He mentioned that one agent flying in a helicopter had discovered many areas there where marijuana is grown.

8. President Nixon emphasized the need for law enforcement on the drug question at the federal, state and local levels in America. He remarked:

"We tend to blame it all on the kids and the others that are drawn into this field. It has been made available to them. The sale has been made. The government hasn't done its job. . . ."

"On the education side, I was talking to Art Linkletter about this last night, I said, 'Don't they start in high school?' He said, 'No, in junior high school.' This, apparently, is the problem."

9. Secretary Finch pointed out that in some school districts in Virginia the superintendents say more than half their students are using marijuana or other drugs.

10. Much of the discussion concerned marijuana, and the question was raised as to whether it is on a par with alcohol. Senator Jacob Javits of New York put it this way:

"The main point in marijuana is you can't take one drink. Once you have it, you have had it."

11. President Nixon made a final suggestion that, instead of "a dull educational program" on television about the evils of marijuana, heroin, LSD and other drugs, it would seem "that some exciting programs on this could have an enormous educational impact on the country."

## BIG TRUCK BILL

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the St. Paul Dispatch, and the St. Paul Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn. The editorials follow:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch, July 17, 1969]

TRUCKERS, AGAIN, WANT MORE

The annual push is on for the use of longer, wider and heavier trucks and buses on fed-

eral interstate highways. The House Public Works subcommittee is hearing testimony on a bill to permit bigger trucks and buses and an advertising campaign has begun in public print.

Last year, you'll recall, the trucking lobby almost had hauled such a bill quietly through Congress before the public got wind of it. Worried taxpayers and another powerful lobbying group, the American Automobile Association, managed to put the brakes on the truckers.

But they are back again, claiming that their proposed increases are "modest" and that the bigger trucks will be safer than the rigs which now rock our cars as they go rumbling by. Testimony at last year's congressional hearings showed that large trucks are involved in a significant percentage of the nation's fatal accidents. Federal Highway Commissioner Lowell K. Bridwell said that the 1968 bill failed to include adequate safety provisions and would "speed the deterioration" of the roads.

George Kachlein Jr., executive vice president of the American Automobile Association, addressed himself to the problem of road deterioration at the current subcommittee hearings, estimating that the larger trucks would create a \$1.6 billion road repair bill over a 10-year period. He stated further that the AAA believes that such damage would occur each 10 years. Even if the monster trucks were to be taxed heavily enough to pay for such damage (which apparently they would not be under the present bill), the question remains as to what will happen to the speed and safety of interstate highway traffic if these roads are constantly being torn up and repaired. Speed and safety were the prime reasons for building the interstate system, if memory serves correctly.

In an apparent attempt to influence the motoring public, a major supplier of truck parts has taken a full-page magazine advertisement to argue for bigger and heavier trucks. At the top of the ad is a picture of a tree-lined, two-lane road and at the bottom is a photo of one of those typically arid, sun-baked treeless stretches of multi-lane interstate highway. Nearly everything has changed, says the ad.

In truth, there are still a lot of those two-lane roads remaining and many are located where those proposed monster trucks will have to use them to get to their destinations after they leave the interstate highways. At the subcommittee session Tuesday, Joseph Coupal, Iowa director of highways, pointed out that a substantial percentage of that state's road system could not stand the gaff of heavier truck traffic. Highway department heads of most other states would make the same statement.

The trucking industry may be correct when it says that the larger and heavier trucks would be more efficient and would allow the industry to keep shipping costs down. But, for the present, it appears as if what's good for the trucking industry is not good for the country.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Sept. 8, 1969]

#### TRUCKS AND SAFETY

Seldom has any government agency shown as callous a disregard for the public as has the Transportation Department in its statement of support for a bill to permit longer, heavier trucks on interstate highways.

The department has offered to support to the bill, if certain changes are made, even though the agency does not know how the bigger tractor-trailer rigs would affect highway safety. It seems incredible that the department would offer any support, however qualified, until it had compiled and evaluated sufficient safety data.

Federal Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner admitted to a House Public Works subcommittee that federal highway officials

do not have enough data to reach a "definitive conclusion" as to whether bigger trucks would pose an unacceptable safety hazard. Yet he proposed that Congress enact the bill because the department believes it would benefit the nation's economy.

Turner tossed a crumb to the safety-conscious members of the subcommittee by proposing that Congress postpone the effective date of the bill three years to allow time for setting safety standards. But what happens if it is learned during those three years that the bigger trucks will pose an unacceptable safety hazard? Will the bill be repealed? Not likely.

So, before such a bill is considered for passage, it is imperative that the facts be known and the safety standards set. There should be an effort made to determine what effect such trucks will have on the mental and emotional attitudes of auto drivers, how much nervous strain the presence of such trucks will cause, how much the "whoosh" of air from them will rock a passenger car, how much dirty slush they will throw onto an auto's windshield when they pass, how long it will take one to pull across a highway in front of a line of fast-moving cars, what hazards will be caused by the highway repair crews that will be out more frequently to repair damage caused by these monsters and what dangers await motorists along the routes these trucks will use between terminals and interstate highways.

Big trucks are dangerous. When they collide with a car, the car always comes out second best. Semi-trailers can jack-knife and tip over. At least three have toppled this summer on Interstate I-84 in and near St. Paul. It was only by chance that none of them hit cars. Congressional passage of a bill permitting the operation of even larger trucks without an evaluation of their effect on highway safety would be an abdication of responsibility.

The Transportation Department's proposal does not square with President Nixon's campaign statement that the safety of the traveling public must be protected. The department's position puts economics above human lives. That's a strange priority.

#### VFW POST NO. 5718 STAGES "SALUTE TO YOUTH"

#### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, after President Nixon proclaimed September 28 through October 4 of this year as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week," the Veterans of Foreign Wars—No. 5718—of Coral Gables, Fla. and its ladies auxiliary took the initiative to follow up this proclamation. Their program "Salute to Youth" was held on Sunday, September 28. Students and adults gathered to hear speakers on the role of today's youth.

Mrs. Anne M. Genesse, VFW Americanism chairman, said:

The theme was "Accentuate the Positive" and the purpose was to stress the positive and constructive side of the majority of today's youth; as opposed to the negative and destructive activities of the noisy minority. . . . Our idea is to give recognition to the young people who are truly worthy of it and to present a positive approach to youth; we have all heard enough of the negative view point.

At the program, over 140 high school and college students from Coral Gables, South Miami, Miami Beach, Hialeah,

and North Dade were honored by the VFW with citations for their outstanding community service. Individuals and groups received awards; included were: American Red Cross Youth Activities Volunteers, the Junior Venetian Aquatic Club, the Nursing Volunteers from Doctors' Hospital, representatives from the Decency Rally and from the University of Miami and Miami-Dade Junior College.

I wholeheartedly commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Ladies Auxiliary of Coral Gables for their outstanding work in promoting understanding and for their efforts toward closing the "generation gap."

#### PAY FOR POSTAL WORKERS IS OUT OF LINE AND VETO THREAT ONLY AGGRAVATES SITUATION

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House recently passed H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969, by a vote of 311 to 51.

This is vital legislation designed to accomplish two things: First, to set up a permanent system of adjusting pay for Federal employees; and second, to correct the present inequity which requires a postal worker to work 21 years to reach maximum pay.

The House acted despite the advance threat from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue of a Presidential veto.

I think that it is regrettable that the Chief Executive chose to speak out so negatively on this matter before it had been acted upon by the Congress. Unfortunately, his action has only aggravated an already sensitive situation with regard to our postal workers.

As an example, I call the attention of Members to an article which appeared in a downtown newspaper the other day, as follows:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Oct. 22, 1969]

LONG ISLAND POSTMEN MAY SEEK WELFARE; MOVEMENT SNOWBALLS AMONG LOW-PAID CARRIERS

(By Jeff Forgoston)

It looks like the two Manhattan letter carriers who applied for welfare benefits last week started something, because dozens of Long Island postmen now are contemplating the same action.

Carriers working in all sections of Queens, their number apparently growing each day, except to apply for relief en masse, probably at both the Jamaica and Long Island City welfare centers, sometime next week.

This display of the postmen's plight—less than \$85 a week take-home pay for younger carriers—will have followed the expected appearance this afternoon of 20 Brooklyn letter carriers in their uniforms at the Department of Social Services' office at 330 Jay Street.

The snowballing welfare movement among postal workers was prompted by President Nixon's threat to veto a pending pay increase bill for federal employees, passed last week by the House of Representatives by a wide margin.

Postal union leaders are in complete agreement with the men.

"Does a guy who works for the U.S. government have to apply for welfare to support his family?" asked Albert Manz, president of the Flushing Letter Carriers Association. "Is this fair? Is this justice?" Manz, who works as a carrier out of the Middle Village station, said he has received about 60 calls from young postmen asking for help.

Thomas J. Spillett, head of the Long Island City Letter Carriers Association, has received only about 20 calls—but he sympathized with the postmen's economic hardships just as much as Manz. "The entrance salary is so low, this is the problem," he said. "Good responsible men are coming into the postal service, but with this salary they can't stay."

Anthony Perrota, the president of the 1,000-member Jamaica Letter Carriers Association, said many men leave for better-paying jobs in the city's civil service. He has received about 50 calls.

In Freeport, about one-third of the 130-member Freeport Letter Carriers Association has inquired about seeking welfare benefits, said Aaron Trachtenberg, president of the local unit and vice president of the association's Long Island district. He said sentiment in this direction was growing throughout Nassau.

The annual starting wage for a letter carrier is \$6,167. After five years, it is just over \$7,100. The top salary is \$8,400 for 25 years of service.

Manz, whose Flushing association has 1,000 members pointed out that city policemen and firemen reach the top of the wage scale after only three years. A postal job, he added, "is for the birds. I'm in my 21st year and I'm still not at top salary." He said he grosses \$8,200. The starting salary for a policeman is \$9,499.

"It's pitiful," Manz said. "You see men who have to work at two jobs who never see their kids." He estimated that 25 per cent of his group might be eligible for relief subsistence. Most are men under 30 years of age, some with several children.

Why haven't they sought welfare benefits prior to now?

Spillett, who works out of the Sunnyside station and lives in Flushing, had a theory. "Carriers," he said, "are just becoming aware that their salaries are so low that they are eligible for welfare."

Each case, however, will have to be judged on its own merit. A spokesman for the Department of Social Services said yesterday that decisions had not been reached yet on the two Manhattan postal workers who applied last week.

Spillett, who also holds the post of executive vice president of the state Letter Carriers Association, had another thought. He said some men may not submit a welfare application because of "a sense of shame. They're a little timid." But he added that he was trying to allay their fears, pointing out that their financial status was not their fault.

Another postal union leader agreed. "The country doesn't seem to worry very much about our letter carriers," said Gustave J. Johnson of East Meadow, national field director of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS—NOVEMBER 1969

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the cal-

CXV—2014—Part 23

endar of events for the month of November of the National Gallery of Art.

The National Gallery of Art is to be congratulated on its excellent, high-level presentations, and the events scheduled for November are a fine example of the programs offered.

I am happy to call this calendar of events to the attention of my colleagues and the American people, and urge that they take the time to visit the National Gallery of Art.

The calendar of events follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, NOVEMBER 1969

Old master drawings from Chatsworth: Opening November 2 in the Central Gallery for exhibition through the month are 131 master drawings from one of the foremost private collections. Lent by Britain's Duke of Devonshire and circulated by the International Exhibitions Foundation for first showing in the United States, the exhibition includes superb examples by Dürer, Rembrandt, van Dyck, Raphael, two pages from Vasari's celebrated *Libro di Disegno*, and a section of six drawings by Parmigianino. Fully illustrated catalogue with introduction by James Byam Shaw, 10" x 7½", 160 pages, \$3.00 postpaid.

Wright of Derby: November 22 is the opening date for an exhibition of 19 paintings and one drawing by an early Romantic artist who has only recently come to the forefront of scholarly attention, Joseph Wright of Derby. This is the third in a series of exhibitions of the work of individual British artists as represented in the private collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. Fully illustrated catalogue with introduction and notes by Ross Watson, 10" x 7½", 40 pages, 21 black-and-white illustrations, \$2.25 postpaid.

Special film series: *Civilisation*, written and narrated by Kenneth Clark for B.B.C. television, will be shown on Sundays from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. through December 14. Consisting of thirteen 50-minute programs in color, the series has not been previously seen in the United States. The former Director of the National Gallery, London, charts a course through ideas and events that led Western civilization from the collapse of Rome to our century. No seats reserved. See weekly listings.

Sunday lectures: The five Sunday afternoon lectures this month are all related to the drawings from Chatsworth. Besides a talk on the exhibition, and one on other important collections of drawings, there are three lectures on artists whose work is shown in the Chatsworth exhibition.

Recent publication: Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools XV-XVI Century, by Fern Rusk Shapley, published by Phaidon Press. Second in a series of three volumes, the book catalogues over 430 Italian paintings of the High Renaissance period. 459 pages, 445 illustrations including 13 color plates. \$25.00 postpaid.

Christmas cards: The 1969 catalogue of National Gallery Christmas cards may be requested from the Publications Office by mail or by telephoning (202) 737-4215, ext. 285. The Christmas card sales desk is now open.

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 12 noon to 10 p.m. Admission free to building and scheduled programs.

Cafeteria hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., luncheon service 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sundays, dinner service 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 27, THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 2

Painting of the week: Canaletto. "The Square of Saint Mark's" (Gift of Mrs. Barbara Hutton) West Stair Hall-Main Floor. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Art collectors of the past. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Old Master Drawings from Chatsworth." Guest speaker: James Byam Shaw, lecturer, Christ Church, Oxford, England. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday film: *Civilisation*, program No. 1 "The Skin of our Teeth." Lecture hall 5:30.

Sunday concert: Kathleen Joyce, contralto; Neil Tilkens, Pianist; East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3 THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 9

Painting of the week: Vermeer. "Young Girl with a Flute" (Widener Collection), gallery 44. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Paintings related to the old master drawings from Chatsworth. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Master of Maniera: The Art of Francesco Parmigianino." Guest speaker: Sydney J. Freedberg, professor of fine arts, Harvard University, Cambridge. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday film: *Civilisation*, programs Nos. 2 and 3. "The Great Thaw & Romance and Reality." Lecture Hall, 5:30.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra: Richard Bales, conductor; Evelyn Scheyer, harpsichordist. East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 16

Painting of the week: Jasper Francis Cropsey. "Autumn—On the Hudson" (Gift of the Avalon Foundation) gallery 67. Wednesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Old master drawings from Chatsworth. Central Gallery. Wednesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Tuesday (Veterans Day) 1; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Carracci's Conservative Rebellion: 1585-1605." Guest speaker: Robert Engass, professor of art history, Pennsylvania State University, University Park. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday film: *Civilisation*, programs Nos. 4 and 5: "Man, the Measure of all Things and The Hero as Artist." Lecture Hall 5:30.

Sunday concert: Daniel Comegys, lyric baritone; Igor Chichagov, pianist. East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 23

Painting of the week: Lotto. "Allegory" (Samuel H. Kress Collection) gallery 27. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: *Early techniques of painting*. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the collection*. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Fact and Fancy: The Graphic Works of Jacques Callot." Speaker: H. Diane Russell, Department of Graphic Arts, National Gallery of Art. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday film: *Civilisation*, programs Nos. 6 and 7: "Protest and Communication and Grandeur and Obedience." Lecture Hall 5:30.

Sunday concert: Edmond Rosenfeld, pianist. East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 30

Painting of the Week: Hobbema. "A Wooded Landscape" (Andrew Mellon Collection), gallery 47, Tuesday, Wednesday, Fri-

day, and Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the Week: Late techniques of painting. Rotunda. Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Thursday (Thanksgiving Day) 1; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Great Collections and Great Collectors of Drawings." Guest Speaker: Jacob Bean, curator of drawings, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday film: Civilisation, programs Nos. 8 and 9: "The Light of Experience and The Pursuit of Happiness." Lecture Hall 5:30.

Sunday concert: Vladimir Weisman, violinist; Mario Miranda, pianist. East Garden Court 8.

### ONE STANDARD

## HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is engaged in a great debate on the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth to the U.S. Supreme Court. While it is the constitutional responsibility of that body to approve Presidential nominations, it is certainly the responsibility of Members of this body to speak out when such a nomination is clearly not compatible with the best interests of this Nation.

Such is the case in Judge Haynsworth's nomination. I and my Philadelphia colleagues already have urged the President to withdraw the nomination. We were politely but curtly informed by the White House that:

The President remains convinced of Judge Haynsworth's integrity and believes that he will make an outstanding Associate Justice.

We urged the minority leader of the Senate to vote against the nomination in the Senate Judiciary Committee. He did not. Now we must urge that he vote against the nomination on the floor of the Senate.

Among the many issues raised by the nomination is the issue of double standards. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a column from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of October 14, by my friend Michael von Moschzisker, who himself was a distinguished lawyer before turning to the world of letters and journalism:

FORTAS AND HAYNSWORTH: DIFFERENT STANDARDS?

(By Michael von Moschzisker)

On Saturday, the American Bar Association's judiciary committee reaffirmed its endorsement of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth for a seat on the United States Supreme Court. The committee then adjourned without explaining the reasons for its action and without stating how individual members voted.

In Washington just a few days before, the Senate Judiciary Committee took up President Nixon's nomination of Haynsworth and approved it by a 10 to 7 vote. Members emerged somber-faced from the meeting and did their best to avoid newspapermen. Pennsylvania's senior senator, Hugh Scott—who supported Haynsworth—went out a back

door and walked down two flights of stairs before boarding an elevator.

Perhaps Hugh Scott wasn't feeling well, but how about the other Senators and the members of the bar association committee? Is something embarrassing them?

The answer may lie in an ugly whisper that is abroad, and that ought to be dragged out into the open. It is that the charges against Judge Haynsworth are being treated differently than those against Abe Fortas were treated last spring, and that this must be because Haynsworth, unlike Fortas, is neither a Jew nor a liberal.

Of course, this story rests on the assumption that the two men's cases are similar. As to that, let's look at the record . . .

Fortas was close to President Johnson, and it was conjectured that he might have lied about the extent to which he let down the standards of an independent judiciary by acting as counsel to the President while serving on the Supreme Court. Abe Fortas was friendly with convicted businessman Louis E. Wolfson too. There was suspicion that Fortas used his prestige as a Justice to try to help Wolfson escape punishment.

Judge Haynsworth is charged with nothing like that. To this extent the case against him is weaker than that against Abe Fortas.

The charge that Fortas counseled President Johnson in a way ill fitting a high court justice and that he assisted Wolfson improperly, were matters of conjecture, however. They were never proved to be true or false.

In the final analysis, the solid case against Abe Fortas came down to another matter. He was driven from the bench after he admitted receiving money from a Wolfson family foundation while serving as a Supreme Court Justice. There was no charge connecting this to any case Fortas sat on.

Now consider Judge Haynsworth. I think the suggestion that he should be refused confirmation because he is a southerner is unworthy. Men and women from every section are entitled to sit on the Court.

There is more to the charges against Judge Haynsworth than this, however. Senator Birch Bayh states that a firm called Carolina Vend-a-Matic paid thousands of dollars in directors fees to Haynsworth while he served on the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

That resembles the charges against Fortas in connection with the money the foundation paid him. This isn't all, however. Judge Haynsworth joined in deciding cases involving companies whose business formed a substantial proportion of Vend-a-Matic's revenues. That is more than was proved against Fortas.

This does not mean Judge Haynsworth is venal. There is an appearance of evil, however, and in Abe Fortas' case men who now support Haynsworth said that was enough to disqualify him.

We will have to wait and see whether Senate debate on the Haynsworth nomination clears the air of the suspicion that he and former Justice Fortas have been judged by different standards.

### MORATORIUM DAY AND THE UNIVERSITY—SHOULD NOT UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND FACULTY RUN THE COUNTRY?

## HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, much was said during Moratorium Day and about Moratorium Day. Unfortu-

nately, but not surprisingly, little that was said was new. Most repeated old slogans, rehashing the warmed-over rhetoric which has begun to characterize much of the Vietnam "debate." Politicians and participants often as not reacted without reflecting and generally only paused to reinforce their own viewpoints.

Dr. Brage Golding, president of Wright State University, was a most welcome exception. His speech to the Moratorium Day activities on the campus constitutes a beacon light—not only in the Vietnam debate, but in the broader debate over the role of education—particularly higher education—in America.

In one sense, it is unfortunate that Dr. Golding's address was made on Moratorium Day. There, despite its insight and its illuminating view, it did not receive the attention it deserved due to the sheer volume of words uttered that day and the splashier publicity value of some of the more stellar participants.

The lasting applicability of this address far exceeds that of most of the moratorium observances, though the speech also speaks directly to that transitory issue. The speech initiates what I think is a more significant discussion in the long run—a discussion which relates directly to the ultimate success or failure of our political system. Dr. Golding has put a calm intellectual hand on a brewing and troubling problem in America—the relationship between the university and its liberally "educated" student bodies and faculties, and the Government.

Serious consideration should be given to the issues raised by this speech. It should be widely read and its message even more widely discussed. I am inserting it in the RECORD today in an effort to encourage such consideration:

VIETNAM WAR MORATORIUM—OCTOBER 15, 1969

(By Dr. Brage Golding, president, Wright State University)

I am pleased to have been invited to participate. I have given much thought to the role of the university in modern society—it is part of my job to do so and especially during the last year or so on the impact of the Vietnam war on universities, particularly our own.

I am opposed to the war in Vietnam. War represents failure of diplomacy, of mutual trust, of common understanding.

War represents death and suffering. War represents needless sacrifice. War represents the total waste of our resources.

Limited war is even worse—if that is possible—since it means a commitment to all that a full war represents without even the possibly redeeming feature of a solution, right or wrong, through decisive victory.

And last, I am opposed because the possibly desirable objectives this country had, several generations of presidents ago when the war began, now seem incapable of attainment, regardless of the outcome.

However, intellectual honesty requires that this moratorium be put in its proper perspective. Further, you have made it clear that this moratorium was to be an educational experience and I am taking this assertion at its face value.

I am aware that speakers before and after me have and will be expressing views that most of you want to hear. The organizers of the moratorium have planned the events and speakers of the day, not primarily to provoke debate but to provide a justification

for anti-war protest. In other words, this day will be spent mainly as a reinforcing session for most of you rather than as an educational experience. I hope that what I have to say will, in some small measure, prove to be an educational experience for many of you.

There are two possible attitudes that a university can adopt toward the war in Vietnam. It can officially adopt a partisan attitude, as an institution, or it can remain officially neutral while allowing its personnel as private individuals to follow the dictates of their consciences. I remind you of the position I stated in my inaugural address just one year ago. I believed then and continue to believe that "while all members of the academic community should feel free to speak out on subjects of interest or concern, the university itself must not be partisan. It must not become a monolithic, ideological, vested interest. A partisan institution is hospitable only to those who support its tenets—it cannot be pluralistic—it cannot be a community—and it will not long be a residence for scholars."

In spite of the brilliance of these observations, many continue to believe in a direct relationship between higher education and public policy. What is the genesis of this belief? Why do so many students assume that political activity and educational activity are directly related?

Their assumption is based on a democratic ideal of education which we all share. We feel that the strength of our democratic republic (democratic with a small "d") depends upon a well-informed and politically aware citizenry capable of independent thinking and critical judgment. Everyone should be well-educated! With this ideal as a basis, the country has created the largest public educational system in the world.

As a consequence, most students today believe and, in fact, have been encouraged to believe by their teachers that a college education—and a liberal education in particular—automatically endows them with the capacity for and the responsibility to make wise political judgments and expound publicly their convictions on every aspect of public policy. This is nonsense! The capacity for good judgment comes with long experience. Any type of education should be dedicated to inculcating a healthy respect for the difficulties of arriving at simple answers to complex questions. Moreover the responsibility of an educated man is to recognize the limits of his knowledge and understand the difference between a judgment arrived at rationally and one reached emotionally.

It is an unfortunate fact that many of you have been led to believe that you bear an unlimited responsibility for the ills of the world and, concomitantly, an unlimited obligation to correct them. You do not and cannot carry these burdens alone! Your militant faith is the result of an over-reaction by your teachers of an earlier generation who believed—and still believe—that all the evils of the world are simply corrected by further formal education.

Because an urban university such as ours interests itself in more and more of the entire community, the temptation arises to identify the part with the whole. The university is a microcosm of our society, we sometimes think. It is not too big a jump from this thought to the conclusion that society as a whole should follow the university's lead. If the majority of the people who constitute the university think that the Vietnam war should end tomorrow, we are told, the majority of the people who constitute society ought to hold the same opinion. Indeed, we are told the university as an institution is obligated to take a public stand on pressing public issues.

This line of thinking is extremely attrac-

tive to young faculty and to students who have grown up since the second World War. They have been overexposed to the idea that higher education should be socially and politically relevant and to the idea that their social and political responsibilities are unlimited. This overexposure, as I pointed out earlier, has in part been the work of the preceding generation. That generation went to the defense of liberal education and of democratic government and confused the two. A liberal education has to do with culture—a democratic government with politics. Although it is argued that the two are closely related, there is no justification for reducing culture to a mere appendage of politics. There is little wisdom in expecting or hoping that a formal education, even a liberal education, will produce citizens demonstrably superior in political wisdom. Political awareness—perhaps, but political wisdom—no! There is a school where it can be learned, but that school is not included in our multiversities. Political wisdom can only be learned, if it is to be learned at all, within the institutions of government, this term being understood in its broadest sense. Those who would commit the university to an institutional position on the Vietnam war would make the university one of those institutions of government. As such it would cease being a university, for it cannot be both at the same time.

The university exists for the pursuit of truth. Scholars and students must not tolerate compromise in their research or discussions. They are free to reconsider questions and to change their minds. Their faith in that truth is best served by constant criticism of presuppositions, evidence, and argument. University administrators are dedicated to maintaining the official responsibilities of both faculty and students within limits which will preclude the possibility that any faculty member or student will ever be called upon to compromise himself in the course of his academic work.

Government, on the other hand, exists for the pursuit of compromise! It is the official responsibility of the politician. If he cannot reconcile the opposing views of his constituents, the community may well be endangered. His lot is to be misunderstood and often damned. If he changes his mind, he is a hero to one side and a traitor to the other. Searching criticism of his work may destroy the good he has done. I have been fond of saying that "politics is the art of the possible." John Kenneth Galbraith disagrees—he says "Politics is not the art of the possible. It consists in choosing between the disastrous and the unpalatable."

During the past two decades these roles have been greatly confused. Convinced that they are both qualified and obligated to engage energetically in political activity (eagerly and incautiously applying the hypotheses of the social sciences to contemporary problems), many students and faculty members have figured prominently in sit-down strikes, marches, demonstrations, and campaigns. Many have survived, fortunately, with their powers of discrimination intact and their lives enriched.

Others, however, have corrupted both roles by mixing the two. Expecting politicians to display the freedom of scholars, they have demanded an instant end to long-standing policies and instant implementation of new ones, occasionally in the face of considerable opposition. Since the principle of rule by the majority does not apply in scholarly pursuits, they have discounted this rule in politics. Faculties polarize and do battle over the Vietnam war. Students demand courses relevant to particular contemporary problems, although they may never have learned

how to discriminate between what is relevant and what is not or may never have considered adequately the question "relevant to what?" Faculty and students take on additional responsibilities which color their scholarship and their studies, not because they are incapable of doing two things at once, but because they make no effort to differentiate the two.

The policy of this University toward the Vietnam Moratorium is aimed at avoiding such confusion. You meet today as citizens who happen to be part of the Wright State community. You are probably more aware politically than your contemporaries who have not received an equivalent education. Please remember your education does not of itself confer political wisdom, even though obtained at Wright State.

#### ARE WE ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul C. Warnke, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, has asked in the October 1969 issue of the Washington Monthly, "National Security: Are We Asking the Right Questions?"

Mr. Warnke points out that:

In the area of conventional forces, we waste the time and the talents of our military leaders when we leave them to prepare their budget requests on the basis of assumptions devoid of political validity. Our military planners, in fact, are major victims of our defective interrogatory technique. The problem is not that their advice is too often ignored. It is that their answers frequently don't matter because we've asked them the wrong questions. It's neither fair nor fruitful to ask them to develop a military machine that will help achieve a set of foreign policy objectives which haven't been articulated—and which, when developed, can prove impervious to military solution.

Or, as he says elsewhere in his statement:

In making decisions on defense planning we're constantly in danger of putting the hardware before the horse sense.

Mr. Warnke's article should be read by all of us who will debate and vote upon the military appropriations bill.

The article follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY: ARE WE ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS?

(By Paul C. Warnke)

In the area of national security, it is probably a good deal easier to raise questions than to supply answers. Anyone who has ever tried the latter can only hope that his successors will be better at it. But he may also find himself hoping that he, and the American public generally, can begin to do a better job of asking the right questions. Until we do, there is little purpose and even less justice in railing about the size of our defense budget. The military-industrial complex, with the soaring cost of its care and feeding and its dire consequences for the quality of American life, is the inevitable answer to the questions we have asked and the demands we have made in the name of national security. Our military-industrial complex exists because we have asked for it.

We can never cut it back to size and free up a fair share of our budget dollars for competing and compelling causes until we begin asking the right questions—about how our defense effort squares with the real world and with our genuine national security. Without the right questions directed to the right people we can never get answers that will permit us to design, or even to recognize, a defense budget commensurate with our over-all interests and objectives.

In not too oversimplified terms, the concept of security we evolved after World War II was to make sure that non-Communist countries stayed that way. During the years when "Who lost China?" was the popular security question, nobody in the national-security business, at least, craved identification as one who had "lost" some other strayed member of the non-Communist community.

The Eisenhower Administration pursued the concept of security by adhering to the doctrine of "massive retaliation." As the answer to the question of how we could prevent Communist take-overs, we could point to our nuclear striking force. But this answer became less and less plausible as our monopoly in intercontinental missiles dissipated. Neither we nor our potential adversaries could continue to believe that the United States would react to any and every Communist provocation by initiating a nuclear exchange in which our own society would be devastated.

Nor could we accept an "all-or-nothing" doctrine of defense that would leave us bereft of any ability to respond with conventional force to conventional attacks on friendly nations. So "massive retaliation" gave way to the more common-sense notion of a "flexible response" adequate to counter, and hopefully to deter, instances of aggression for which we would be unwilling to risk a nuclear holocaust.

But the cost of the capability to respond flexibly can be immense if an American military response must be contemplated whenever an international development disfavors our national interests. And this expense can be infinite if the adequacy of that capability must be measured in terms of a clear superiority in every aspect of armed might.

In a world in which we are not the single "great power," any such total military versatility and invincibility is clearly unprocurable—at any price. Until we begin to refine our questions and direct them toward realistic and realizable security goals, we will continue to ask the impossible and get answers that are unacceptable.

In the broadest sense, we now ask our government: make us safe from any attack by any foe. The answer is a defense budget in the neighborhood of \$80 billion a year. It is an answer that is increasingly unsatisfactory. It certainly does not satisfy the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who recognize that this amount is inadequate to buy the American people anything like full protection. The Armed Services Committees of Congress can prove that a lower budget means less overall military strength and less capacity to do things by military force, for a defense budget of \$80 billion obviously provides the capability to meet contingencies that a budget of \$50 billion must ignore. But before concluding that the \$50 billion budget will leave us weaker and in greater danger, we need political judgments as to what unmet contingencies are apt to occur and—if they do occur and if they are unmet—what vital national interests may be adversely affected. We need the further political judgment of whether the \$30 billion thus freed can be spent on problems of greater risk to our national security and in areas of greater benefit to the over-all quality of American life. We need the answers that will put in perspective any incremental gain in physical security.

In the age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, we cannot now, with any amount of money, buy physical safety from a Soviet attack of indescribable devastation. But the real pressures for a ballistic-missile defense—and perhaps even its lulling designation as the "Safeguard" system—derive from our unwillingness to accept emotionally what we have every factual reason to comprehend.

Nor can we curb the infinite expansion of the military-industrial complex by continuing a demand for margins of superiority over our potential adversaries all across the spectrum of military armament. We should ask instead which leads are meaningful in terms of security or political advantage, and which are not. "Superiority" in nuclear missiles, for example, is too expensive if all it gives us is a status symbol. And "inferiority" is no cause for alarm or even embarrassment if what we have is enough to deter any Soviet effort at a pre-emptive strike.

We should keep in mind that what the Soviets themselves are doing may not always provide a useful measure of the appropriateness of our own defense expenditures. We sometimes seem to proceed on the assumption that we are not doing enough unless we more than match what the Soviets spend in every area of armed might. We rarely inquire whether the Soviets are spending too much. Instead, when there is criticism of our ABM deployment, we accept as valid the answer that, after all, the Soviets have already deployed an ABM of their own. Maybe we should ask whether theirs is a poor investment. While vaunting our superior sophistication in other things, both economic and social, we at times come perilously close to adopting Soviet answers when it comes to the allocation of our defense dollars on strategic weapons systems.

In the area of conventional forces, we waste the time and the talents of our military leaders when we leave them to prepare their budget requests on the basis of assumptions devoid of political validity. Our military planners, in fact, are major victims of our defective interrogatory technique. The problem is not that their advice is too often ignored. It is that their answers frequently don't matter because we've asked them the wrong questions. It's neither fair nor fruitful to ask them to develop a military machine that will help achieve a set of foreign-policy objectives which haven't been articulated—and which, when developed, can prove impervious to military solution.

In order to obtain the proper weapons systems—in the proper quantities and supporting the proper number of military personnel—we need a much clearer idea of the circumstances under which we will be willing to use them. The Systems-Analysis group within the Office of the Secretary of Defense serves an essential function in developing the most effective means of performing the various military missions. These civilian experts constantly discuss issues of relative cost effectiveness with the different Armed Services. But neither the civilian nor the military personnel of the Pentagon should be asked to speculate on the nature and number of instances in which they'll be asked to provide military force in furtherance of national objectives. Our current force posture—designed to fight two wars while handling another contingency somewhere else in the world—is the product of such speculation.

This "two-and-a-half war" concept did not arise from an informed prediction of international developments. It derived, during the last decade, from what Pentagon planners saw as the need to buttress conventional military forces neglected during our years of reliance on a nuclear strategy of "massive retaliation." But we lacked then, as we lack now, an accepted perception of

our national-security interests; we had no measure for the adequacy of our conventional military capability. As a consequence, our forces are not shaped to fit a policy—and the risk always exists that the policy itself may be influenced by the military forces on hand. We need not conclude that our analyses of force requirements in the early '60's were wrong. But we do need to ask if, in today's world, our national scale of priorities justifies the expense of preparing to fight the Soviets in Europe, while we simultaneously fend off Chinese aggression in Asia and deal elsewhere with some lesser adversary.

It may be that I unduly discount the risk that Russia and China may resolve their differences to the point where they could even consider concurrently engaging us in large-scale conventional warfare. But it is difficult to imagine that either nation would deem the nuclear threshold sufficiently high to block an early resort to strategic forces. Before we commit ourselves to further funding against such an eventuality we should ask the National Security Council to consider the likelihood of this kind of dispersed Armageddon, and to shun a policy that might make it thinkable.

A bumper sticker of the recent past read: "Support Mental Health or I'll Kill You." Sanity in foreign policy compels the recognition that we can't use military means to make the world behave the way we'd like it to behave. We can't use it to compel a country to be free and democratic. And we're aware, at least tacitly, that however we may deplore aggression and strife anywhere in the world, most of it cannot affect our national security and most of it does not call for an American military response. But I don't think we've told those who originate our defense planning enough to permit their reasoned response to our basic questions about how national security can best be assured.

When we ask them to define the necessary dimensions of our military forces, referring them to our existing treaty commitments is not enough. No treaty negates our right to determine the character of our reaction on the basis of our perception of the national interest. Our one absolute commitment is to the preservation of our own independence. And we might fairly ask whether that independence does, in fact, turn on the viability of every international basket case with anti-Communist credentials.

To accept the facts of modern life, we need not adopt the extreme position that no defense effort is availing and that no measure of security can be obtained through expenditures for weapons systems. What is required is that debate about the level of defense expenditures—and about the kinds or quantities of armaments that we can prudently purchase—focus on the real risks and on the means realistically available to meet them. In national defense, as in our personal finances, we can afford to carry just so much insurance—particularly against the rarer tropical diseases. Our present preoccupation with physical security may be anachronistic when only two nations in the world can pose a physical threat and when neither could carry it out except at the cost of its own existence as a modern society.

In posing new questions about our national security, we need not repudiate the expert witnesses on whom we have relied in the past. Granted, the results achieved have not been uniformly satisfactory. But we should resist the temptation to blame our Vietnam troubles, for example, on the advice of our military men. In my view, we've consistently been asking them the wrong questions about Vietnam. Such issues as measuring the pace and permanence of pacification involve political judgments that only an objective Viet-

namese politician could make, if one could be found. Our commanders are probably right in thinking that a virtual U.S. military occupation is the best way to control an insurgency, but it does little to advance our announced political goal of self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

It has been suggested—by Candidate Goldwater in 1964 and by Senators on both sides of the aisle in years since—that victory in Vietnam requires only that we tell our military leaders that we have decided to win and then leave the war to them. This ignores, I think, our lack of an agreed definition of victory and our unwillingness to go all-out to achieve military conquest. Indeed, no satisfactory answer can be given to the question why we are in Vietnam, because we never asked the question in time. In late 1967, Secretary Rusk explained our presence as necessary to contain a projected one billion Chinese armed with nuclear weapons. But if the original purpose of American participation in Vietnam was to contain China, we never asked whether adoption of an attrition route to victory was consistent with that purpose. Certainly there are more promising avenues to the close-in control of China than by killing off the nationalistic North Vietnamese.

Much of the failure to examine the underlying political rationale stems from a fear of poaching on military preserves. But, in the absence of all-out war, our military means surely must be kept consistent with our political objectives. They can't be and they won't be unless we insist that our policymakers articulate these objectives.

Perhaps the first step toward useful answers in the realm of national security would be to abandon the partisan prose. "Missile gap" allegations from the 1960 campaign, like the outlandish charge of a "security gap" in 1968, have only made it more difficult for incoming administrations to pose the relevant questions. What should worry us is a "question gap" that leaves us without meaningful answers, both on national-security policy and on how it should be translated into military capability. In making decisions on defense planning we're constantly in danger of putting the hardware before the horse sense.

There are growing signs of a healthy willingness to question some of the items in the defense budget. But the absence of an overall policy from which these individual items derive makes the debate revolve largely around tangential issues.

For example, in examining the request for additional attack carriers, it is sensible to ask whether one nuclear-powered carrier is preferable to the two that could be built with conventional power for the same price. It's important to note the age of some carriers in our fleet and the alternative possibility of land-based aircraft. But the real questions remain unanswered. They concern the relationship between our tactical air power and our security interests. Fifteen nuclear attack carriers will indeed permit the flexible application of that power anywhere in the world. But where in the world, and against whom, will we want to apply it, and what should we pay for this capacity?

Without an updated justification for our carrier fleet, we can make no value judgments on the need for new fleet defense aircraft. The mission intended for the F-111B (the Navy version of the TFX) was to stand well off from the fleet for hours with a highly sophisticated missile capable of shooting down hordes of enemy bombers at great range. But debate about the F-111B focused on its weight, its expense, and whether Boeing might have done it better. The Navy succeeded in substituting the F-14A, which on paper provides a superior dog-fighter but continues with the basic mission of fleet

defense. The case for continuing this multi-billion-dollar program should not rest on the merits of the airplane. The question we should ask is: what are the chances that our fleet will be sent to sea when there is a real risk of the kind of mass air attack that only the Soviets could mount? Perhaps we should be persuaded that this is plausible, but I think those responsible for our foreign policy should be asked to convince us.

The Senate, by almost a two-to-one margin, recently approved going ahead with the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA). Supporters of a new nuclear bomber, while granting its redundancy, refer to the risk that our intercontinental ballistic missiles may work imperfectly. But no new bomber can provide the ability to destroy the Soviet missile forces and thus prevent nuclear retaliation. Nor, we are told, do we aim at any such "first-strike" capability. Our strategic forces are intended to deter and thus, in an age of sophisticated air defense, strategic missiles must remain our primary deterrent. How, we might ask, is that deterrent affected by a decision to proceed with a new manned aircraft on the premise that it is needed because the nuclear missiles may not work? Moreover, our continued expenditures for anti-bomber defense are rationalized as serving to discourage the Soviet Union from developing a new supersonic bomber. Do we expect our bomber to be that much better, the Soviet air defense that much poorer, or the Soviets that much smarter in deciding that manned bombers are obsolete?

Sound defense decisions outside the procurement area are equally impossible until we acquire a better sense of policy direction. In the military assistance field, continuation of our military advisors in Latin America obviously preserves a degree of United States influence. But shouldn't we ask, on a country-by-country basis, whom we are influencing, toward what ends, and how this serves our national interest?

As a military matter, reversion of Okinawa to Japanese administrative control primarily involves the question of our unrestricted freedom to use it as a military base. But politically we should ask whether there may ever be circumstances in which we will want to use Okinawa for military operations which the Japanese are unwilling to support. In situations where the Japanese conclude that such use is not in their security interests, can it be essential to ours?

British withdrawal from East of Suez will leave a "great-power" vacuum in the Indian Ocean. Do we need bases and boats to fill it or can we count on nature's abhorrence, and the people of the area, to do that job? The considerations that led to British colonialism in the Nineteenth Century, when empire was profitable, can't justify an American military presence in this century if it means little more than a bigger defense bill. The White House and State Department assert that we will not replace the British. But unless we tell our military planners to forget it, we may find ourselves continuing to pay for that possibility.

The asserted unavailability of a "peace and growth dividend" will be a self-fulfilling prophecy if we use the peace to catch up on every item of our defense arsenal stunted by Vietnam priority needs. Before we can fit our defense program to our national interest, we must decide when and where we may seek to advance those interests by the application of military force. If our national security in fact demands a kind of Western Hemisphere "Brezhnev doctrine," we need the means to enforce a non-Communist orthodoxy. If we plan to support regimes in Southeast Asia against overthrow by their internal political rivals, we have to face up to the budgetary

consequences. And if we must conclude that our security requires us to resist and repel external aggression wherever it appears in the world, then our present defense budget is indeed too little and too late.

But I doubt that these are the premises on which our foreign policy will proceed in practice. And I think that the theory underlying our defense budget should be consistent with what we plan in practice to do. This violates, I recognize, the principle of ambiguity in the conduct of foreign policy. There are admitted disadvantages in tipping off a hostile power as to the circumstances under which we may go to war. A degree of uncertainty is undeniably a valuable factor in deterring aggression. But the gray area should not be so large as to delude those who, if under attack, would have our best wishes but might expect our armed support. A coherent defense program can never be constructed if we continue to leave the architects confused about the purposes we want it to serve.

#### ONE-BANK HOLDING COMPANY LEGISLATION

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, due to the tremendous amount of interest in and quite some misunderstanding about, the one-bank holding company legislation (H.R. 6778) reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, I have prepared an in-depth statement in explanation of what the bill does, and does not, do and provide which may be of interest to my colleagues. The text of my statement follows:

Bank holding company legislation was first enacted in 1956 to regulate and limit the "noncongeneric"—not of a related nature—activities of holding companies which had two or more banks as subsidiary or affiliated companies. It should be remembered that a "holding company" is so named because its only reason for existence is to provide an organizational structure or nucleus for the financial and/or commercial corporate activities it "holds." I have emphasized "corporate" because as written in 1956 and as the law reads today, natural persons or combinations of natural persons—partnerships, et cetera—are not covered by the act; apparently because the drafters of the law recognized the impropriety under our free enterprise system of restricting or limiting the business activities in which an individual may engage absent violation of antitrust, anticompetitive, or restraint of trade laws.

When the 1956 bank holding company legislation was passed, holding companies having only one bank as a subsidiary or affiliate were excepted from the purview of the law because these "one-bank holding companies" were generally speaking, small, local, agrarian oriented operations, the noncongeneric activities of which were recognized to be in the community or public interest. In other words, these small one-bank holding companies posed no threat of an excessive concentration

of power through the combination "under one roof" of finance and commerce.

It was not until recent years that large banks and large commercial enterprises recognized—or in any case, decided to make use of—the structural benefits of resorting to the one-bank holding company exception in the 1956 act; and, since no size limitation had been incorporated in the law, they were free to use this so-called loophole.

Once big banks decided to avail themselves of this "one-bank" exception to the Holding Company Act, it became obvious that whatever threat multibank holding companies offered, huge asset one-bank holding companies could be as ominous. As a result, legislation was first introduced on February 17 of this year by Chairman PATMAN which would subject one-bank holding companies to the rules, regulations, and restrictions formerly only applicable to multibank holding companies.

Both the Patman bill and the bill introduced on behalf of the Nixon administration went beyond a closing of the "loophole" exemption of one-bank holding companies from the Holding Company Act of 1956. Both bills amended the Holding Company Act of 1956 to bring one-bank holding companies under its purview, but in addition one or both bills: changed the regulatory agency—under the 1956 act, the regulatory agency was the Federal Reserve Board; eliminated the partnership exemption; established a "laundry list" of either permitted or prohibited activities in which the holding company or any of its affiliates could engage; changed the general definition or description of the activities which would be permissible as properly congeneric or bank-related; established new guidelines with respect to unlawful interlocking directorates of corporations; and contained miscellaneous other provisions quite unrelated to holding company legislation.

After weeks of hearings during which all aspects of the issue were explored, including presentations made by the insurance, travel agency, and data processing industries, and representatives of the profession of accountants, the committee reported out the bill, still numbered H.R. 6778, which will soon be before the House of Representatives for its consideration.

The primary purpose of the bill reported by the committee is to bring one-bank holding companies under the jurisdiction and purview of the Holding Company Act of 1956 thereby subjecting one-bank holding companies to the same rules, regulations, and restrictions as are applicable to multibank holding companies. In addition, the bill continues the Federal Reserve Board as the regulatory agency, but changes the definition or description of permitted nonbanking activities of affiliates of a bank holding company to those which are "functionally related to banking." This latter language was suggested by Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board during his testimony before the committee.

The committee did not deem it advisable to specify permitted and prohibited activities of affiliates of a holding company which owns a bank or banks except with respect to two activities. The bill specifically prohibits the Federal Reserve Board from approving the acquisition or retention by a bank holding company of shares of stock in any affiliate company which:

First, performs the function of an insurance agent, except where the insurance provided is limited to insuring the life of a debtor pursuant to or in connection with a specific credit transaction, or providing indemnity payments becoming due on a specific loan or other credit transaction while the debtor is disabled—under this provision of the bill, the bank holding company itself is restricted the same as an affiliate would be; or

Second, engages in the underwriting, public sale, or distribution of mutual funds.

Finally, the bill as reported establishes February 17, 1969 as the retroactive date from which the provisions of the amendatory legislation will be effective. The effect of this "grandfather clause" is to authorize the continuance of activities by bank holding companies if they were engaged in such activities prior to February 17, 1969, even though such activities may not meet the tests and requirements of the new legislation. However, any affiliate a bank holding company acquired, or proposes to acquire, subsequent to February 17, 1969, must meet the test of permissible activity as such activity is described and defined in the bill.

In many quarters, there is a gross misconception of the purpose of the bill. Many persons who are travel agents, data processors, accountants, or members of the insurance industry have been misled or have misconstrued the real purpose and impact of this legislation. This legislation does not pertain to the regulation or restriction of activities which may be carried on by a bank. In fact, this legislation has no real relevance to banks that are not affiliated with, or owned by, holding companies. The regulatory provisions of this legislation only govern and restrict the kinds of corporations or other business entities with which banks may be associated in a holding company. The regulation of the activities in which a bank may engage, is provided for in other laws which establish the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as the regulatory agency for State-chartered insured banks; the Comptroller of the Currency as the regulatory agency for national banks; and the Federal Reserve Board as the regulatory agency for banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System.

These latter agencies determine what activities are permissible for banks under their jurisdiction, and they will continue to do so, regardless of the passage or defeat of H.R. 6778. I cannot emphasize too much the fact that the legislation in question is more holding company legislation than bank legislation.

The foregoing describes what the bill

does, and does not, do and provide, but what are the critics saying about the bill?

Criticism of the bill by and large is voiced by those industries or activities which to a greater or lesser degree feel banks have unfairly and improperly encroached upon their area of interest. Primarily these include the insurance industry, travel agents, the data processing industry and professional accountants. Needless to say, the Committee could have approved language in the bill which would have prohibited affiliates of a holding company which owns a bank from engaging in any insurance activity, travel agency function, data processing service, or activity which might be considered to be the practice of the profession of accountancy. It is equally obvious that the Committee in its judgment did not deem it necessary and/or advisable to specifically prohibit activities of an affiliated company other than the insurance and mutual funds prohibitions recited above. It is fair to state that a majority of the Committee recognized the need for flexibility in the regulatory agency regarding these other activities and that varying conditions and circumstances might dictate a total prohibition in one case whereas the public interest would be served by approving of the affiliation of a company engaged in one of these activities in other cases. This flexibility is incorporated in the language of section 4(c) (8) which reads in part:

"... (8) shares [may be] retained or acquired with the approval of the Board in any company performing any activity that the Board has determined, after notice and opportunity for hearing, is functionally related to banking in such a way that its performance by an affiliate of a bank holding company can reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public that outweigh possible adverse effects."

Although representatives of the industries or professions, whose activities were not specifically denied affiliation with a holding company owning a bank, have been critical of the legislation because they felt a much tighter, more restrictive bill should have been reported by the Committee, the most vociferous of all have been the members and representatives of the insurance industry. A discussion of their objections is pertinent and relevant to the criticism voiced by others to the bill. Therefore, these objections should be more thoroughly examined.

The two main objections voiced by the insurance industry are: First, opposition to banks being in any way involved in the insurance or insurance-writing business; and, second, opposition to the "grandfather clause" of February 17, 1969—the date of January 1, 1965 having been suggested by the insurance industry, its contention being that it was after this latter date that the big banks started using the one-bank holding company "loophole" to engage in general insurance agency operations.

In discussing these objections, it should be said at the outset that probably no member of the Banking and Currency Committee is totally satisfied with

the bill as reported. It would be almost impossible to satisfy everyone in view of the totally different public welfare considerations which are involved in attempting to apply the provisions of a piece of legislation to the circumstances of small communities where financial conglomeration is almost essential to the public good as contrasted with the application of such legislation to our more populous urban centers where financial conglomeration can become an abuse and detrimental to the public welfare. A strong argument can be, and was, made that with respect to the smaller one-bank holding company operations, legislation is neither necessary nor desirable. Yet, the idea of setting size limitations and having different rules apply to the small and the large one-bank holding companies was almost unanimously rejected.

In examining the first objection of the insurance industry, it should be pointed out that some involvement by banks in what the insurance industry claims as its sole province has been lawful ever since the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 was passed, and, as discussed earlier, what banks may do in this area is technically not a matter to be resolved by this legislation since H.R. 6778 is not intended to dispose of the question of what is a proper banking activity but rather it directs itself to the question of what kinds of activities companies may engage in which are affiliated with a holding company which has as one of its affiliates or subsidiaries a bank. It should be further pointed out that any insurance activity not prohibited by the specific language of the bill, may not be carried on by a company affiliated with a bank holding company unless it satisfies the test of section 4(c) (8) set forth above. The insurance industry or anyone else feeling aggrieved by a proposed affiliation will have an opportunity under this section of the law to point out why such affiliation should not be approved by the Board.

The second objection voiced by the insurance industry and others is a usual complaint. Any time legislation is enacted which makes unlawful the continuation of a previously lawful practice or activity, objections are heard from both sides of the issue. Those who are engaged in the lawful practice or activity feel that they should not be required to divest themselves of such activity and that any "cutoff" date should be coincident with, or subsequent to, the enactment of the legislation. Others, who object to the carrying on of such lawful activity, always advocate that the legislation be totally retroactive and that the continuation of any activity or association which is made unlawful by the legislation be prohibited and divestiture required. Since equity and fairness usually dictate a middle road, a "grandfather clause" results.

From the foregoing it is obvious that the date to which any grandfather clause relates will be considered arbitrary and capricious by many if not most, and irrespective of whether or not they favor or oppose such a clause. The reason the February 17, 1969, date was selected by a

majority of the Banking and Currency Committee for the cutoff date is because that is the date Chairman Patman introduced his bill to regulate one-bank holding companies. This bill was the first legislation offered and with its introduction affected parties were given notice that legislation would be formally considered. Although the insurance industry has reached some consensus on the January 1, 1965, date, it is obvious that date is as arbitrary and capricious as is the February 17, 1969, date. Holding companies required to divest themselves of an activity perfectly lawful when entered into between the January 1, 1965, date and the date any legislation is enacted, could claim such requirement to be as much or more unjust as the injustice claimed to result by those who object to the later February 17, 1969, date.

Before concluding, it would be advisable for me to comment briefly upon the somewhat different and more particular concerns of the industries, other than the insurance industry, which feel they would be adversely affected by this legislation.

Travel agents and travel agencies would like to have language incorporated in this bill which would prohibit holding companies having a bank or banks from owning as an affiliate a company operating a travel agency business. Although most of the correspondence received from this industry requests a prohibition against banks engaging in the travel agency business, as previously indicated, this correspondence and these requests can only have relevance to this legislation to the extent such activity is carried on by a company affiliated with a bank in the same holding company. Disregarding this misconception, there was substantial testimony received by the Committee which supported the contention that the travel agency business originated with banks; that banks were the first to assist their traveler's check patrons and customers with reservations assistance and similar services now performed by travel agents; and, that there are many localities where it is not economically feasible for a travel agency to exist and that in those situations banks perform a real service to the community by providing travel agency services. It, therefore, was the committee's determination that the permitting or prohibiting of a travel agency affiliation with a bank holding company should be decided on an individual basis under the general test that the benefits of such an affiliation to the public must outweigh the possible adverse effects for such an affiliation to be approved.

The data processing industry admits that banks should be permitted to perform certain data processing services for their customers, but that such services should be strictly limited to the banking services rendered to or for the bank's customer. In other words, the data processing industry does not feel that banks should be permitted to use their data processing equipment for the performance of data processing services which are totally unrelated to the banking services they offer, nor should banks be able to provide data processing services

for a nonpatron of the bank. Here again, it was the committee's determination that it would be difficult to draw the fine line by general rule which the data processing industry sought and that it would be advisable to let the circumstances and conditions of each individual case determine the question of the propriety of an affiliation; the public benefit versus adverse effects rule being the test of such propriety.

Professional accountants have objected to the legislation contending that it is inadequate since it does not specifically prohibit banks from engaging in any form of professional accounting services. Again, it would be somewhat difficult to particularize in legislation that which is considered to be a professional accounting service as distinguished from the acceptable bookkeeping activities performed by banks for their customers. And, probably the criticism is much more directed to the day-to-day operations of banks than it is to bank affiliations. The writing of such a prohibition by the committee would have had to be done in general language, that is, a prohibition against banks performing the services of professional accountants, but such language for reasons previously stated, is not appropriate in this legislation and is more a matter of day-to-day enforcement than a legislating of policy.

The abuses these industries cite by and large fall into a few basic categories: First, tie-in sales, that is, requiring a customer of the bank to use the services of an affiliate company; second, preferential loan or credit treatment of affiliates; third, anticompetitive affiliation with associated companies; and fourth, restraint of trade. In the hearings of the committee, it was quite well established that recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court interpreting existing antitrust and related laws would seem to make unnecessary further specific legislation in these areas. There is every indication that the enforcement agencies and the courts are going to scrutinize much more carefully and enforce more strictly activities and laws relative to companies which are associated under one umbrella so as to make sure that the convenient family structure does not result in improper self dealing, preferential treatment, restraint of trade, or anticompetitive dealings or transactions.

Although there are several aspects of the bill which do not meet with my total satisfaction, probably more could have been done with the section dealing with authorized or unauthorized "bank-related" activities of affiliates. Rather than merely expressing in the legislation our disapproval of companies conducting insurance activities other than credit life and credit health and accident, and transactions in mutual funds, I believe it might have been appropriate to legislatively state certain other policy presumptions. For example, it might have been appropriate for us to state that it shall be presumed that the Federal Reserve Board shall not approve of the acquisition of companies by a one-bank holding company which companies' activities are those of public accountants, data processors, or travel agents—or any other

activity determined by the Congress to be an inappropriate activity for a bank holding company. In this way, the extraordinary circumstances which would justify a bank-holding company engaging, through an affiliate, in an otherwise inappropriate activity, would be sufficient to overcome such presumption and justify the approval of such acquisition by the Federal Reserve Board. In turn, absent such extraordinary circumstances the presumption would be sufficient to deny to the Board the authority to approve such acquisitions.

The Holding Company Act of 1956 covering multibank holding companies apparently has worked satisfactorily through the years since its enactment. With the passage of H.R. 6778, one-bank holding companies will be subjected to the same registration and regulation as multibank holding companies under the 1956 Act. Therefore, despite the many differences of opinion regarding this legislation, it should be passed to accomplish its primary purpose, that being the bringing of one-bank holding companies under the provisions of the 1956 Holding Company Act.

#### AFL-CIO BACKS O'HARA SAFETY BILL

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is the principal sponsor of H.R. 3809, an occupational safety and health bill which is now the focus of hearings by the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Education and Labor Committee. The administration has also introduced a bill in the same area, which falls far short of the O'Hara bill in most of the meaningful issues.

Recently, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, head of the legislative department, AFL-CIO, testified before the committee, urging the adoption of the O'Hara bill approach, and specifically pointing out many of the flaws of the administration proposal.

The Detroit Building Tradesman, published by the Detroit Building Trades Council, reported Mr. Biemiller's testimony on the O'Hara bill in a story which I include at this point in the RECORD:

LABOR DEMANDS END TO JOB SLAUGHTER—  
AFL-CIO BACKS O'HARA SAFETY BILL—  
BIEMILLER TELLS HOUSE UNIT OF ENORMOUS TOLL

WASHINGTON.—LABOR has called on Congress to act quickly "to stop the killing in the workplace, the crippling injuries and the disease-induced illnesses that plague workers in the United States."

AFL-CIO Legislative Director Andrew J. Biemiller and President I. W. Abel, of the federation's Industrial Union Department, called for passage of a strong occupational safety and health bill, based on legislation introduced by Rep. James G. O'Hara (D., Mich.).

Biemiller told a House Labor subcommittee that more than 14,000 workers have died on the job since the AFL-CIO testified for similar legislation last year.

"Another 2.2 million have been injured," he said. "Billions of dollars in wages and production have been lost; worst of all there has been innumerable hours of human suffering caused by the pain of slow death from the effects of asbestos, beryllium, carbon monoxide, coal dust, cotton dust, cancer-causing chemicals, pesticides, radiation and other occupational hazards."

And, he warned, the rate of occupational injuries is on the rise because "private industry has not taken the necessary steps to make the workplace safe and healthy."

Biemiller said the substitute bill the administration is supporting, however well-intentioned, is weaker and would be less effective than the O'Hara bill.

Abel said the substitute "would set up paper standards that employers and workers would rely upon at their peril."

Stressing the need for Federal action, Abel told the subcommittee that national safety and health codes are essential.

"The life and health of workers are equally precious in every state," he said. "Safety and health rules should be applied with equal force without regard to state boundary lines."

Biemiller presented to the subcommittee the resolution unanimously passed at the AFL-CIO's convention this month supporting the O'Hara bill as "the first decisive step" towards the objective of "a safe and healthy place of employment for every American working man and woman."

He praised President Nixon's message to Congress, stressing the need for Federal legislation, and said that the issue "is not longer whether or not there should be any Federal occupational safety and health legislation, but what kind of legislation should be enacted."

Explaining why the AFL-CIO supports the O'Hara bill in preference to the administration bill sponsored by Rep. William H. Ayres (R., O.), Biemiller cited these key differences:

The O'Hara bill directs the secretary of labor to issue on-the-job safety and health standards, and to enforce the law with power to shut down an unsafe operation in an emergency. Health standards would be based on recommendations developed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

"The administration bill would establish a new five-member national occupational safety and health board, appointed by the President. Instead of providing a single focus for attacking the safety and health problems of the American workplace," Biemiller said, "it would constitute another layer of bureaucracy."

The bill, he added, "mixes up responsibilities like a mess of spaghetti" between the proposed board, the Labor Department and HEW.

Furthermore, Biemiller noted, the administration bill in practical effect would rely on private standard-setting organization such as the National Standards Institute and the National Fire Protection Association to develop the Federal codes.

Such groups have made "important contributions," Biemiller said, and the AFL-CIO has co-operated with them. But they tend to be dominated by management and various standard-setting committees "move with glacial slowness" in trying to reach a consensus.

#### NOISE POLLUTION

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in this week's edition of Life

magazine, William Zinsser comments on a growing problem found within the United States. According to the Life "Comment," authorities say that excess noise is a growing cause of, among other things, rapid heartbeat, mental illness, family strife, suicide, and murder. In my opinion, it is also responsible for inferior educational opportunities for students attending schools located near sources of excess noise.

My congressional district encompasses part of Los Angeles International Airport and consequently I have been quite concerned with the problems caused by jet created decibels. Consequently, I have joined with several other Members of Congress in a bipartisan effort to focus attention on the problem. Recently the city of Inglewood, Calif., an area within my district, and the community of Hempstead, Long Island, N.Y., jointly sponsored a conference on jet noise here in Washington. It was my privilege to address delegates sent to the meeting representing concerned cities throughout the United States. As a result of the conference a national organization is being formed to coordinate municipal, State, and Federal efforts to combat noise pollution.

I have personally introduced bills to soundproof classrooms affected by jet noise—H.R. 3850—to provide compensation to individuals whose property has suffered damage due to sonic booms—H.R. 8206—and to amend President Nixon's airport and airways development proposal to establish a noise abatement trust fund—H.R. 12824. I am presently conducting research to determine, city by city, the effects that noise is having upon the educational process of schools and school districts in close proximity to sources of excess airplane noise. I intend to eventually expand my research activities to include other sources of disturbances such as freeways, construction sites, railroad lines and other potential causes.

In our technologically advanced society it would seem to be a minor chore to reduce the present noise producers to acceptable levels. Must it take years of research to come up with startling discoveries that we are definitely subject to hearing loss and psychological disturbances due to the increasing din of our environment? Can we not act preventatively instead of after the fact? While I and many scientists and concerned citizens are aware of the dangers caused by noise pollution, must we be like voices shouting in the wilderness, not being heard by our colleagues and neighbors and possibly being drowned out by a combination of the noise about us and the apathy within the hearts of our fellow citizens? I hope not, but in any event, I shall continue in my efforts to bring relief to those presently suffering and protection to those who will be vulnerable in the future.

The article follows:

ARE WE HOOKED ON NOISE?—THE ESCALATION OF "ENVIRONMENTAL DIN"  
(By William Zinsser)

A group of scientists met in Chicago earlier this year to hold a symposium on noise pollution and, presumably keeping their voices low, agreed that "environmental din" is

doubling with every decade and will have us all on the ropes by 1975.

"It might be a good thing if people's ears would bleed," one environmental psychologist told the meeting, which was held by the American Medical Association. "Then people might get aroused. It may take a disaster like the Santa Barbara oil slick to dramatize the situation. Otherwise, noise pollution could be the last straw, on top of air pollution and all the other pollutions, that might bring our society crashing down."

Well, I've never seen a bleeding ear and never hope to see one. Still, the man has a point, and it may be that America is entering a new phase of the democratic process—government by mishap. Santa Barbara proved that the country won't stop polluting its seas and beaches until it befouls an entire region beyond the tolerance of man, bird and fish.

Therefore what the nation really needs is a Secretary of Disaster, whose job would be to turn blunder into victory. He would repair all the erosions of everyday life that Washington is too inert to cure. The first person with ear-bleed, for instance, would go to see him, or the first person driven mad by air compressors or jackhammers in the street, or by jets in the air, or by noisy plumbing in the next apartment. The Secretary would hustle them over to a joint session of Congress and get the necessary legislation started.

What makes modern noise so insidious, the symposium experts said, is that we're getting hooked on the stuff, as dependent as an addict for our daily level of din. "A vacuum cleaner that was nearly silent, while technically feasible, would not be likely to sell very well," suggested Ray Donley, an acoustical engineer, "because today's housewife wants to hear the sound of power."

Far be it from me to doubt the word of an acoustical engineer, but in this case I'll make an exception. The wail of a vacuum cleaner is one acoustical treat that I think our wives can live without. Are we to believe that Mrs. America actually revels in the decibel count of her machine as it sucks old scraps of dirt and food from under the sofa? She endures the vacuum cleaner's roar out of gratitude for its labor, and simply assumes that science hasn't yet found a way to shut it up.

But science has found a way—Mr. Donley let the cat out of the bag. Hey, everybody! A silent vacuum cleaner is technically feasible! Pass it on! The only catch, he says, is that no woman will buy it. Want to bet?

After all, it's not as if a silent vacuum cleaner will plunge the neighborhood into deathly stillness, the sort of place where you can hear a pin drop. Dropped pins just aren't being heard in America today. Background noise in the average community has risen so sharply that it exceeds the standards accepted by industry. So don't be surprised, ladies, if your husband starts leaving home early and returning late. He just wants to get some quiet down at the plant.

And don't try to tell him that a vacation in the country is any answer. It isn't—power tools have seen to that. A vacationer who wakes with delight at 8 to the singing of birds will be enraged at 9 by the whine of a power saw a quarter-mile away. The notion that one man with one saw should not be allowed to destroy the sanity of several hundred people evidently doesn't trouble our lawmakers; otherwise they would write some silencing laws into the manufacturing laws. Nor is going to the lake any better—Thoreau's broad margin of life has been whittled away by water-skiers. The outboard motor that pulls the water-skier through his swoops and turns is one of the most strident creatures now loose in nature, and winter brings no relief. Then the 700,000 snowmobiles come out to play.

I'm not against water-skiing, or sawing, or any of these noise-making pastimes. I'm

only against the noise that they make, which could be reduced if anybody cared enough. So what if the product would cost more? Anyone with enough money for power tools or an outboard motor is not hurting for dough. What's hurting is the central nervous system of whole communities. Authorities say that excess noise is a growing cause of, among other things, rapid heartbeat, mental illness, family strife, suicide and murder.

As for whether it's technologically possible to hush these machines, I'm assuming that it is. Any country that can achieve what its President calls "the greatest week in the history of the world since The Creation" should be able to manage such minor jobs of creativity—mere third-day stuff—as toning down the gadgets that are driving its citizens crazy.

I know this is the tritest thought now in the public domain: that if we can put a man on the moon, we should at least be able to redeem our cities, educate our children, elevate our minorities, feed our hungry, and clean our environment. Still, it's no less true for being a cliché, and I refuse to be shamed out of repeating it—anything to keep us from forgetting that our priorities are here on earth and our commitments to the quality of life.

Noise is now one of life's cruelest enemies. Yet the Department of Health, Education and Welfare didn't request in its last legislative package that Congress do anything about it. All hope, however, need not be lost. As one spokesman said, "HEW is undergoing a lot of reprogramming, and I think noise is going to get a very good looking at."

That may be the trouble right there. Washington is going to take a good look at noise. But is anybody going to listen?

#### SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

### HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial technical-economic issues of this decade is the question of whether or not we should commit the Nation and its resources to the development and operation of a commercial supersonic transport—SST.

It is a difficult issue. Proponents and opponents have both made good arguments supporting their positions. The principal issues in the decision of whether to build or not to build can be separated into four main categories: economics, sonic boom disturbance, unanticipated technical difficulties, and Government funding policy and national priorities.

Having carefully considered the pro and con arguments in each of these areas, I am forced to conclude that development and operation of the SST should not be assigned the high priority it has been tagged with by the administration. It is with reluctance that I oppose the administration in its attempt to secure funds for continued development of the supersonic transport. There are still many questions involving technical problems that remain unanswered. The sonic boom is a difficult problem that has not been adequately resolved, even by the announcement of the Secretary of Transportation banning supersonic flights of SST's over land until the boom is controlled or eliminated.

In addition, there is disagreement

among economists on the economic feasibility of the aircraft's development and operation; there is disagreement over the effect of the aircraft on America's balance-of-payments situation; and the effect of foreign competition and the higher supersonic air fares compared to lower subsonic fares is unknown. This adds up to a large number of unknowns.

At a time when we are trying to gain control of an overinflated economy, should we risk making a massive investment in a program whose outcome is so doubtful? I think we have too many more pressing problems which should receive national attention first. The SST is one area where we can trim the budget.

Let me take a moment to explain my opposition to the SST. First of all, I think we must ask ourselves if we think the SST is a sound investment for the Nation. We must remember that this investment is not a minor commitment, but a commitment that will accompany us for several years. It is a budgetary commitment that we will have to meet over a period of time.

Even expert economists and analysts acknowledge that the economic picture of the SST is highly sensitive. Widely varying estimates and predictions have been made about the economic outlook of the SST. Studies undertaken by Boeing—the contractor—and the Federal Aviation Administration predict a rosy future for the SST, but other studies have not been so favorable.

A study conducted under the auspices of the Commerce Department by Booz-Allen Applied Research, Inc.—BAAR INC—indicates higher cost estimates than those submitted by the contractors. This is understandable since most contractors tend to be optimistic about development whereas BARRINC based its estimates on past examples where program changes have upped costs. See appendix A. A plane that is designed to revolutionize commercial air travel is bound to require such program changes to meet new and unanticipated technical problems.

Many have touted the SST as "good business" for Uncle Sam—a boost for the aircraft industry, potentially—through sales on the world market—a big help to our sagging balance-of-payments situation. But let us look at the entire picture. First, we are already a year behind schedule in our development program of the SST. The Soviets are far ahead at this point in the development of a supersonic transport, having flight tested their plane on December 31, 1968.

Although in the past the Soviets have not been conspicuously successful in selling their commercial airliners outside the Soviet bloc, it is anticipated that they will be making a concerted effort to sell their supersonic transport to world airlines.

The French have also test flown the Concorde, their version of the SST, and are anticipating operating the plane for commercial use in the early 1970's.

While the American plane will be faster and larger than its competitors, can we be sure that the airlines of the world will be willing to put off procurement of a supersonic commercial plane until its

development is completed? Undoubtedly, the SST faces formidable competition which cannot help but cut into potential sales. Even development of the American jumbo jet, the 747, will have an effect.

Furthermore, a study by the Institute for Defense Analyses—IDA—concludes that under certain conditions, introduction of the U.S. SST would have a negative effect on U.S. balance of payments. The study argues that SST sales may to some extent supplant U.S. subsonic aircraft sales abroad, and that, if Americans comprise more than 50 percent of the marginal SST passengers, the travelers' foreign expenditures will tend to offset the SST's foreign sales contribution to the balance of payments.

In making decisions about the economic feasibility of the SST, the sonic boom which the plane will produce cannot be ignored. Obviously, sales will be influenced by restrictions imposed to control the effects of the sonic boom. The sonic boom is probably the single most objectionable aspect of the program. The possibility does exist that the boom can cause physical damage, and there have been reports that under certain conditions sonic booms can cause landslides and rock falls. If the physical situation is highly unstable, there is a good possibility that a sonic boom or repeated sonic booms could cause such an occurrence. This presents a threat to irreplaceable natural and artificial structures of historic and cultural significance. Even though a single boom may not cause the damage, the cumulative effect of a large number of sonic booms would be more likely to cause harmful damage.

In addition, while preliminary tests have been made, we do not really know the extent of the adverse psychological and physiological effects of the sonic boom on people. Preliminary tests indicate that a good portion of the population would find it intolerable to live with the resulting sonic boom at certain levels.

Secretary Volpe's announcement that the SST would be prohibited from flying over land until the sonic boom problem was worked out takes cognizance of the problem, but it is no answer in itself. First of all, the alternative of not flying the SST at supersonic speed over land undercuts much of the rationale for having such an aircraft. And second, once the plane has been developed and put into commercial operation will the Secretary of Transportation be able to resist the public pressure to permit overland flights at supersonic speeds?

There are other technical problems in the plane's development and operation which remain unanswered or unresolved. An issue of major concern, also related to noise, is that of engine noise during warmups and takeoffs. The engines on the SST, more powerful than conventional subsonic engines, are far noisier in the airport than are subsonic planes. With public resistance to aircraft noise around airports already a problem, this noise factor, combined with the sonic boom, definitely raises the question of public acceptability of the aircraft. This is a problem that has not been given the proper kind of consideration.

One of the difficulties with the SST is

that, of course, we have no assurances that satisfactory solutions to the difficulties in technological development can be found. Furthermore, other technological problems may be uncovered as development proceeds that could even cause abandonment of the entire program.

In addition, we are currently suffering badly from overly congested airspace and inadequate development of facilities and equipment and manpower to handle the heavy air traffic. This is a very dangerous situation. Can we afford to risk midair collisions between airplanes traveling at supersonic speeds? Do we have the necessary equipment and manpower to get these supersonic vehicles into the air and down again safely?

I believe safety should be a paramount consideration, and anyone following the complaints of the air traffic controllers knows that our facilities leave much to be desired in the way of safety. I would rather we upgrade our airport facilities and safety standards before we embark on a course that will put super-high-speed aircraft into the skies. Only disaster can follow if we have not provided the facilities to handle them.

And finally, we must ask ourselves whether the objective of maintaining leadership in air transportation is important enough to divert scarce resources into such a risky venture when we are faced with a national housing shortage, when our ground transportation system is in bad shape, and when our cities are crying for help?

I am afraid we simply have too many other more pressing domestic problems, not to mention foreign commitments. At a time when we are fighting a war in Southeast Asia it is foolish to be spending money on a skeptical plane whose potential cannot be known and whose effect on the economy and population are uncertain.

This is a particularly bad time to be proceeding with such a large spending program. It comes at a time when we are suffering from a serious case of inflation—at a time when we are trying to trim the budget and reduce expenditures—at a time when the President has cut back on Federal construction projects and has asked business to use unusual restraint in investment ventures.

I ask, How can we justify this expense when we look at our economic landscape? How can we justify the expenditure of \$662 million of tax funds for a plane of doubtful worth and acceptability when at the same time, the President admits the need for improving education, but complains that the economic picture forces him to make some drastic cuts in the education budget? I do not think we can.

If the venture is truly "good business," then business should be willing to take the risk to finance development. Since when has our Government taken the position that it ought to subsidize a monopolistic business enterprise with taxpayers' dollars? As the President said, "the supersonic transport is going to be built." But maybe we ought to let others build it while we rebuild our cities and restore the quality of our education. I do not think we have to be first in every-

thing. We do not have the resources to do it. Let us be first in what counts most. Let us set our priorities. If we do not, we will do nothing well.

APPENDIX A  
COMPARISON OF BAARINC ESTIMATES WITH  
CONTRACTORS' ESTIMATES

[In millions of dollars]

Contractors	Boeing/ General Electric	Lockheed/ Pratt & Whitney
Airframe.....	\$27.388	\$25.111
Engines.....	6.253	7.074
Avionics.....	.800	.800
Total.....	34.441	32.985
BAARINC:		
Airframe.....	42.967	39.806
Engine.....	8.733	8.319
Avionics.....	.800	.800
Total.....	52.501	48.925

Source: From "SST Development and Production Cost Analysis," Booz-Allen Applied Research, Inc.

CBW TRAINING FOR FOREIGN  
MILITARY PERSONNEL

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a recent newspaper report to the effect that the Army has been offering courses dealing with chemical and biological warfare to military personnel from over 30 different countries has prompted me to ask for a full explanation of these activities from the Department of the Army.

I frankly am disturbed over the possibility that by our actions we may be contributing to the acceptability of chemical and biological weapons and that, during hostilities, the expertise gained by military officers of foreign nations will some day be used in waging offensive operations against other countries. According to one account, the knowledge gained by Egyptian officers several years ago from courses offered at Fort McClellan, Ala., was in fact utilized in poison gas attacks carried out by United Arab Republic forces in Yemen against civilian targets.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is of little significance whether these courses are labeled as being "defensive" or "offensive" since it is plain that in order to perfect defensive techniques against CBW, offensive strategy and methods must first be understood. The dissemination of CBW information to nations whose political complexions may change overnight is to my mind not in the interests of preventing the use of germs and poison gas as a substitute for other more sophisticated and costly arms. Our training policy also weakens the credibility of our own unofficial reassurances that the United States will never use these terrible weapons first.

I am looking forward to the Army's

full response to the questions I have raised concerning these courses, and I hope that this issue is being included in the review of our Nation's CBW policies that is supposedly going on at the present time.

A copy of my letter to Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor is printed below:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., October 27, 1969.  
HON. STANLEY R. RESOR,  
Secretary of the Army,  
The Pentagon,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to express my concern over a recent report in the press that the Army has been training foreign military personnel from more than thirty countries in the use of chemical and biological warfare agents.

I would hope that the desirability of this particular facet of our extensive CBW program is being studied in the review of our nation's CBW activities. I am concerned over the very real possibility that the indiscriminate dissemination of CBW expertise might lead to situations where CBW operations might be attempted by some of these nations using the knowledge acquired here. According to the newspaper story, the skills acquired by Egyptian Army personnel in these courses were actually used in poison gas attacks on civilians in Yemen.

I also wonder whether we are not encouraging some of the poorer nations to develop CBW weapons as a substitute for more costly sophisticated armaments and for use as a threat against potential enemies. The many coups in recent years have demonstrated the instability of many regimes and the irrational behavior of governments in conflict situations, making the propriety of such training even more doubtful.

In order to clear up questions as to the value of these training activities, I would appreciate your furnishing me with a listing of the numbers, ranks and nationalities of foreign military personnel who have taken or are now taking these courses, and a description of the contents of each of the courses. In addition, I would appreciate answers to the following questions:

Could the course contents aid in any significant way in the development of an offensive chemical or biological capability by any of the participating states? Or, to put it another way, what guarantees do we have that so-called "defensive" techniques are not adaptable to offensive use at the discretion of the user?

At what level, if any, in the State Department were clearances sought for the enrollment of foreign nationals in these courses and was due consideration given to our overall foreign policy objectives as opposed to our bilateral relations with a particular country?

What were the extent and sources of the funds used to provide this training?

To what extent have we solicited foreign participation in these courses?

Is any training provided overseas by U.S. military personnel and are any materials provided?

What are the present plans within your Department for the continuation of these courses?

An airing of the issues raised is needed to dispel justifiable fears that in offering these courses to a large number of foreign military personnel, we are increasing the likelihood that CBW might be used. I also believe we are not strengthening our public posture, which always needs reinforcement, that we will not be the first to use CBW.

It is difficult to square this dissemination function with our nation's overall arms con-

trol efforts and fear of the continued proliferation of nuclear weapons. As you are aware, it is particularly difficult to verify research and stockpiling of chemical and biological agents.

If, on the other hand, it turns out that these courses have been offered routinely because they are considered of little strategic importance, then there is a danger that we are promoting the acceptability of CBW by treating it as just another form of warfare.

I am looking forward to your full and frank response to the points raised in this letter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,  
Member of Congress.

#### A NEW PLAN TO FIGHT PORNOGRAPHY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the November issue of the Reader's Digest, the issue now available on the newsstands, carries an important article by the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen entitled "A New Plan To Fight Pornography." The editors of the Digest prefaced the article with these remarks:

Senator Dirksen completed work on this article barely a week before he died on September 7. We are convinced that the objective it espouses—that only juries of local citizens should make the final determination of what is obscene—is not only valid but attainable. The passing of the Dirksen anti-obscenity bill (S. 1077) would, in our opinion, constitute an appropriate memorial to this distinguished lawmaker.

The late Senator's concern over this issue was well founded. In the article he stated:

The business of pornography has reached such immense proportions that 200 companies are producing hard-core filth, with sales reaching over \$500 million a year. Postal authorities are swamped with complaints from citizens objecting to the pornographer's lurid sex ads. In fiscal 1969 alone, 234,692 such protests were registered. A recent Gallup poll showed that 76 percent of the American people insist that tougher laws are needed to keep obscene publications off newsstands.

On February 19 of this year Senator Dirksen introduced S. 1077 while, on the same day I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 7201, in the House. The same legislation had been introduced by Senators Dirksen and MANSFIELD on September 18, 1968, but unfortunately died at the close of the 90th Congress for want of action. This year on the House side I have asked the Judiciary Committee for a report from the appropriate Federal agencies as to their position of this particular legislation. I am hopeful that the report will soon be forthcoming as committee action is desirable as soon as possible. The text of S. 1077 and H.R. 7201 reads as follows:

A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 71, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1466. Determinations of fact

"In every criminal action arising under this chapter or under any other statute of the United States determination of the question whether any article, matter, thing, device, or substance is in fact obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy shall be made by the jury without comment by the court upon the weight of the evidence relevant to that question, unless the defendant has waived trial by jury."

(b) The section analysis of that chapter is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new item:

"1466. Determinations of fact."

Sec. 2. (a) Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 176.—ACTIONS INVOLVING  
OBSCENTY

"Sec.

"3001. Judicial review.

"§ 3001. Judicial review

"(a) In any criminal action arising under any statute of the United States for the prosecution of any person for the possession, sale, dissemination, or use of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy article, matter, thing, device or substance, no court of the United States or of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to review, reverse, or set aside a determination made by a jury on the question whether such article, matter, thing, device, or substance is in fact obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy.

"(b) In any criminal action arising under any statute of any State or under any law of any political subdivision of any State for the prosecution of any person for the possession, sale, dissemination, or use of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy article, matter, thing, device, or substance no court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, reverse, or set aside a determination made by a court of such State on the question whether such article, matter, thing, device, or substance is in fact obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy."

(b) The analysis of title 28, United States Code, preceding part I thereof is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"176. Actions involving obscenity---- 3001".

(c) The chapter analysis of part VI, title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"176. Actions involving obscenity---- 3001"

As Senator Dirksen pointed out in his article, this legislation would free juries of local citizens to make the final determination as to whether a book, magazine, or movie is obscene. He stated:

In prosecutions under state or federal obscenity laws, the verdicts of juries as to the question of obscenity would not be subject to review by federal courts. The Supreme Court could, as always, review the legal correctness of any such prosecution, but it would no longer be allowed to look behind the lower court's findings of fact. (My bill would affect appeals to federal courts only, but I urge state legislatures to adopt similar rules for their appellate courts.)

Why this drastic step regarding the Federal courts, and in particular the Supreme Court?

The key role played by the Supreme Court in the deplorable smut glut now enraging American citizens was brought to public attention by the monumental

efforts of the Citizens for Decent Literature—CDL—whose founder Attorney Charles H. Keating and attorney for the executive board of CDL, James J. Clancy, testified on July 22, 1968, before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the proposed appointment of Justice Abe Fortas as Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Referring to cases handed down in May and June 1967, by the highest court, the CDL representatives pointed out that the Court reversed 23 of the 26 State and Federal obscenity determinations. The community standards of 13 States were upset. Eight findings of fact by juries were reversed. The lengthy and thorough CDL testimony then proceeded to list the pertinent cases with their summaries and legal citations. This testimony, which I inserted in the RECORD on September 4, 1968, along with a CDL film showing some of the literature and films approved by the Court, brought into proper perspective the part played by the U.S. Supreme Court in the present hard-core pornographic deluge.

The presence of Senator Everett Dirksen will certainly be missed on the Senate floor, but his resolve and counsel, as expressed in the closing paragraph of the Digest article, should be both emulated and heeded:

For my part, I intend to use every means at my disposal to see that my bill is enacted. But I need the backing of an aroused citizenry. Every one of you can help, individually and through civic groups and local organizations, by writing your Congressman and both of your Senators expressing your outrage at the filth engulfing our land and urging their support of S. 1077. If all of us pull together, we can win this fight!

I insert the article, "A New Plan To Fight Pornography," by the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, appearing in the November 1969, issue of the Reader's Digest, in the RECORD at this point:

#### A NEW PLAN TO FIGHT PORNOGRAPHY

(By Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen)

(NOTE.—Senator Dirksen completed work on this article barely a week before he died on September 7. We are convinced that the objective it espouses—that only juries of local citizens should make the final determination of what is obscene—is not only valid but attainable. The passing of the Dirksen anti-obscenity bill (S. 1077) would, in our opinion, constitute an appropriate memorial to this distinguished lawmaker.)

The United States is overwhelmed with smut. Like some medieval plague, the mounting flow of obscene books, films and magazines surrounds us, threatening our national health. Consider just a few of the symptoms accompanying this plague:

A multimillion-dollar printing factory in Phoenix, Ariz., keeps its presses rolling 24 hours a day, five days a week, turning out 35,000 lewd books each day. A Los Angeles, Calif., smut publisher who went into business just three years ago with \$25,000 capital now grosses over a million dollars annually. A jury recently found two of his books to be hard-core pornography, and by his own admission he is in the business primarily to make money.

In recent years, the rapidly proliferating sleazy bookstores in cities throughout the nation have added a new attraction: filmed peep shows. For 25 cents, the customer can peer through a slot and watch naked men and women gyrate for a few moments. New York City alone now has some 400 peep-show machines scattered about.

Books, magazines and sometimes movies now show full genital exposure. Sexual intercourse has been shown in commercially exhibited films which are raking in millions of dollars across the country. Tabloid newspapers with such names as *Screw*, *Pleasure* and the *New York Review of Sex*—with pictures to match—are sold over hundreds of newsstands.

These are far from isolated cases. The business of pornography has reached such immense proportions that 200 companies are producing hard-core filth, with sales reaching over \$500 million a year. Postal authorities are swamped with complaints from citizens objecting to the pornographer's lurid sex ads. In fiscal 1969 alone, 234,692 such protests were registered. A recent Gallup poll showed that 76 percent of the American people insist that tougher laws are needed to keep obscene publications off newsstands.

How did we reach such a state?

For some 12 years, the U.S. Supreme Court has labored to define what may be banned as obscene. In June 1957, the Court handed down a landmark decision in the case of *Roth v. United States*. Declaring that the First Amendment guarantees of free speech have never applied to obscene material, the Court held that "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press."

The test of obscenity, as spelled out in this and later cases, is: Whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the "dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest" and is "utterly without redeeming social importance." A key point in the declaration: a book or film must be judged in its entirety, not on the basis of isolated passages.

This legal definition, admittedly not perfect, is at least workable. Unfortunately, the courts—and, too often, the Supreme Court itself—have not permitted it to work. Time after time, juries have sought to apply the Supreme Court's guidelines to a book or movie, only to have their decision on the facts summarily overturned.

Here is a sampling of the most important recent cases:

A Redwood City, Calif., nudie-film merchant named Sam Ratner exhibited an 8-millimeter strip-film entitled *Honey Bee*. It showed a well-endowed model, clad only in garter belt and stockings, undulating on a couch, moving her hands, torso, lips and pelvis to suggest sexual intercourse. A jury found the film to be pornography, without artistic significance or even a modicum of redeeming social importance. The appellate department of the superior court of California upheld this finding. Yet, incredibly, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned Ratner's jury conviction. Thus, the film was, in effect, declared not obscene, and was therefore protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

In Rochester, N.Y., David E. Keney ran a bookstore featuring what he told customers were called "spicy hot" books. Three of his paperback books carried the titles *Lust School*, *Lust Web* and *Sin Servant*. Their message: detailed descriptions of sexual aberrations of all kinds. A jury found the books obscene. An appellate court agreed with the jury's decision, and New York State's highest court turned down the appeal. Nevertheless, this case was among a group of 26 obscenity-conviction appeals considered by the U.S. Supreme Court during its October 1966 term.

As in the Ratner case, the Supreme Court reversed Keney's conviction. In neither instance was the Court ruling on the legal correctness of the case, but rather was making its own value judgment that the materials involved were not obscene. By these declarations, it switched from being a conservator of legal tradition to being a censor of individual books and films—a most unfortunate switch.

In all, the Court reversed the obscenity determinations in 22 of the 26 October-term cases involving material ranging from homosexuality to sadism. With its decisions, the Court overturned the obscenity finding of eight juries and wiped out the attempts of 13 separate states to control the distribution of salacious material.

In Portland, Ore., newsstand operator Harold G. Childs was arrested for selling a book entitled *Lesbian Roommate*. A Portland jury found the book obscene and convicted Childs. On appeal, the supreme court of Oregon upheld the jury decision, describing *Lesbian Roommate* as a "series of sexual descriptions, tending to and produced solely for the arousal of exotic sexual fantasies."

The U.S. Supreme Court turned down a petition to consider the Childs case. But, just three months later, on June 23, 1969, a federal district judge made a remarkable intervention, granting a writ of habeas corpus to free Childs on the ground that *Lesbian Roommate* was not obscene. In his opinion, the book did not appeal to prurient interests, nor did it offend contemporary community standards. By this ruling, a federal judge overruled the judgment of a community jury and of the state supreme court, and made a shambles of that state's efforts to curb smut.

What can be done about this court-approved filth?

The Constitution of the United States provides us with an answer. Article III specifically empowers Congress to make "exceptions and regulations" to the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction. Thus, explained *The Federalist*—that historic group of essays written by early supporters of the Constitution—the Legislative Branch "would certainly have full power to provide that in appeals to the Supreme Court there should be no re-examination of facts where they had been tried by juries."

The pornography problem is so grave that Congressional action along such lines is desperately needed. Accordingly, I have introduced a bill (S. 1077) which would if passed, free juries of local citizens to make the final determination as to whether a book, magazine or movie is obscene. In prosecutions under state or federal obscenity laws, the verdicts of juries as to the question of obscenity would not be subject to review by federal courts. The Supreme Court could, as always, review the legal correctness of any such prosecution, but it would no longer be allowed to look behind the lower court's findings of fact. (My bill would affect appeals to federal courts only, but I urge state legislatures to adopt similar rules for their appellate courts.)

Thus, the people of our communities would decide what they think the moral standards under which their youngsters are to be reared should be. This procedure would avoid the dread hand of unreasonable censorship and would be in keeping with the best of American legal tradition. As Judge Learned Hand, one of our greatest jurists, once pointed out: "In this country the jury must determine, under instructions, whether a book is obscene. The court's only power is to decide whether the book is so clearly innocent that the jury should not pass on it at all."

Enactment of my proposal would not foreclose other steps urgently needed to win the fight against pornography. Local prosecutors, police and citizens must redouble their efforts to keep the filth peddlers at bay. The Administration's tough new program to crack down on the smut advertising now being mailed into the nation's homes must be passed. However, laws cannot do the job without the goad of public opinion. In the words of President Nixon: "When indecent books no longer find a market, when pornographic films can no longer draw an audience, when obscene plays open to empty houses, then the tide will turn."

For my part, I intend to use every means at my disposal to see that my bill is enacted. But I need the backing of an aroused citizenry. Every one of you can help, individually and through civic groups and local organizations, by writing your Congressman and both of your Senators expressing your outrage at the filth now engulfing our land and urging their support of S. 1077. If all of us pull together, we can win this fight!

### REDS' NEGRO PUPPET CLAIMS SANCTUARY IN DETROIT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it seems we are about to be treated to one of the propaganda displays of our times in the case of a small-time hoodlum who has been built up by international communism to the point that he takes himself seriously.

Robert Williams was too loudmouthed for the NAACP in his native North Carolina. He fled the State when indicted for kidnaping, which is a crime in that State. Fleeing in interstate commerce to avoid prosecution for a felony is a Federal crime, so the FBI is also interested in him.

He has been in Cuba, Red China, Tanzania, mouthing constant seditious hogwash against the United States. He has openly counseled and encouraged such parlor games as murder, arson, and revolution. He even thinks he is a president.

Surprisingly, some of our officials seem to have fallen for the same song, treating him with kid gloves, delivering him new passports, dropping charges, granting him privileges which are totally unheard of in dealing with common criminals of this type. In the end, he has served his Red masters well.

For the information of this House, I insert pertinent news clippings and articles at this point in my remarks:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News]

RETURN TO NORTH CAROLINA MEANS DEATH,  
RNA LEADER TELLS COURT

LANSING.—Robert Williams, leader of the black separatist Republic of New Africa (RNA), faces possible death if Michigan sends him back to North Carolina on a kidnaping charge, he says.

"If you send me to North Carolina, I'll just assume it will be a suicidal mission for me," Williams told an extradition hearing officer yesterday.

Williams' attorney, Milton Henry, of Pontiac, said Union County, N.C.—where the kidnaping allegedly took place—is "Klan country." "Law (there) . . . is conducted on a racist basis," he said.

North Carolina's "purpose is to get him back to perhaps harass and even kill him," said Henry, vice-president of the RNA. "They wouldn't want to try this case at 12th and Clairmont (in a black area of Detroit). We don't want to try it in North Carolina."

Williams, who appeared at the hearing with his wife, Mabel, and three other attorneys, said "American justice is on trial—not Robert Williams."

Joseph Thibodeau, assistant legal adviser to Gov. Milliken, set Nov. 10 for a second

hearing after Henry said he could produce evidence to provide the indictments forwarded by North Carolina are forgeries.

After that hearing, Milliken will decide whether to return Williams to North Carolina to face the charges stemming from a 1961 "Freedom rider" demonstration.

Williams and four others were accused of kidnaping a white couple, Mr. and Mrs. G. Bruce Segall. The Segalls were held briefly, then released unharmed.

Henry said indictments sent to Milliken were dated 1965.

Indictments were handed down in 1961 and later voided by the North Carolina Supreme Court, he said. Indictments were brought again in 1967.

But those issued in 1965, Henry said, were against four persons—"but not Robert Williams. Your attorney general should go down to North Carolina and see what these people have done."

Henry argued also that the North Carolina law under which Williams was charged did not until 1962 define the term "kidnaping." "This is unenforceable by virtue of vagueness," he said. "You can't be a fugitive unless there's a crime."

Henry noted the "political" nature of the situation in 1961—"it was slavery versus freedom," he said—and maintained that extradition involving a political charge is not allowed under statute.

He argued also that the Segalls are "not interested in prosecuting" the case. "It's the police and the Ku Klux Klan," he said.

Williams, suspended as head of the Union County chapter of the NAACP in 1959 for publicly disclaiming the group's nonviolent position, fled the United States after the first indictments were brought.

He asked for political asylum in Cuba, then journeyed to Communist China in 1966. He returned to this country only last month.

"We selected Michigan," Henry said. "We can get what the law says we are supposed to get—justice. We believe that Michigan, of all the 50 states, will give us the fairest hearing."

[From Tactics, June 20, 1969]

REDS HOPE FOR YENAN ON U.S. SOIL—ROBERT WILLIAMS COULD BE ITS FIGUREHEAD

Indulge in a little revolutionary fantasy, and then ask if it is so fanciful after all. The unmentionable and the unbelievable is that international communism would be so bold as to announce that a "People's Government of the U.S.A." has been set up in the New World. Crazy, man, crazy, even to suggest that the reds would be so bold and even mad as to declare that a revolutionary government of the United States existed in exile anywhere in the Northern or Southern Hemispheres, or in hiding anywhere on U.S. soil.

Yenan for years was the proclaimed capital of a self-proclaimed, communist government in China. Could there be a Yen-an, U.S.A.?

Actually, all this needs, "in exile," or "in hiding," is the political permissiveness and the anti-anticommunism we are now pursuing, and the moral and legal permissiveness that now characterizes our society. All the reds need to do is to disguise the communist instigation and form of the destructive, subversive movement to full us. We have heard so much of the red salami tactic, of cutting off one slice at a time, that we haven't given any thought to the political consequences. We are not dealing with a salami, of course, but with our political system. The slicing is being done by the hungry, red apparatus.

Let us go to specifics. The tactics being used are to exploit one issue after the other, each time approaching more and more to the grand finale of final conquest, if they can get away with it. The civil rights movement was transformed cynically into an anti-Viet Nam war movement. Simultaneously, a college re-

form and free speech movement was focussed upon weakening the military structure generally, from research to the draft.

#### REPUBLIC OF NEW AFRICA

When will we learn that communists never abandon an objective, but bend over to force and power, their concept of co-existence? We laughed at Stalin's plan for a "black republic" on U.S. soil.

But the reds knew that law was not being enforced against conspiracy and treason. So a "declaration of independence" for a "Republic of New Africa" on U.S. soil was glibly announced at the end of Mar. 1968, and its revolutionary activities and even violence have been given the most respectable publicity by our news syndicates and such newspapers as the N.Y. Times. Indeed, this organ of the Establishment and Fabian socialism sounded the clarion call with editorials and purported "news" articles on the possibility of "two successor states—one black and one white"—developing out of the United States. The insidious but prestige-robbed N.Y. Times magazine section of Sunday, Aug. 11, 1968 soberly gave over two complete pages and part of five other pages to a soberly written study, "The Case for Two Americas—One Black, One White," written, of course, by a professor. Respectable treatment of this kind given to this most vicious conspiracy is a cruel hoax played on the black citizenry of our land, and in effect, incitement to such suicidal treason.

Whether the editors who plot such pages are simply sick mischief-makers or masochists is academic.

The proclaimed "president" of this "black republic," that has no backing, but only the opposition of practically the entire colored and white population together, is the criminal fugitive, Robert F. Williams, who has been sending instructions on guerrilla warfare and murderous sabotage into the United States from such places as Havana and Peking. He has been encouraged to believe he can re-enter the United States, and take advantage of our permissive and ineffectual legal system to conduct a glamored publicity campaign for national destruction right inside the United States.

Communists, of course, take him seriously only as a front for them. If it can be arranged, he will appear somewhere in North or South America for such insurrectionary activity, or even concealed inside the U.S.

#### ELDRIDGE CLEAVER, AS "MINISTER OF INFORMATION"

The so-called Black Panther Party has its communist links through such centers as Alexandria, in Egypt. He was enabled to flee from the United States so he could avoid serving out a prison sentence, and is working against our country from Havana. A four-page leaflet signed by him as "minister of information" includes such names as Stokely Carmichael as "prime minister" and Bobby Seale as "chairman." Its "proposals" refer to "the racist pig gestapo police who occupy our colony as foreign troops occupying conquered territory."

Of course, behind the white and black parallel revolutionary movements are the communist psychological warfare planners operating from Moscow and Peking, with Havana as satellite headquarters.

None of this would warrant even mention, for none of it would have been able to blow up even a small shop with impunity except for the anti-anticommunist propaganda climate created by professionals. This has snared politicians and millionaires alike—sometimes in the same person. What has been required was the softening up of the American people, and the depriving of anti-communists of outlets by which the public could be given the benefit of their wisdom and experience. After all, they have been proven

consistently right, whereas the Walter Lippmanns, on the written record, have been shown by events to be consistently wrong.

Washington, as the national capital, provides a horrible example of this one-sidedness in communications. A slick magazine, richly subsidized, has been in existence for several years now. It is fake "liberal," but fat with advertising. Its name is the Washingtonian. A few months ago, a competitor appeared, as slick but with practically no advertising. It is called the Washington Monthly. The sort of so-called intellectual appeal of these magazines is shown by their cost, 60 cents for the former and a full dollar for the latter. Washington Monthly is as extremist as one can get in propagandizing for the weakening of our country in all its defenses. Frankly, except for the few still red labor unions, American workers would see through this subversion at once. Of course, we find the name of Murray Kempton on the "advisory board," with Richard Rovere as the chairman. Included, too, is Pete Lisagor, of the Chicago Daily News, one of those who has been undermining Otto F. Otepka, whose skills lie in the field of national security. His paper obviously runs Drew Pearson.

Who subsidizes Washington Monthly? No communist, De Tocqueville understood the phenomenon. The angel is said to be none other than John D. Rockefeller the Fourth! Ah, yes, a Democrat, he won a seat in West Virginia's legislature. His eyes, too, you see, are on the White House. This takes an organization, that has to be built up, and all sorts of organization men, such as writers, who have to be kept busy between campaigns.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 12, 1969]

#### WILLIAMS ARRESTED ON RETURN TO UNITED STATES

(By Lyle Denniston)

Black revolutionary Robert F. Williams returned to the United States today after eight years in exile. He was promptly arrested by the FBI.

Williams, who fled the United States to avoid kidnaping charges in North Carolina, was arrested as his special Trans World Airlines flight landed in Detroit. He was wanted on a federal charge of unlawful flight to avoid persecution.

Williams, 44, returned amid confusion about who in the U.S. government wanted him back and who doesn't.

The Justice Department's Internal Security Division and the Federal Bureau of Investigation both disclaimed responsibility for any official pressure to return Williams.

Williams flew back on a special Trans World Airlines flight—a 130-seat airliner carrying only him, his lawyer, an airline security guard and the plane's crew of eight.

The flight left London 80 minutes early and the Associated Press quoted TWA officials as saying they were advised "from America" to move the time forward, presumably because someone feared a demonstration when the jet arrived in Detroit this afternoon.

Earlier, TWA had refused to carry Williams.

#### DOUBTS ON ROLE

Williams is a Negro, and some officials in the government apparently fear that he could emerge as a new militant leader among the nation's blacks.

The FBI and its Justice Department colleagues in the Internal Security Division apparently agree at least that Williams could become what one source described as "an aggravation" among Negroes.

Beyond that, however, there is no agreement between the department's two branches over the considerations which went into the final decision to return Williams to this country.

#### EMBASSY REQUEST CITED

A TWA spokesman here said Williams was brought back "at the request of the U.S. Embassy in London."

An official request of that kind was one of the three conditions the airline had imposed, according to the spokesman. The other conditions—also met—were that a "sufficient escort" be provided, and that TWA itself have control over the time and place of Williams' return.

The FBI had never indicated to the airline that it opposed Williams' return, according to the spokesman.

On the other hand, he added, the FBI had not pressed TWA directly to get Williams back, TWA's formal discussions over the return, it was reported, were entirely with the State Department in Washington or the U.S. Embassy in London.

TWA's unusual expense—reportedly \$20,000—in making today's flight was undertaken at the initiative of the airline alone, the spokesman said, to avoid the risk of having Williams on a regular flight with other passengers—"which conceivably could have led to a disturbance."

State Department officials were not immediately available for comment on their part in the situation.

The state of North Carolina had only a limited role in the discussions over Williams, Deputy Atty. Gen. Ralph Moody said in a telephone interview today.

Since Williams still faces a kidnapping charge in that state, law enforcement authorities there were interested, Moody said. However, they had not directly pressed the federal government to seek Williams' return, he said.

Williams had been held in London, imprisoned as an "undesirable alien," during the days of uncertainty about whether he could get back to America by air, as he wanted. The British tried to send him back to Egypt, but he refused. He also declined to come to the United States by ship.

The FBI, sources suggested, has not been intimately involved in the U.S. government's handling of the question of Williams' return. That has been the responsibility of the Internal Security Division, bureau sources said.

However, the division in turn has insisted that its position was one of "ambivalence," and that it was the FBI which had really been in charge.

While the security division did seem somewhat concerned about Williams' impact on his return home, sources indicated the division made no attempt to bar his entry, partly because of an understanding it had that both the FBI and North Carolina wanted him in this country.

Since leaving the country, Williams had visited Cuba, Red China and Tanzania.

[From Battle Line, October 1969]

#### BLACK REVOLUTIONIST LEADER DECLARES DETROIT AS THEIR "SAFEST" AMERICAN CITY

It will be to Jerome P. Cavanagh's everlasting shame that he presided as Mayor of the American city that was chosen by this nation's enemies as the "safest" in the country for return of their leader, Republic of New Africa President Robert Williams, in order that he might now direct the revolution from within our own shores.

His arrival in Detroit was delayed a number of days when T.W.A. refused to carry him aboard their trans-Atlantic flight. Many people ridiculed the Republic of New Africa officials when they threatened the airlines. But T.W.A. wasn't laughing as they quickly changed their decision after the Communist Party called for massive demonstrations before T.W.A. offices; cancellations and harassment of Airline schedules, along with threats of sabotage by the black militants. In fact, T.W.A. flew a special flight with Williams as

their only passenger in what could honestly be called their "blackmail run."

Let us take a closer look at this "beast" that has entered our city, a revolutionist that Breakthrough, led by Don Lobsinger, warned Detroiters about more than 4 years ago. Williams has outlined his concept of guerrilla warfare in his publication, the Crusader, printed in Red China. His views are similar to Mao-Tse-Tung's with whom he shared the same rostrum at a May Day rally in Peking recently. His book, "Negroes With Guns," has become the official guerrilla manual of several black extremist groups. He calls for a new concept of guerrilla warfare, one in which the revolutionists huddle as close to the "enemy" as possible so as to neutralize his modern and fierce weapons. He goes on to say, "any Afro-American revolt would constitute a unique form of urban warfare. The match and gasoline would be his most effective weapon."

Recently, another RNA official, Milton Henry made the statement, "The U.S. Army can't win in Vietnam and they can't win in the United States. We can fight from within. How are they going to get us out of here? Where would they make the guns to shoot us—in the United States? Do you think we are just going to let them keep on making guns? How will they transport their guns and soldiers—on railroad trains? The United States can be destroyed by sabotage and guerrilla warfare."

This then is the poison that our government allows to flow into the bloodstream of our country. Is it any wonder that the "impossible" is happening before our very eyes? The probability of a military takeover to save this country from a communist victory appears more likely every day.

#### COMMUNIST PRESS ACCUSES BREAKTHROUGH OF CAUSING RACIAL STRIFE AT LOCAL HIGH SCHOOLS

The ability of the communists to twist the truth is almost too much to comprehend. A number of Detroit high schools have witnessed black militant students, led by outside agitators, going on a rampage, attacking students and teachers alike, burning the American flag, replacing it with the flag of the Republic of New Africa and causing the schools to close down. Then the next day you read in the communist paper, the "Daily World," and also headlines in the Negro newspaper, that Breakthrough members were driving around with truckloads of their "goons," riling up the blacks just so the police could then step in and beat on their heads. It is a known fact that Breakthrough is opposed to having their members ride around in trucks.

[From Combat, Oct. 15, 1969]

#### "KILL BABY KILL"—THE ROBERT F. WILLIAMS STORY

(By Henry P. Durkin)

Less than a month ago one of the major promoters of a black-white civil war in the United States returned to this country after eight years of self-imposed exile to avoid criminal prosecution.

Robert F. Williams' trip to Detroit in September contains elements similar to Vladimir Lenin's historic return to Petrograd some 52 years ago. Both men waged propaganda war against the homeland from a safe haven overseas. Both men stand among the foremost advocates of terrorism as politics. Both reject reform as too gradual. And both came home treated as, in Churchill's phrase, the plague bacillus; Lenin and his entourage in the famous sealed railway car, Williams and his attorney encapsulated in a giant airliner, its only passengers.

Lenin ultimately triumphed in his October Revolution and destroyed the only representative government Russia has ever had. He did it to "free the workers." Williams promises that his revolution, pitting black against white in a racial civil war, will lead ulti-

mately to Negro Americans being free of "oppression."

Williams has gone far in eight years.

During those years, Williams' home had been Cuba, Red China, and Tanzania. Almost uniformly the press touted Williams merely as a "black militant" who wanted to return to clear himself of kidnaping charges in Monroe, North Carolina. And just as uniformly the press ignored his strange and fascinating activities over the years.

Williams, an ex-Marine, was born in Monroe, North Carolina, in 1925. In 1956 he joined the local chapter of the NAACP and soon became its president. At that time, the NAACP's demands followed the "separate but equal" philosophy of the national office, which predominated in the mid-50's. But Williams decided this was not enough and began to organize self-defense units in the Negro community. On one occasion, by the use of foxholes, sandbags, and a well-prepared strategy, his units succeeded in repulsing with gunfire a motorized Ku Klux Klan "invasion."

In 1959, just after an all-white jury in Union County had acquitted a white man of beating up a Negro, Williams, shaking with anger, told a reporter that Negroes must defend themselves even if it meant "meeting violence with violence if that is to be the only way we can obtain justice." Negroes, he said, should be "willing to die" or "even to kill if necessary" to protect themselves. "If it is necessary to stop lynching with lynching, then we must be willing to resort to that method." Remarks such as these prompted Roy Wilkins, NAACP national director, to suspend Williams for six months.

In 1960 Williams traveled illegally to Cuba a number of times and reported favorably about Castroland. Then, on April 21, 1961, Williams sent a telegram from Monroe to Cuba's foreign minister, Raul Roa, at the UN during the General Assembly debate on the Bay of Pigs invasion. Roa read the telegram to the delegates, as U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson sat in silence: "Now that the United States has proclaimed military support for people willing to rebel against oppression, oppressed Negroes in the South urgently request tanks, artillery, arms, money, use of American airfields and white mercenaries to crush the racist tyrants who have betrayed the American Revolution and the Civil War. We also request prayers for this noble undertaking."

Four months later, in August 1961, North Carolina indicted Williams on a kidnaping charge. A white couple driving through the Negro section during one of Williams' bouts against the local police were dragged from their car and held prisoner in Williams' home. Eventually they were released and Williams fled to Cuba (via New York, Canada, and Mexico). While in hiding "somewhere in New York City" on his way to Cuba, Williams sent a long letter to the *Guardian* (nee *National Guardian*) presenting his side of the Monroe troubles. Williams admitted that a white couple was "captured, disarmed and placed under citizens' arrest by a group of Negroes," that the couple was brought to his yard, where he asked the "colored group to let them go; they did." And, Williams said, he told the white couple they could go, but that "they would have to leave through the angry crowd" which had gathered. Williams said he turned back to his house and the couple followed; when he looked for them a short time later they "had disappeared." Williams claims he fled because Monroe Police Chief A. A. Manney told him that "state troopers were coming and that in 30 minutes I would be hanging in the Court-house square." He escaped with the help of some Negroes on their way to Greensboro, N.C., from where he and his family caught a bus for New York, arriving there August 28, 1961.

While he was living in Monroe, Williams had begun issuing a newsletter called *The Crusader* (first issue: June 26, 1958). He continued to publish it in Cuba, and also started making anti-American broadcasts over "Radio Free Dixie," courtesy of Castro's shortwave transmitters. In both he urged the Negroes in the United States to revolt.

Cuba was a good choice for Williams' first exile. His 1960 trips there had convinced him that Castro's "workers paradise" was ideal. At least one of Williams' trips was under the auspices of Fidel's American front, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In November 1960 Williams was one of the featured speakers at an FPCC rally in front of the U.N., protesting U.S. patrolling the coasts of Guatemala and Nicaragua against Cuban attempts at infiltration. Williams signed several of the FPCC advertisements in American newspapers. One of these, in the April 22, 1961 issue of the *Baltimore, Maryland, Afro-American*, was a "Declaration of Conscience by Afro-Americans": "Afro-Americans, don't be fooled—the enemies of the Cubans are our enemies, the Jim Crow bosses of this land where we are still denied our rights. The Cubans are our friends, the enemies of our enemies." Another ad in the *New York Post* three days later carried almost the same text.

Assorted left-wingers and Communists quickly jumped to Williams' aid, via an organization called the *Monroe Defense Committee*. Communists (identified in testimony as old-time or current; Moscow, Peking or Trotsky-oriented) were listed as supporters: William Albertson, Herbert Aptheker, William Epton, Carl Marzani, Jesse Gray, Cyril Phillips, Victor Perlo, and others. Liberals and leftists who also lent their prestige included James Baldwin, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Nat Hentoff, A. J. Muste, and Lyle Stuart. And Clark H. Foreman, Executive Secretary of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (now renamed National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee) commented that Williams "represents the most practical approach for the Negro who considers himself entitled to be a full-fledged American."

In April 1962 the pro-Williams campaign had reached such proportions that Detroit Local #600 of the United Auto Workers passed a resolution calling on President Kennedy to give executive clemency to Williams!

But in *The Crusader* Williams was proclaiming "The slick John Kennedy gang is operating one of the greatest sham governments in the entire world," and that America was "a jungle filled with wild beasts and savages presided over by an impotent witch doctor, Slick John Kennedy." While continuing his attacks on Kennedy, Williams asked that money to keep the newsletter going be sent to Mrs. Anne Olson in Toronto, Canada—at the headquarters of Canadian Fair Play for Cuba Committee—and announced that his attorney, Conrad Lynn, was hard at work on the legal machinery to clear his name of the kidnaping charges.

"Radio Free Dixie," Williams' jazz music show mixed with political commentary, began to be heard every Friday from 11 p.m. to midnight, Eastern Standard Time. In one broadcast in late summer 1962, he said: "Communism is not lynching black people! Communism offers equality. If it were not for Russia, the oppressors of the Negro would have already conquered the world, and we can rest assured that it would be a racist world. If it were not for the power of the Soviet Union, all oppressed peoples everywhere would have very little hope of ever acquiring the means of freeing themselves. If it were not for the Soviet Union, the racists of the USA would already feel free to wage a campaign of total extermination against the Afro-American." Early in 1963, "Radio Free Dixie" began broadcasting three days a week. Stepped up, too, were the tirades

against Kennedy, who became "Herr John" (the new Hitler): "he thinks he's God" and a "great benefactor to white supremacy and the southern racist enemies of the 14th Amendment to the US Constitution."

September 1963 saw a new development in Williams' political education. He turned up in Red China, telling Peking's New China News Agency that he had wanted to come to China since the "triumph of the Chinese revolution" in 1949. While in China he sent President Kennedy a message protesting what he called "the savage persecution of American Negroes by U.S. racists." Williams warned "Let me remind you that these heathen racist crimes against black humanity shall be avenged!" (About two months later, a one-time member of the New Orleans Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Lee Harvey Oswald, assassinated Kennedy.)

The next issue of *The Crusader* appeared in February 1964 and made no further references to President Kennedy. Instead, that issue and subsequent ones carried detailed instructions for sabotage and terrorism. Example: "The weapons of defense employed by Afro-American freedom fighters must consist of a poor man's arsenal. Gasoline fire bombs (Molotov cocktails), lye or acid bombs (made by injecting lye or acid in the metal end of light bulbs) can be used extensively. During the night hours such weapons, thrown from the roof tops, will make the streets impossible for racist cops to patrol. Hand grenades, bazookas, light mortars, rocket launchers, machine guns and ammunition can be bought clandestinely from servicemen anxious to make a fast dollar. Freedom fighters in military camps can be contacted to give instruction on usage.

"Extensive sabotage is possible. Gas tanks on public vehicles can be chocked up with sand. Sugar is also highly effective in gasoline lines. Long nails driven through boards and tacks with large heads are effective to slow the movement of traffic on congested roads at night. This can cause havoc on turnpikes. Derailing of trains causes panic. Explosive booby traps on police telephone boxes can be employed. High-powered sniper rifles are readily available. Armor-piercing bullets will penetrate oil storage tanks from a distance. Phosphorous matches (kitchen matches) placed in air conditioning systems will cause delayed explosions which will destroy expensive buildings. Flame throwers can be manufactured at home. Combat experienced exservicemen can easily solve that problem." (*The Crusader*, May-June 1964).

Copies of this issue were circulated in New York City before the now-famous Harlem riots of 1964. Williams had predicted such violence on page seven of the same issue: "This year, 1964, is going to be a violent one, the storm will reach hurricane proportions by 1965 and the eye of the hurricane will hover over America by 1966. America is a house on fire—Freedom Now!—or let it burn, let it burn. Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition!!!"

From November 25 to 30, 1964, Williams was in Hanoi attending the International Conference for Solidarity with Vietnam. He told the delegates "I feel much freer here than I ever felt in the U.S.A. . . . I believe this is the beginning of a new relationship between our two peoples, the people of Vietnam, the Afro-American people and our white allies in the U.S.A." Also, while in Hanoi, Williams broadcast to U.S. troops in South Vietnam to lay down their arms.

Prior to coming to Hanoi, Williams stopped off again in Peking, publishing the October 1964 edition of *The Crusader* there and having a personal meeting with Mao Tse-tung. Said Williams: "It was a great feeling for me, an exiled former NAACP official, to be in China when their first Atomic bomb was exploded . . . This bomb is not just a Chinese

bomb, it is a freedom bomb for all the oppressed people of the world."

Returning to Cuba, Williams announced that *The Crusader* now had a U.S. address: P. O. Box 359, New York, N.Y. 10025, which turned out to be the same address as the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), of which Williams was then Chairman-in-Ex-Officio. RAM's theoretical journal, *Black America* (Summer-Fall 1965) set the tone for its activities: "As the struggle becomes more intense, a Mau-Mau of a political form will probably have political ambitions which the house niggers (Uncle Toms) and the public racists will be unable to fulfill. It will probably assassinate racist leaders and house niggers who don't follow its line. The cry of the black community will be 'Liberation or Death!'"

Let's pause a moment and see what RAM members have been doing in the United States to carry out the movement's orders:

**February 1965:** RAM members were arrested in a plot to blow up the Statue of Liberty, the Liberty Bell, and the Washington Monument. The RAM group used the name of Black Liberation Front, led by Robert Steele Collier, Walter A. Bowe (a signer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee ads referred to above), and Khaleel S. Sayeed. Attorney for Collier was Conrad Lynn, also Williams' lawyer, while Mark Lane (famous for his posthumous defense of Lee Harvey Oswald) defended Sayeed. All three plotters were found guilty and sentenced to between 18 months and 5 years in jail. Collier was released after 2 years and turned up as a \$5,700-a-year New York City Parks Department employee in charge of recreational activities at the Tompkins Square Community Center, supervising local children and adults using the swimming pool. As soon as news of this leaked out, Collier was fired from the job and dropped out of sight until April 1969. At that time he was arrested as part of a Black Panther plot to bomb several New York department stores. Twenty-one Panthers in all were arrested. Coming to their defense were long time leftist attorneys William Kunstler and Arthur Turco.

**June 1967:** Sixteen RAM members were arrested in a plot to assassinate "moderate" civil rights leaders, including Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young, Jr. Leader of the plot, according to District Attorney Thomas Mackell, was Herman Ferguson, at that time an assistant principal in New York City's school system. Ferguson is East Coast Vice President of RAM and Minister of Education. Also named in the indictment was RAM's Special Ambassador Max Stanford, who was arrested in Philadelphia. At the trial, the prosecution declared that Senator Robert F. Kennedy was also on the RAM kill list. Ferguson was convicted and is now free on bail pending his appeal. Last November he was a candidate for the U.S. Senate on the Freedom and Peace Party ticket, a front set up by the Communist Party USA.

**September 1967:** Four RAM members were arrested in Philadelphia in a plot to poison hundreds of policemen and some of the city's top officials in the event of a riot. The Trotskyite-oriented Youth Against War and Fascism, headed by Mark Lane's former secretary, Deirdre Griswold, sponsored a protest rally in Philadelphia in October 1967. Among the scheduled speakers were Mae Mallory, one of Robert Williams' co-defendants from Monroe, N.C., and Conrad Lynn, Williams' and RAM's attorney.

During June 1966, Williams ceased his "Radio Free Dixie" broadcasts from Havana and went to China, claiming dissatisfaction with the Cuban regime because it barred him from opening an information office for his movement and because phonograph records and other material sent to him from outside Cuba for his broadcasts were stolen from the Cuban post office and even from

Cuban Foreign Ministry diplomatic pouches. In addition, one issue of *The Crusader* was forged and contained anti-Chinese statements; also, \$1,550 he sent to sympathizers in New York never reached them. Further, the Cuban government barred his accepting a speaking invitation in Sweden. Williams' other charges were that he was forced to use "only the progressively weaker long-wave facilities of Radio Progresso" instead of the shortwave Havana Radio; that a promise of \$200 a month to buy records and publications for his broadcasts was not kept; that his wife was not allowed to go to Canada, and that the Cuban authorities had refused to investigate his charges. But the biggest reason for transferring his base of operations, said Williams (in the August 12, 1966 issue of *Peking Review*) was Cuba's anti-Negro racism: "We Afro-American revolutionaries have discovered that some so-called socialists, we thought to be our comrades and class brothers, have joined the international Ku Klux Klan fraternity for white supremacy world domination. To our consternation, we have discovered that the bourgeois-oriented power structure of some socialist states, even one with a black and white population, would prefer to preserve the white reactionary anti-communist power structure in racist America, their natural enemy, than to see a just, democratic fraternal socialist state brought about by the revolutionary action of oppressed blacks that would serve the best interests of all people of all races."

From then on, Williams' newsletter appeared at regular intervals with the imprimatur "Printed in China as a Personal Journal." One of his first new slogans from Peking was the following: "The most noble cry to come out of racist America since the Boston Tea Party is the cry: Burn 'baby Burn. It is a good starter for more than just fires. It is a point of origin for a mighty revolutionary process. . . . Yes, Burn Baby Burn, like the Boston Tea Party, is a good point of origin but in the final analysis the brutal oppressor must go and the cry Kill Baby Kill must prevail." Williams even offered one of his own recipes: "Try the new sensational, Black Power Cocktail. Mix the Best! Gasoline, a little burnt thick motor oil and a dash of petroleum jelly. Catches on like napalm. Shake well before serving."

The nation's press again took notice of Williams in March 1968, when Milton Henry (then chairman of the Malcolm X Society) announced the formation of the Republic of New Africa (see *Combat*, Sept. 1, 1968; April 15, 1969). Williams was elected President of RNA at this founding convention of the National Black Government Conference.

With this announcement, serious work began to arrange for Williams' return to the U.S. In June 1968, Williams took the first step on his trip back: he visited Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, where he met with Milton Henry and his brother, Imari, and Mae Mallory, who had flown to Tanzania. In addition to political meetings, Williams found time for a ten-day, 1500-mile motorcycle tour down to Zambia. He said he undertook the trip to test his stamina, to inspire black youth to a greater sense of exploration and to see seldom-visited villages of Africa. (Williams had traveled to Tanzania with his wife, Mabel, on Chinese alien travel documents, having been without a U.S. passport since his flight from America in 1961.) In October 1968 Williams wound up his visit and returned to Peking. Curiously, before Williams boarded a ship in Dar Es Salaam for the return to Red China, an official of the U.S. Embassy presented him with a new American passport.

Back in China, Williams began publishing *The Crusader* again and started to include some of his revolutionary poetry. In one issue (May 1968) he gave his own lyrics to the

"Star Spangled Banner": "Burn baby we must, insurrection is just, / And this be our cry: 'In Guns is our trust.' / And our glorious new flag in triumph shall wave / O'er a Black people free, never more to be slave!"

The official announcement of Williams' return came from Milton Henry on August 23, 1969 in Washington, D.C., at a four-day "legislative conference" of the Republic of New Africa. But Williams' return was delayed just a bit: arriving in London via Cairo on September 6, Williams was stopped by British immigration authorities and taken to Pentonville Prison, because Trans World Airlines refused him passage, saying that the airline had "concluded that his presence aboard our aircraft both in the air and upon his arrival at a United States destination would be inimical to the best interests of T.W.A. and its passengers."

Five days later, TWA announced it would transport Williams back to the United States via a special flight (only passengers: Williams and his attorney, Milton Henry).

Williams arrived in Detroit on September 12 and the *New York Times* reported the historic event on page 1 and devoted an entire "Man in the News" column to him, never once mentioning his philosophy of terrorism; to the *Times*, he was just a "Pioneer Black Militant." As soon as he stepped off the plane, Williams was arrested by Federal authorities on a fugitive warrant issued by North Carolina and then released on \$1,000 bail. Local officials in Detroit took him into custody and Williams appeared in the Common Pleas Court where the warrant was reviewed and he was released on a \$10,000 personal recognizance bond.

"War" to Robert Franklin Williams means, in the words of RAM's underground newspaper, *Afro World*, that "We must vow to meet violence with violence, 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' filling the Mighty White American cities with White American blood; leaving not a building standing in their pure, white, Christian land 'till we can walk in dignity with our black brothers and sisters of the earth."

*The Crusader* carries specific instructions for causing havoc and destruction. One of the most detailed plans appeared in the September-October 1967, issue:

"A united, well organized, armed and trained Black America is a potential force to be reckoned with in its own right. . . . A precision-type guerrilla warfare is the prerequisite for the black man's survival and liberation in racist America. Such a campaign must be well organized and coordinated. There must be a vast network of communication and central planning. No matter how primitive, black freedom fighters must establish their own coded and clandestine communications system. There must be central planning and a national supreme command. Afro-American revolutionary forces must create a top-notch agency. This agency must be responsible for the establishment of an efficient and extensive intelligence network. It must infiltrate the armed forces, the National Guard, the police, the FBI, the CIA, public utility services and all political groups, right, center and left. The power structure's facilities must be utilized to advance the cause of Afro-American liberation. . . . The most aggressive and irrepressible arm of the over-all organization would be the fire teams. . . . The mission of these thousands of active teams would be setting strategic fires. They could render America's cities and countryside impotent. They could travel from city to city placing lighted candles covered with large paper bags, allowing enough air at the bottom to allow the flame to burn until it burned to dry leaves and grass, thus devastating the forests. . . . The fire teams roving in automobiles would find unguarded rural objectives even more accessible. A few

teams could start miles and miles of fires from one city to another. The psychological impact would be tremendous. By day the billowing smoke would be seen for miles. By night the entire sky would reflect the holocaust and emit a feeling of impending doom...."

#### THE NEW LEFT—HEIRS OF THE GUILLOTINE

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a thought provoking address delivered at King's College, New York, last week, Mr. Jeffrey St. John, a prominent member of the Conservative Party, seems to have put his finger squarely on the New Left and its role in history.

Students of history have long understood the relative roles of the American Revolution and the bloody French Revolution which followed within a few years. Mr. St. John accurately sums up the difference—the founders of our Nation were capable of building, and did build, while the French Revolution was capable only of destruction, destroying finally its revolution.

The New Left offers nothing but destruction. It is totally incapable of anything constructive, has no ideas but nihilism and anarchy, and from this bankruptcy can produce only violence. It, too, will consume itself, but only after innocent blood has been shed in more cities than Chicago.

I commend Mr. St. John's address to the careful attention of all members of this House, and include it in my remarks:

#### FINISHING THE WORK OF THE FOUNDERS— A FREEDOM MANIFESTO FOR OUR TROUBLED TIMES

(Speech by Jeffrey St. John based on his book, "Countdown to Chaos: Chicago 1968," published by Nash Publishing Corp., Los Angeles, given on October 21, 1969, King's College, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.)

[Copyright 1969 CINCOM Inc. Not to be reproduced except for press quotations without permission from CINCOM Inc.]

"Historians will differ," wrote former New York Times correspondent and author Arthur Krock, "on whether the political philosophy and the military economic direction of any nation has changed more fundamentally than those of the United States in a comparable period of time, 1933-1967. But as an eye witness to governmental and other public action throughout these years, I have formed the opinion that the United States merits the distinction of having discarded its past and meaning in one of the briefest spans of modern history."

Can a nation, having discarded its past and its meaning, escape the consequences of such an act? The violence, lawlessness, and social disruption that has engulfed the nation in recent years suggest it cannot. When a country cuts itself off from its historical experience and the principles that allowed it to flourish, it is like a giant ocean liner on a dark fog-bound sea without a philosophical rudder or radar to guide it. And almost no one today denies that somehow two hundred years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence we have

lost our sense of direction and bold daring as a nation.

We began, as most of us know, with a profound sense of direction, provided by perhaps the most remarkable group of men to ever come together in one given period of history. What would our Founding Fathers say of those individuals and groups today who initiate violence for political ends and ignore the principles upon which our laws and our Constitution are based?

First, the Founders might compare today's New Left radicals not with themselves but with the radicals of the late eighteenth century who precipitated the French Revolution. The Founders might point out that while they supported the aim of the revolution in France, it failed in its promise of freedom because French radicals—like today's New Left—knew only how to destroy, not how to build.

America's revolutionaries of 1776 constructed a system that was responsible for one of the most remarkable social, political, and economic revolutions in the history of mankind. This is the legacy left to America by a small band of brilliant men. The French radicals left their people a Napoleonic dictatorship. Many scholars see France's constant turmoil in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as directly traceable to the failure of the French Revolution.

Second, the Founders might conclude with horror and disappointment that the actions of the New Left, given its premises and philosophy, could, if unopposed, destroy the free political, social, and economic system that the American Revolution had made possible.

But why is it that our nation now finds its institutions under violent attack and its streets and college campuses virtual battlegrounds after so brilliant a beginning?

#### THE INTERRUPTED REVOLUTION

The American Revolution of 1776 is an interrupted revolution. After 150 years of living close to the Founders' philosophy we gradually drifted from the main tributary of our beginning and traditions.

The social and political system inherent in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution provided the freedom for every man to be the founder of his own fortune. And this system created the geographical unity for trade and cooperation among the states of the union. Such freedom and unity developed the climate necessary for the unprecedented burst of creative energies that culminated in the countless mechanical inventions and industries of nineteenth-century America, which formed the foundation for today's Technological Revolution with its resulting material abundance and affluence. Thus, our material wealth today is the direct result of the events of the nineteenth century which were made possible by the freedom won in the revolution of 1776.

In a profound, affirmative way, the Founders studied the past and all the lessons it offered, and constructed an original, uniquely American, free social and political system. The Founders also looked deeply into the nature of human beings and sought to harmonize their thinking with the natural state of men and women. The Founders came to the conclusion that the natural state of man was to be free and that he had within him the potential to act responsibly if offered a set of principles and a philosophy.

What is staggering about this achievement is that such a benevolent outlook toward man had never before been professed, let alone expressed in a workable, concrete social system. Men like Thomas Jefferson fought hard to extend this principle to all men, meaning the abolition of slavery. But in a mood of compromise the Founders defaulted on the issue of slavery, which would only be corrected with the great Civil War of

1860. This lethal compromise illustrates that the deeds of the dead often have a hold on the living, and to compromise on basic principles is to invite disaster at a later date.

In the same year that the Declaration of Independence was signed, Adam Smith first published his work on free economics, *The Wealth of Nations*. Like the Founders, Smith drew on centuries of historical experience in arriving at certain theoretical principles concerning free economics. His work had a profound influence on the Founders. Later, in 1789, the framers of the U.S. Constitution drew major inspiration from Smith—Thomas Jefferson praised *The Wealth of Nations* for its "sheer genius." In the same decade, the 1770's, another momentous event occurred: the invention by Watt of the first workable and salable steam engine.

Thus, in one decade, the Founders laid the political and social foundation for the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century; Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* laid the theoretical economic foundation, that is, the practical principles to guide men of productive genius; and James Watt's invention of the steam engine laid the physical foundation, for steam engines later became locomotives, which made possible the railroads of the world—uniting people, nations, and even continents.

Yet in the midst of all these unprecedented and breathtaking material and intellectual achievements, in the nineteenth century, there began to rise just prior to the U.S. Civil War, a group of intellectuals in America who felt left out and unrewarded by the then newly emerging industrial era. Holding a philosophy that stood for collectivism and state control of the lives of the American people and the means of economic production, such men and women stood as a counter-revolutionary force to those principles of the Founders that set forth a belief in individualism and limiting the power of the state. These intellectuals, many of them Marxists and Socialists, sought to smear and distort the achievements of the Founding Fathers and the industrial and inventive geniuses of the nineteenth century.

Eventually, the attempt to interrupt and subvert the achievements of the revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in America climaxed in the election of the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal in 1933. Just as the influences the Founders set into motion in 1776 did not find their greatest fulfillment until decades later, so the efforts of America's counter-revolutionaries begun in the nineteenth century did not come into concrete political form until 1933.

#### ROOSEVELT'S COUNTER-REVOLUTION

The New Deal was said to have been a necessary response to the Great Depression—which was allegedly caused by the collapse of the free economic system.

However, the Great Depression of the 1930's was the direct result of attempts by government to control freedom. Between 1865 and 1933 intellectuals influenced certain political leaders to correct abuses and "monopolies" caused by Big Business and the private economic system. But those monopolies arose because city, state, and federal governments used their power to close out competition for the advantage of politically influential businessmen. Each government-imposed "correction" of abuses undercut the natural working of free economics, making the situation much worse until by the late 1920's the private economic sector collapsed in a monetary crisis under the burden of government controls.

Instead of removing these life-bleeding controls and restraints on freedom, the Roosevelt New Deal added still more government controls. When spending schemes did not cure the Great Depression, but only drugged it, Roosevelt turned to the oldest

solution known to men and nations: he began gearing American industry for war. In doing so he committed a former free economy, which profited more from peace than from war, to a warfare and welfare state economy.

In no small measure, the distortion of our economic and political life that began under FDR made possible the violence and upheavals of the 1960's. The machinery of government, built over the decades since the Thirties, is breaking down under its own deficiencies and gargantuan size. Professor Peter Drucker of New York University has observed:

"Modern government has become ungovernable. There is no government today that can claim control of its bureaucracy and of its various agencies. . . . This is a threat to the basic capacity of government to give direction and leadership."

Since FDR's counter-revolution against the principles of 1776 and 1789, our nation has tried to straddle the principles of both revolutions: the 1776 Revolution's principles of rights and limited government, and the 1933 revolution's principles of growing government that often leads to the violation of individual rights. Neither an individual nor a nation can serve two masters, as Abraham Lincoln stated (in a different context) in his House Divided speech of June 16, 1858:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I do not expect the house to fall but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all another."

So it is with the United States: divided between the force of government and the struggle for individual freedom, it will become all one thing, or all the other. The violence, anarchy, and social discord of the 1960's exemplify the inability of the American Republic to remain divided—and, equally, the incapacity of the government to properly give direction and leadership.

In the cities of our nation this breakdown has made possible the rise of radical political elements who seize upon the government's inability to provide promised social services and firm leadership to assault violently the entire social and political system and the principles of the Founders.

Criticism that government is a danger, heard in the past only from more conservative circles, now transcends political party lines. Therefore, given the admission by many that the principles and programs of the New Deal are unworkable or have collapsed, what choices are left open to Americans in the second half of this century?

There are three choices. One: We can submit to the forces of the New Left who have made it clear that their solutions to our mounting problems are not less government, but more—going beyond Franklin Roosevelt's program in the vain hope of curing the very problems government helped create.

Two: We can seek to bring government under control and make it more manageable—streamlining government agencies, cutting waste and duplication, and keeping a tight check on spending schemes.

The third choice is that we can turn toward a truly free enterprise system through an "Era of Reform and Repeal," step by step ridding ourselves of those programs, policies, and ideas that have ended in impoverishing the poor and prosperous alike. We can appeal those programs instituted by government and the counter-revolutionaries that contribute to the violation of individual rights and deny the spirit and letter of the U.S. Constitution and Declaration of Independence. It is because we have broken with these moral and philosophical covenants that we are paying a heavy price in mounting chaos.

For those Americans who cherish freedom, the third course of action is the only avenue left open. An "Era of Reform and Repeal"

would mean removing the restraints that force freedom into a series of retreats, that progressively creates dependency, and limits the choice of the individual. And individual choice is what you and other college students across the nation are seeking, and what adults are accused of frustrating.

#### 1976—FOCAL POINT FOR A FREE FUTURE

The distinguished author John Dos Passos observed that the problem "is whether we can improvise a workable program fast enough to reverse the trends toward disintegration and anarchy. The time for generalities is past," he stated. "Someone must present a practical chart for the future which will restore to the American people a sense of direction."

In 1976 we will celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The bicentennial year honors the achievements of a handful of brilliant minds that gave a new nation a sense of dynamic direction and purpose. It was a beginning that laid the foundation for the most remarkable social, political, and material revolution in mankind's history. This two-hundred-year period may rightfully be called "The Era of the Triple Revolutions"—the American Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and today's Technological Revolution.

As we near 1976, radical political forces in our society would take us further away from those founding principles by offering more of the extreme political philosophy of government force. The New Left programs have already demonstrated their weaknesses, including a propensity to multiply rather than solve our nation's problems. As Dos Passos also observed, our current crisis indicates that "we suffer from an essential shoddiness of much of the philosophy which underlay the New Deal . . . the Liberal approach to human problems has reached a dead end."

You on our college campuses and the young in our cities who are opposed to the violence of the New Left are without a rallying point and, most important, without the ammunition with which to answer the attacks on the American system. The New Left can only inflict further damage on our democratic republic if they continue to be unopposed because you who cherish the American tradition do not have a more clearly held alternative.

It is one thing to suppress violence by law. It is more difficult to remove the deeper causes from which anarchy, violence, and disruption flow.

Therefore you must arm yourselves with the philosophical and historical roots of the American system. By this, I mean the philosophical and political programs of the Founders must be clearly understood. This is your ammunition against the forces of the New Left which seek to destroy the very foundations of the Republic. It is your battle cry, it is a great American anthem that largely goes unsung because it is not understood. You cannot learn to play an instrument if you do not first know how to read music, and so it is true historically. To finish what the Founders began we must know what are their principles that form the foundation for the most original, the most unique, the truly most revolutionary program in the entire history of Western man. These are your tools with which to fight the totalitarians of modern times.

As I pointed out at the beginning of my talk, we are like a large, magnificent ocean liner without a philosophical or moral rudder. And because of the renunciation of our nation's founding principles and its constructive past we are now engulfed in the irrationality and lawlessness all around us.

#### THE REAL REVOLUTIONARIES

Americans who recoil in righteousness and rightful anger at force, violence, and flight

from freedom such actions portend, must not sit back and either lament such actions or give lip service to documents like the U.S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. As great as they are in enunciating the principles of freedom, they are only as strong as the honesty and integrity of the men and women who use them, interpret them, and defend them. When a nation's citizens lose sight of a document's meaning, it loses all its moral or actual power, and force fills the place where once freedom stood supreme.

America needs a Freedom Manifesto in these troubled times, and a new and dynamic leadership that will help thoughtful and concerned Americans rediscover the ideals, philosophy, and political program of the Founding Fathers. This does not mean "going back," for the philosophy of the Founders is a philosophy for all ages and for all seasons—born of struggle, tempered by time's experience, and tested in the laboratory of life. The universality of the Founders' philosophy is richly reflected in its influence not only on Americans and on our nation, but on the very outposts of the civilized world.

The Founders of America were the only real revolutionaries of the last two hundred years; all other revolutionaries were pretenders because what they sought was power over people. Understanding the evils that even well-meaning men in power could inflict on their fellow countrymen, the Founders sought not power over people but the unleashing of the power within the individual.

We shall overcome our troubled times if we but have the will and the intelligence to shape a realistic manifesto that reflects the principles, the hopes, and the highest expectations of our Founding Fathers—finishing what they so nobly began.

As young Americans this is your task. The philosophical and political program of the Founders remains unfinished because many adults have discarded it. Pick up this noble fallen standard of liberty, law, and the philosophy of reason. It is your intellectual arsenal, it is your inheritance, and it is your true revolutionary role for the future.

#### RETARDED SCOUTS HELPED BY BOYS

#### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, we have frequently heard of the benefits of the Boy Scout movement. I think that most people do not realize that scouting is innovating all the time.

A remarkable new experiment in the country is taking place in my own district in the largest mental hospital in the State.

About 1 year ago, as chairman of the Frontier District, Philadelphia Boy Scouts of America, and as Congressman of the district, I presented a charter to the director of the hospital, Dr. Daniel Blain. Dr. Blain is without a doubt one of the foremost men in his field in America today. It is a tribute to him that he would encourage scouting among his patients in the hospital.

I think it of great interest to provide a report on what has been happening as reported in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Thursday, October 23, 1969, as follows:

[From the Evening Bulletin, Oct. 23, 1969]  
**RETARDED SCOUTS HELPED BY BOYS**  
 (By Ben McElveen)

Boys serve as "sort of Big Brothers" to retarded adult males in an experimental Boy Scout Troop at Philadelphia State Hospital at Byberry, where a weekend work camp starts Friday.

Mrs. Dorothy Zuckerkandel, a hospital staff member, explained yesterday "it's the first scout troop for mentally retarded adult males at a state hospital in Pennsylvania."

The members of Boy Scout Troop 760 are retarded men from 30 to 60. Several other regular Boy Scout Troops serve as "help-mates" for the adult scouts.

But, Mrs. Zuckerkandel said, "these men were originally being undersold and no one anticipated as much response as they are getting."

"Nobody really knew how much they could do over a year ago when the troop was formed," she said. "But we've found they are a great deal more receptive and capable of doing far more in such a project that they really enjoy."

#### MEET WEEKLY

The adult scouts meet weekly in three separate patrols at the hospital, located on Roosevelt Blvd. at Southampton road.

The men learn regular scouting skills such as rope tying, outdoor activities and arts and crafts. "They have their own uniforms and are really thrilled about that," Mrs. Zuckerkandel said.

The troop was formed in February, 1968, when a charter for the new troop was presented by U.S. Rep. Joshua Ellberg (D-Pa) to Dr. Daniel Blain, director of the hospital.

"When they were first chartered," Mrs. Zuckerkandel said, "each of the new men scouts recited a different portion of the scout oath. It gave them all a chance to participate."

#### TROOP HAS FLAG

She said there are currently about 15 retarded adult males in the troop. Richard Delaney is scoutmaster and William Spencer and Brad Storey are both assistant scoutmasters.

"The troop now has its own flag for Troop 760," she added.

The troop has participated in various parades, taken part in good deed projects and served to help paint-up and fix-up the hospital.

Meanwhile, some 100 Boy Scouts and their leaders are expected to join with this troop during the third weekend work camp of "good turn" projects this weekend.

The scouts will join in recreation programs, display scouting skills and take part in campfire activities at the hospital.

#### CAMPFIRE PLANNED

A highlight of the Saturday campfire will be the investiture of Byberry's own Troop 760 of male retardates, who will receive merit badges in a court of honor.

Serving as "buddies" will be Troop 341 of Pennypack District, whose scoutmaster is Leonard Picar of Brighton st.

Patients and staff from the hospital's North and East units will work with the scouts. Among the "good turn" projects will be the development of a fish pond, bulb planting and bench repairs.

Other troops participating in the scouting workshop and their scoutmasters are Troop 240, Pennypack District, Charles Piring, E. Steinbest st.; Troop 33, Edge Hill and Valley Forge, Donald Kelley, Laverock rd., Glenside; Troop 394, Frontier District, Alfred Clark, Emerson st.; Troop 117, Pennsbury, Bob Paff, Levittown, and Troop 254, Pennypack, Lou Flade, Welsh rd.

## PROFESSOR WARNS OF PARENTAL ANGER ON SEX EDUCATION

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill which would prohibit the use of Federal funds in sex education programs unless there was approval by the local school board.

Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand, an adjunct associate professor at Long Island University, was in Washington last week and voiced her concern over the way sex education is being handled in the United States.

In an article in the Sunday Washington Star, Dr. Lorand said she feels many of the advanced sex education programs are simply "too much too soon." She told Star reporter David Braaten:

We've got to put a stop to it before the bitterness and suspicion of the parents brings a reaction that will sweep away all sex education.

Mr. Speaker, there is merit in what Dr. Lorand has to say and before we allow Federal funds to be spent in such a manner, let us take a very close look at the programs involved. Better still, let us pass the bill I have introduced and have those at the local level decide what type of program they should have.

I urge each of my colleagues to spend a few minutes in reading Dr. Lorand's observations.

The article follows:

#### PROFESSOR WARNS OF PARENTAL ANGER ON SEX EDUCATION

(By David Braaten)

Parental outrage at the way sex education is being handled may sweep the entire subject out of the public schools, a child psychologist warned yesterday.

Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand, an adjunct associate professor at Long Island University, voiced her concern in an interview during a visit to Washington.

The parents' revolt is a grass-roots movement, Dr. Lorand said. The fact that critics of the sex education programs include some political right-wingers is used to intimidate liberals, she said, and allows proponents to avoid arguing the case on its merits.

Things are fast reaching the point where some parents won't trust the schools to teach anything, so angry are they at the sex-education programs. The attitude of some school administrators, who shrug off honest criticism and ridicule all critics, doesn't help the situation, Dr. Lorand said.

#### WOULD HAVE MORATORIUM

Her suggested solution is a complete moratorium on sex education, for as long as is necessary to determine exactly what kind of program parents are willing to accept. It wouldn't do children any harm to go without sex education for a year while the issue is thrashed out, she said.

Dr. Lorand makes no secret of her position. She thinks many of the advanced sex-education programs are simply "too much too soon."

Teaching third- and fourth-graders the details of sexual intercourse, complete with diagrams and colored slides, can do serious harm to children, she believes.

"But even assuming it's a good program, you can't help a 7- or 8-year-old child with information that the parents aren't ready for them to have," said Dr. Lorand. "We've got to put a stop to it, before the bitterness and suspicion of the parents brings a reaction that will sweep away all sex education."

#### MIXED CLASSES OBJECTED TO

A particular target of Dr. Lorand's criticism of modern programs is the use of mixed classes for sex lectures. Little girls, she said, are especially shy and sensitive about the changes that puberty brings, and the last thing they need is to have them discussed in front of boys.

Dr. Lorand believes in a certain amount of sex education—in the fifth or sixth grade, and with separate classes for boys and girls—but deplors the explicit, detailed information on intercourse that is being given in some of the more ambitious programs.

Part of the trouble, Dr. Lorand feels, is that sex education has become a multi-million-dollar industry, involving lucrative publishing contracts, consultant fees, audio-visual aids and government and foundation grants. The advocates of sex education often have a vested interest in entrenching and expanding the programs, she feels.

Dr. Lorand has written a book herself, "Love, Sex and the Teen-Ager," but she disapproves of its use in classroom discussion. Almost any sex question that troubles a school-age child could be answered by having the right kind of books available for library use, plus a guidance counselor to explain whatever remains unclear, she said.

Summing up her critique of the leading champion of more sex education, the official-sounding but private organization called Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, Dr. Lorand said: "Their trouble is, they don't understand sex, they don't understand children and they don't understand the parent-child relationship."

## OPERATIONAL INTERCEPT SUCCESSFUL

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 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. 19, 1969]  
**MEXICO COOPERATION PLEDGED: OPERATION INTERCEPT SUCCESSFUL**

A cautious assessment of the results of Operation Intercept shows the dramatic effort to stem the flow of illicit drugs and narcotics into the United States is on the road to success.

Its success is not to be measured only in kilograms of contraband seized at the border nor in the number of arrests of would-be smugglers during three weeks of intensive surveillance at ports of entry.

Nor should the appraisal be affected by the unpleasant but inevitable side-effects of the operation—the toll in depressed business activity on both sides of the border, and the strain on tempers of those subjected to long delays and searches.

The real measure of the effectiveness of Operation Intercept, which now is included in the new Operation Cooperation program, is what it accomplished in the broad framework of America's serious drug problem.

A direct and conspicuous accomplishment is that the United States and Mexico now stand on a higher plateau of understanding and cooperation in facing those aspects of the drug problem which affect both nations.

The decision to scale down the intensity of surveillance at our border stations rests on Mexico's pledge to intensify its own law enforcement efforts against production and transportation of drugs. The Mexican government already had announced a program of health checks at the border to discourage entry of narcotics users.

Within hours after the new policy was announced, it was reported that Mexican troops had raided an illicit plantation inland from

Acapulco and put the torch to \$40 million worth of marijuana. It has agreed to roadblocks to stop narcotics on highways 5 and 15.

This is marijuana that will never become contraband at any border station, that will never find its way into the locker of a high school student, that will never lose its effect on innocent lives.

Operation Cooperation also recognizes the responsibility of the United States in helping Mexican authorities weed out an illicit industry supported largely by demand from our country. U.S. foreign aid funds have been earmarked for Mexico to help finance a stepped-up enforcement program below the border.

And implicit in the new policy is that the United States recognizes a need for more strict control over the legal traffic of manufactured drugs from the U.S. suppliers into Mexico, drugs which too easily find their way back into this country as contraband.

What first emerged as a strain on friendly relations with the United States and Mexico has led to a greater acceptance of mutual responsibility in maintaining the basis for that friendship.

Operation Intercept created an atmosphere of emergency along our common boundary. Operation Cooperation emphasizes that the drug problem still is an emergency whose solution requires full-throttle effort.