The progress already achieved in the development of this institution merits the attention and the applause of all who are concerned for rural progress, and especially those who recognize that Federal financing alone will not suffice for the expanding needs of rural electric cooperatives.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. RUTH), for 1 hour, on November 5; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES on H.R. 7618.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON on H.R. 11548.

Mr. NEDZI on H.R. 8664, H.R. 9564, H.R. 8662, and H.R. 10317.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WIDNALL in two instances.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT in three instances.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEED in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN in five instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOGGS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 4, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1306. Under clause 2 or rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission, for fiscal year 1969, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 14638. A bill to provide Federal leadership and grants to the States for developing and implementing State programs for youth camp safety standards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 14639. A bill to establish a development bank to aid in financing low- and moderate-income housing, employment opportunities for unemployed and low-income citizens, and public facilities in certain urban and rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 14640. A bill to prohibit the procurement of California table grapes by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 14641. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):

H. Res. 609. Resolution in support of a cease-fire and accelerated U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BURTON of California introduced a bill (H.R. 14642) for the relief of Severina Viray Manansala and her husband, Ciriaco Anicete Manansala, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

314. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to an investigation of procedures for commitment to State mental institutions, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SHIRLEY MARSH—A PUBLIC MAN

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the residents of the southwestern portion of my home State of Washington have recently been saddened by the passing of a man of great stature. Shirley Marsh was a man of many talents—warm, understanding, and dedicated to the growth and development of Cowlitz County. Mr. Marsh's interests were many, and his talents, as pointed out in an editorial published in the Longview Daily News of August 20, 1969, were well refined.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SHIRLEY MARSH—A PUBLIC MAN

The man with an engaging smile and a twinkle in his eye would frequently lean close to whoever he was talking to, remove the cigar clenched between his teeth and say, "Between thee and me, well I . . ."

And when Shirley Marsh was serious, whoever he was talking with listened and listened well. Because when Shirley Marsh was talking politics, power, area problems or the law, he knew his stuff and people knew it.

Now Shirley Marsh is gone and all of Cowlitz County will be poorer for it. While he was widely known and admired around the county and indeed, around the state, relatively few persons understood where his influence came from.

Mr. Marsh was more than an attorney and civic leader. He was a political person. He had one of the shrewdest political minds around. He understood the political processes thoroughly and used them time and again not only for his party's benefit, but more often to help someone else or his native county he loved so dearly.

When he served in the legislature, leaders of both parties held him in high esteem because of his abilities. This respect and admiration continued even after he left the legislature. It proved beneficial to the area and to dozens of individuals with problems over the years. Often the way to get a problem solved was to "see Shirley" because he knew who to call or talk to.

In recent years, Mr. Marsh turned his interests to the PUD—where he was legal counsel—and the city of Longview, where he was president of the Chamber of Commerce. In both bodies, he worked efficiently and effectively for progress and community improvements.

For all his ability and positions, Mr. Marsh never lost touch with people. He seemed to be everyone's friend—the man in the street or the governor of the state. And he greeted nearly everyone with that same engaging smile and twinkle in his eye. Because he was a Democrat, some Republicans came to know that when Mr. Marsh put his talents to work, it usually meant woe for the GOP.

Shirley Marsh, then, was a public man. He spent his life in the public arena and loved it. His death leaves a void that will not be filled soon.

IOWA ARTS COUNCIL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Arts Council is a relatively new agency of the State government in Iowa. In its short life, it has made some rather significant contributions. These contri-

butions are very ably detailed in a recent guest editorial in the October 25, 1969, Davenport Times-Democrat. The editorial, by Julie McDonald, follows:

ENRICHING A WIDERNESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The guest editorial today is by Julie (Mrs. E. R.) McDonald of 2802 E. Locust St., Davenport. She has been appointed chairman of the Iowa Arts Council by Gov. Robert D. Ray. A free-lance writer, she contributes feature articles to the Times-Democrat under the name of Julie Jensen; she also is the author of several novels, short stories and a children's play. She is the wife of an attorney and mother of a boy and a girl.)

The Iowa Arts Council is three and a half years old, younger than some of the councils in each of the 50 states and several territories and older than others.

The state arts council movement is a response to a realization that human life involves more than maintaining physical existence.

The American people are ready to consider the arts as basic nourishment for all the people rather than a fancy dessert for the rich.

The job of the state arts council is to make painting and scultpure, theater, music, literature, the dance, and architectural excellence available to all the people.

Why are the arts important to a community or to a state? David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, says, "Corporations genuinely concerned about their environment cannot evade responsibility for seeing that increased leisure is channeled into rewarding activities such as those the arts afford. We must face up to the task of bringing our cultural achievements into balance with our material well-being through more intimate corporate involvement in the arts."

As humans, we need the arts. Paul Engle of the University of Iowa, a member of the National Council on the Arts, says the arts will have to take the place of the wilderness in our time.

He says, "As the landscape gets chewed up and air becomes unbreathable, what do you have left to enhance your life! The power of the arts to make life bearable has been underestimated."

Artists need to be seen, heard and read, and their audiences need openness more than specialized training to appreciate the offerings of the arts.

When the 15 members of the Iowa Arts Council meet to consider proposals of arts projects to be funded each year, they yearn for rubber dollars.

A great deal of worthy talent is turned away for budgetary reasons, but the available dollars go a long way toward reaching the 99 counties of Iowa with unique small projects in the arts.

The Iowa Legislature appropriated $30,730 for the council for fiscal 1970, and the National Endowment for the Arts grants each state $31,000 a year.

Since most of the state appropriation is necessary to run the council office and pay the salary of the executive director, funding of arts programs is limited to the amount of the federal grants.

Individual grants range from a few hundred dollars to several thousand, to be matched in a combination of time, talent and money by the individual or group presenting the proposal.

About 30 projects are funded each year, mostly touring groups and shows in music, dance, theater and the visual arts.

The council's aim is to develop art resources in Iowa and spread them to areas which have no resources of their own.

Our neighboring states are richer through state appropriations and can mount more ambitious programs. The Illinois program receives $270,000 from the state for fiscal 1970 with more funds from private contributions to the council. The Minnesota Legislature has appropriated $113,825 to the Arts Council; the Missouri appropriation is $201,082.

The Iowa Arts Council is grateful for the Legislature's efforts in its behalf. Its members realize that the actions of the state governing body reflect the views of the people, and until Iowans acknowledge the importance of the arts and transmit this awareness to their representatives, we cannot hope for state funds comparable to those of our sister councils.

However, we have hopes for the development of another resource. In his inaugural message, Gov. Robert D. Ray said, "No mention of better living for Iowans would be complete without a salute to the State Arts Council, which has provided a big return for a very small investment . . . I pledge enthusiastic support to the continuing success of the Arts Council, and remind my fellow-citizens that the council is authorized by law to accept private contributions."

Jack Olds, executive director of the Iowa Arts Council, will be at the Davenport Municipal Art gallery 11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. Nov. 12 to consult with anyone interested in offering a proposal for funding to the council to be included in next year's projects.

The council sponsors touring services, technical assistance, educational programs, and experimental projects. Colleges, school boards, PTA, services organizations, student groups, concern and theater groups, study clubs, and individuals are urged to explore the possibilities of programs the council may support.

The youth drain which Iowans deplore may be attributed in part to a poverty of cultural programs in many parts of the state. Supporting the arts is good business because they make an area attractive to business investors. Skilled, well-educated employees demand more than "things" in the choice of a long-term environment.

CATV QUESTIONS POSED

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the cable television industry is one which is vitally important to my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, both in terms of its contribution to the State's economy through the manufacture of CATV equipment and in terms of service to the people of Pennsylvania. Because of my concern over certain Federal Communications Commission policy in this area, I submitted a number of questions on this subject to Dean Burch during the Senate Communications Subcommittee's initial October 15 hearing on his nomination to be Chairman of the FCC. His written response now has been received. I believe this exchange will be of interest, nationally; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that both my questions and the combined answer supplied by Mr. Burch be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR HUGH SCOTT TO DEAN BURCH, NOMINEE FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, OCTOBER 15, 1969

1. On December 18 of last year, the Federal Communications Commission abruptly ordered a complete freeze on the further growth of cable television systems within the Nation's largest 100 markets. This was done through the procedure of "interim rules" which added to and superseded the FCC's Second Order and Report of 1966. In view of the fact that this action has effectively stopped the growth of cable television in this country for almost a year, do you believe, especially in view of the economic hardship and uncertainty which has resulted, that the entire subject of CATV regulation should be brought up for a thorough review now?

2. As you are probably aware, much of the criticism of the FCC's handling of the CATV matter has centered on charges that the Commission did not faithfully follow the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. Sec. 1005). I am one who strongly holds this view. When I asked this question of Chairman Hyde last spring, I was told that the FCC "believes" it is acting in full accord with the Act. In view of the continuing controversy on this point from many sources, do you believe there is good reason to review again the provisions of this Act and to determine for yourself whether the FCC violated either the spirit or the letter of this Act in ordering the CATV freeze?

3. In response to another question which I asked of Chairman Hyde last year, he said he knew of no instance in which a television station had been forced off the air or even forced to reduce service as the result of CATV competition. Is there any reason, then, why the FCC should not promote the development of cable television to the fullest extent unless and until it is factually demonstrated that regular broadcast service is actually impaired?

4. There is now a provision in the FCC rules that permits the Commission to impose an indefinite injunction upon a cable system's operation with no standards for even a minimal showing of need, or for any time limit on the injunction. I am reliably informed that there are some injunctions that are now running into their third year. Do you believe this to be a proper way for the Federal Communications Commission to exercise its discretion?

5. I would like to have your views with respect to the proper role of the Federal Government in fostering an improvement in television programming. There are some who feel that the existing services ought to be protected from competition but, at the same time, subjected to rather strict programming standards, going to the content and subject matter, and thereby raising some serious questions with respect to censorship and First Amendment freedoms. On the other hand, there is a school of thought which suggests that programming controls are not needed, but that more competition *is* needed and that the Commission can more easily assure the public of better programming by providing for more channels of television. With which point of view do you side?

6. In line with the above, the FCC has now authorized the use of the broadcast spectrum for pay television, presumably to encourage program diversity. Doesn't it seem inconsistent to you that the Commission has moved at the same time to restrict cable television?

7. Do you feel that the Federal Communications Commission should ever irrevocably commit itself to a certain course of action

even if technology develops so rapidly that the policy becomes outdated?

ANSWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR SCOTT

Since the seven questions posed by Senator Scott are directed to the FCC's CATV regulatory policies, I believe that the following answer is pertinent to all these questions:

You will appreciate that I am not now in a position to give you a response of any substance to questions 2, 3, 4, 6. They do deal with specific Commission decisions or policies that obviously require my further study and I feel it would be presumptuous of me to seek to respond to them until after I have had the opportunity to become more familiar with the subject matter. I assure you I appreciate the significance of the questions you have raised and will endeavor to provide definite responses in the near future.

I will seek to respond in very general terms to the overall theme of the need for continued Commission review of its CATV policies as contained in Question 1. It is my understanding that the broad subject of CATV regulation will be considered, both by the Commission in its rule making proceedings and by the Congress. I certainly endorse both Commission review, and the need for Congressional guidance in those areas where Congress is disposed to act.

As to Question 5, I would stress that in my view the most appropriate course is to obtain for all the people the maximum degree of diversity of services consistent with the public interest, rather than to attempt a dubious course of strict programing regulation. I fully recognize that the new technology of CATV, because of unique features, holds the promise of a most substantial contribution to greater diversity of programing sources, and will thus seek to promote fulfillment of this promise.

Finally, as to Question 7, I do not believe that the Commission should ever irrevocably commit itself to a certain course of action. Communications would appear to be one of the most dynamic and changing fields, and it follows that the Commission must be alert to revise its regulatory policies, as technology changes.

GE STRIKE FOCUSES ATTENTION ON NATION'S LABOR LAW

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Labor Law Reform has conducted a series of meetings with spokesmen for both management and labor, assessing the adequacy of present labor law legislation to cope with today's realities. While we are still conducting this series of meetings, it has been significant to this point that there has been no outpouring of demands for compulsory settlements of contracts involving the national interest. Relevant to our discussions is an article written by Mr. A. H. Raskin in the November 2 issue of the New York Times which I commend to all those concerned about labor law legislation:

GE STRIKE: ADMINISTRATION'S ROLE SO FAR IS HANDS OFF

(By A. H. Raskin)

Even before the nationwide strike against General Electric began last week, Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz let the company and the heads of the 13 unions involved know that the White House intended to stay out of the dispute. The Administration's resolve was to demonstrate the genuineness of its faith in free collective bargaining by keeping hands-off, despite its awareness that the outcome of the G.E. strike might have a crucial effect on the success or failure of President Nixon's plea to all labor and management for help in checking the wage-price spiral.

When Arthur J. Goldberg served as Secretary of Labor in the Kennedy Cabinet, he was so fast on the uptake in major industrial disputes that some irreverent aides suggested equipping his office with a fire chief's helmet and brass pole. His first weekend on the job found him in New York settling a paralyzing strike of railroad towboat crews. Everything from the Big Three auto companies to the threat of a musicians' walkout at the Metropolitan Opera drew his personal attention. He never stopped running until President Kennedy named him to the Supreme Court.

SCANT SUCCESS

His successor, W. Willard Wirtz, tried to get off the merry-go-round but with scant success. Not only did Secretary Wirtz find himself directly involved in dozens of efforts to keep the peace on the industrial front; he often had a high-level helper in President Johnson, who summoned union and management negotiators to the White House and told them—not always with much effect—how desperately the country needed a settlement.

All that has changed with the advent of the Nixon Administration. No Secretary of Labor since the New Deal put government deep into labor relations 35 years ago has subscribed more determinedly than George Shultz to the notion that the White House should keep hands off. This is a matter not of politics but of philosophical conviction for the man who came to the Cabinet from the deanship of the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business.

The Shultz approach was set forth in some detail in a talk he gave in 1963 shortly after Congress, acting on President Kennedy's recommendation, had passed the first Federal compulsory arbitration law in the country's history to halt a national railway strike. Dr. Shultz argued that what had broken down in the railroads was not free collective bargaining but "government-dominated bargaining." In his view, both sides had grown so dependent on Federal decision-making over the years that all the vitality had run out of their relationship and they could not solve even a simple grievance on their own.

He warned that in many other industries, getting the White House into the act, he felt, was becoming a kind of status symbol, especially for the party that felt it would come out ahead. "It is getting to the point where you are not a big boy any more unless you have the Secretary of Labor involved," was the way the 1963 Shultz put it. And he had a postscript: "If the President hangs out his shingle, he'll get all the business."

NEUTRALITY

Since entering the Cabinet, Secretary Shultz has been following out the precepts enunciated by Dean Shultz. Thus in the G.E. dispute, direct Government intervention has been left to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in discharge of its statutory obligation under the Taft-Hartley Act. But what constitutes neutrality is hard to define in a strike involving 125,000 workers in a company with hundreds of millions of dollars in defense orders. The unions started out feeling aggrieved over President Nixon's issuance on the week before the G.E. strike deadline of his hold-the-line appeal to all management and labor—a communication they regarded as decidedly helpful to the company.

Against that backdrop they were quick to complain when they felt Secretary Shultz was tipping the balance still further on the strikes first day. What triggered their complaint was no breach in his own aloofness from the peace efforts but his reply to an interviewer's question on a C.B.S. news program. Asked why the company was putting up so much resistance to the union wage demands, Dr. Shultz attempted to give a responsive answer—always a mistake for an official in such circumstances. The Shultz explanation was that G.E. was beginning to feel the effects of the Administration's anti-inflation policies in its product market and that it feared its profits would be squeezed by a big pay increase. Although this explanation would seem axiomatic in a class in freshman economics, it brought from Paul Jennings, operating chief of the union coalition, an accusation that Dr. Shultz had taken a partisan stand in the dispute and thus abdicated the historic role of the Secretary of Labor and should resign. The White House chose to ignore the demand for Dr. Shultz's scalp and Mr. Jennings is not pressing it.

When President Nixon met with the A.F.L.-C.I.O. Executive Council in mid-week, the Labor Secretary patched up his feud with Mr. Jennings and the President reiterated the White House determination to stay neutral in the G.E. strike. With both the company and the unions dug in for a showdown test on Boulwarism, the chances were strong for a repeat of the kind of economic holy war the Big Four copper companies and an alliance of 26 unions fought for 37 weeks in 1967–68. In the end neither side won, but the national balance of payments took a bad beating through heavy dependence on high-priced imported copper.

The unions got a leg up from the United States Court of Appeals in New York last week in their long legal battle against "Boulwarism." the formula under which G.E. decides what is a fair offer and then sticks to it. But the prospect of shortening the present strike was not vastly enhanced by the court's 2-to-1 ruling that the company had not bargained in good faith in the contract talks that led up to a much smaller strike in 1960—one that resulted in a crushing union defeat. The decision condemned G.E.'s "unbending patriarchal posture" and the large-scale communications effort that went with it as calculated to persuade the workers that the company, not the union, was their true representative. The unions promptly proclaimed that the decision "buried" Boulwarism. But there were enough loopholes in what the court said to give the company the basis for arguing—even if it lost the final round in the Supreme Court—that its actions in 1969 could not be fitted into the precise mold of the 1960 prohibition. The outlook was for much more litigation, not a clear road to ending the current tie-up.

That means the final decision will be made on the picket line. The company is standing fast on its contention that it has made the best offer in its history and cannot do more without giving the inflationary spiral another upward push, to everybody's detriment. It stresses, however, that the whole package is open to "rearrangement and review" in the light of negotiations.

The strikers take no comfort from that assurance. "I don't know whether Hanoi learned from G.E. or G.E. learned from Hanoi, but they both negotiate the same way," said Mr. Jennings at week's end. "Nobody better get involved in this dispute. There is just one way to deal with a company that only respects the law of the jungle."

THE U.S.S. "MILWAUKEE" JOINS THE FLEET

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 1, it was my honor and privilege to speak at the commissioning of the Navy's newest ship, a new type replenishment oiler, the U.S.S. *Milwaukee*, AOR–2.

Because I believe my colleagues will be interested in the historic tradition of the U.S.S. *Milwaukee*, and the mission and capabilities of this newest addition to the fleet, I insert my remarks in the RECORD:

THE U.S.S. "MILWAUKEE" JOINS THE FLEET

Admiral Wylie, Captain Martin, Friends of the Navy, and you who have brought AOR–2 to this moment of availability of service to the Navy and to our Country:

For several reasons, this is a moment of recollection and pride for me.

It was here, in the first Naval District, Admiral Wylie, that I began active duty in the Navy; in the same month, Captain Martin, that you were graduating from Lowell High School. Here, with a nautical background that extended to manipulating a rowboat on some of Wisconsin's many lakes, I first went aboard a commissioned ship of the United States Navy.

It was here that, on a visit, Mrs. Davis, whom you met, consented to become my wartime child bride.

It was from here that I went through 33 months of service aboard another glorified oiler with a flight deck on top, which met its fate in the form of a Kamikaze Nick off Okinawa.

It was here, out of a book called "Customs and Traditions of the Navy" that I learned that no self-respecting Naval ship joins the Fleet without three rites: keel-laying, launching and christening, and commissioning. There is one common denominator of all three rites, somebody from Washington makes a speech!

I can only say to you Navy people that this is a selfinflicted punishment. You really cannot ask for sympathy, only merciful brevity.

And, of course, it is no matter of small pride to me, and to all the people of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area, that this fine new ship bears the name of the city and river of Milwaukee. Milwaukee, in the Indian language from which it takes its name, means "good country". A good ship can bear such a name with pride.

This is the fourth ship of the Navy to carry this proud name.

The first Milwaukee was an iron-clad double-turreted monitor of civil war vintage. She was torpedoed in Mobile Bay in March, 1865, but her intrepid commander and crew went ashore to man a naval battery which participated in the bombardment which reduced the last confederate fort at Mobile.

The second Milwaukee was a cruiser commissioned in 1906. This ship was fatally damaged off the California Coast in 1917 while engaged in attempts to free a submarine which ran aground.

The third Milwaukee, a light cruiser of World War I vintage, performed numerous significant peacetime missions, including hydrographic soundings in the Solomons, Carolinas, and Marshalls—some familiar World War II names. She recorded the greatest Atlantic Ocean depth, an area of the Caribbean still known as "Milwaukee depth." In World War II she served on numerous Atlantic convoy missions until April 1944 when she was turned over to the Russian Navy and renamed Murmansk. Never again did she rejoin our Fleet.

So, for most of the last 105 years, the name Milwaukee has meant something to our Navy.

This, the fourth Milwaukee, OAR–2, is the second of a new class of multi-purpose replenishment ships being constructed for the United States Navy. The new Milwaukee will be able to sustain a speed of about 20 knots and will be able to operate either independently or as a unit of a fast underway replenishment task group.

She has cargo space and underway transfer equipment for petroleum products, refrigerated and non-refrigerated provisions, and ordnance, including missiles and special weapons.

The new Milwaukee carries the most advanced equipment for fueling at sea. She has a replenishment helicopter landing and launching area which increases her rapid cargo discharge capability.

Quincy Division, General Dynamics Corporation, has done its job well in delivering this modern auxiliary vessel to the Fleet. At one time, fleets operating reasonably near coastlines needed only to put into the nearest friendly port for supplies, but in this age, our fleets must move fast and far from their original supply bases along coasts. An auxiliary fleet is needed to bring the needed supplies. The Milwaukee standing here today is that kind of ship.

It is one of a series of ships being built to meet the challenge of an ever increasing Soviet Union sea power. Since World War II, the Soviets have concentrated on building a powerful Navy dominated by submarines but complemented by modern surface warships including a variety of auxiliary vessels. The Soviets now have the world's largest submarine force. They have also greatly increased their number of auxiliary vessels, freeing them from their historical dependency on their coastline.

The modernity of this vessel is important. The growth in the Soviet Navy has come about largely since World War II. This means about 90 percent of their ships are less than 15 years old. In contrast, almost half of ours are World War II vintage and one-third of ours are 25 years of age. We have something over 500 ships more than 19 years old, while the Russians have only two ships in operation that were commissioned that long ago.

Their cruisers and destroyers carry the surface-to-surface missiles which ours do not have. Their surface-to-air missiles on vessels compare with ours in ability. The Soviets are using gas turbine power on some of their ships, something which we have not tried yet.

In their merchant marine, the Soviets have also expanded greatly during the past few years. The merchant navy ranked only 21st among merchant fleets in 1950. It was in fifth place by 1966. Their merchant marine vessels are younger than ours. Four out of five in their fleet are less than 10 years old. In our merchant marine fleet, four out of five date back to World War II or before.

History records that the United States did not become an influential force in world affairs, did not become a significant factor in world history, until she became a great maritime power—until Yankee Clippers and Boston Whalers plied the seas, until a modern civil war fleet could enforce a blockade and ward off foreign interference until 1898 when, in accordance with a song of that era, "Dewey made a few remarks that carried lots of weight, and we did some fancy bottling down in Santiago Bay, and fixed it so Cevera found he couldn't get away."

For many years, it served our interests well to marry ourselves to the British fleet. This marriage, this dependence, was well illustrated in 1823.

The Spanish colonies in the New World were in revolt. Spain called upon her European allies, the so-called Holy Alliance for assistance in reconquest. The British Foreign Minister, Lord Channing, suggested to that son of Massachusetts who was serving as President Monroe's Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, that Great Britain and the United States should issue a joint statement warning against such reconquest. At that time, Secretary Adams prevailed upon President Monroe to act independently in enunciating the Monroe Doctrine because, as he put it, "He didn't want us to be a rowboat in the wake of the British Man of War."

In today's world, there is no British Man of War—there is no Navy on which we can rely for our defense except our own.

This concept applies not only to carriers, submarines, destroyers, it applies to auxiliary vessels and merchant vessels as well; the essential support of our fleet. I am encouraged to believe there is a growing awareness of this need. The President is aware of it; the House Armed Services Committee, spurred for years by our late lamented friend Bill Bates, is aware of it; our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee is aware of it.

So, Captain Martin, anchors away to you and your crew. Yours is a proud ship that bears a proud name. Admiral Wylie and those who have delivered this modern ship into your hands, in this ceremony a few minutes ago, deserve a "Bravo Zulu" (Well Done) at the two block. I hope this will be the most frequent signal the Milwaukee will acknowledge at sea.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION PROPOSAL

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the current problem of preventive detention should be of interest:

PREVENTIVE DETENTION PROPOSAL

When a suspect is arrested in Britain for murder, rape or other violent crimes, Lord Alfred Denning told the [California] State Bar convention recently, "we keep him in prison pending his trial; we do not allow that man out on bail . . . if there is reason to believe he may commit another offense while awaiting trial."

This amounts to saying that the British already employ the system of "preventive detention" which the Nixon Administration is proposing to employ in certain criminal situations over which the Federal courts have jurisdiction.

Last July the Justice Department asked Congress for authority to detain dangerous suspects in specified classes of crimes for up to 60 days without bail if a judge, having found a "substantial probability" of guilt, determines that the defendant's release on bail would be a danger to the community.

Civil libertarians and strict constitutionalists are bitterly opposed. Senator Sam Ervin Jr., of North Carolina said the request is "unconstitutional and smacks of a police state." In his address to the bar, Lord Denning, a leading jurist of his country, took

note of this opposition. "I have heard here that this is regarded as an unfair procedure because it amounts to imprisonment without trial," he said. "In England, we make sure he (the accused) is tried speedily—within eight weeks."

That is the big difference. The English provide a speedy trial; under the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution we guarantee a speedy trial but seldom make good on the guarantee. The reasons for this are many. Defense lawyers customarily play for delays, rather than for speedy disposition of their client's case, and this practice itself becomes a self-serving argument for release on bail as opposed to detention pending trial.

Courts are slow-moving and usually clogged with backlogs of cases. Most jails are crowded and would feel the strain of any substantial number of suspects being preventively detained.

In the face of these hindrances to speedy trials, all of which are frequently cited as discreditable to American justice, the opponents of the preventive-detention proposal of the Administration are making considerable headway.

Still, in any deliberation about how to control crime in this country, it is a good idea to begin by inquiring how the British do it. Our system, with its rights and safeguards, developed from theirs, and it is generally acknowledged that they have on the whole a much better record than we have of protecting society from the criminal and the criminal from injustice.

It is highly relevant to learn that preventive detention not only is customary in the homeland of Anglo-Saxon law but is no great subject of complaint because justice is swift there.

CLASS ACTION BILL WILL PROTECT CONSUMERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join over 50 of my colleagues in introducing a "class action" bill to permit law suits in the Federal courts on behalf of large groups of consumers.

Under present law, an individual customer injured by illegal conduct cannot afford to bring suit for the injury he has suffered. The amount of his separate claim is likely to be less than the costs of bringing the suit.

Thus large numbers of individuals may be victimized by conduct that is fraudulent but there is no effective redress. Deceptive advertising, usurious interest rates, overpriced drugs and food, and adulterated meat are examples where duped customers are usually helpless.

Our bill gives Federal courts jurisdiction to handle civil class actions brought by consumers when laws for the benefit of consumers have been violated.

This bill is much better than President Nixon's proposal that consumers should wait until the Department of Justice takes action. This often takes years. Our bill permits consumers to take immediate action in the courts on their own behalf without relying on the sincerity and sympathetic support of Federal officials.

SOVIET SCENE '69: CONTROL OF PUBLIC OPINION AND THE GROWTH OF INDUSTRY

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in these installments of his story of Soviet Russia today Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of the Daily Oklahoman, continues his observations on his recent tour. He discusses Soviet control of public opinion, how it works, and how letters to the editor provide an outlet for many citizens. In another article he describes the impressive Russian industrial growth.

The materials follow:

TIGHT REIN MAINTAINED ON SOVIETS' THINKING

(By Charles L. Bennett)

"In two weeks of questioning," the American editor said, "we have not heard one whisper of criticism against your government."

"That means it's a good government," the smiling Soviet official quickly replied. Everyone in the room—that is, all the Soviets in the room—laughed heartily.

We were talking with Nikilai Baybakov, one of the 11 deputy premiers of the Soviet Union and chairman of the State (U.S.S.R.) Planning Board—a very powerful position.

Back in Moscow after visiting eight other Soviet cities, our group of touring editors had become intrigued with the question of whether—under the massive and all-powerful bureaucracy that is Soviet government at all levels—citizens of the U.S.S.R. really had any freedom of expression at all, any chance to criticize or influence what happens in the country.

When the laughter from Baybakov's remark died down, the American editor pressed ahead: "To us, coming from another system," he said, "the lack of criticism could only mean it has been silenced."

We mentioned recent news stories in the United States saying the Soviet government was exercising stronger controls over critics than in the Khrushchev era.

"These articles are incorrect," Baybakov said. "They propagandize the theory that we are returning to Stalinism and re-introducing terror and the hard line. This does not correspond to reality. Who needs it?

"Apparently, it comes from our ill-wishers. From our current democratic freedom of action, creative atmosphere that we now have, we do not intend to return to the past.

"The idea that people are jailed and we have repression is not true," Baybakov concluded.

A basic operating principle of the Communist doctrine, since revolutionary days, has been to maintain strict control over all media of communication—making them serve the interests of the party and "the state". We detected no sign that the present Soviet regime is deviating from that principle.

We heard from the editors themselves that their newspapers and magazines exist only to serve the interestts of the government, the Communist party, "and the people."

Feodor Mikhailov, editor of "Kazakhstan Pravda" in Alma Ata, put it this way: "Our press and government and people all agree—so why would we come out for something against government policy?"

When we asked if any paper ever had disagreed with government policy, the Alma Ata journalists finally did remember "the case of a paper in Leningrad—back in the 1920's—that disagreed. It was a Trotskyite paper." We got the impression that the disagreement—and the paper—were both short-lived.

"We do not separate the interests of the citizens and the party," said Kenesbai Usebaev, chairman for radio and television in the Kazakh S.S.R. "Their interests are the same and when we advance the party and the government, we advance the interests of the people."

"Can we assume the Izvestia's policy is government policy?" we asked Uri Filonovich, assistant editor of this national paper issued from Moscow.

"Yes, of course," he replied.

"And is there any difference between the policies of Izvestia and Pravda?" (another major national paper and official voice of the Communist party)?

"Not on basics, but some on approaches and emphasis . . . We differ in our evaluations of works of art and literature."

Four thousand magazines, more than 7,000 daily newspapers, untold millions of radio sets and, now, more than 25 million television sets make up the core of the Soviet communications media. Thousands of factories, universities and other enterprises also produce special papers. There also are both magazines and newspapers tailored for young people of various age groups.

All of the media is government-controlled, of course. Policy direction comes through government and Communist party channels. Ideological "guidance" is equally present for all kinds of artists—visual, literary, musical and dramatic.

Newsmen expelled from the U.S.S.R. or returning to the U.S. after duty there have reported Soviet authors are under tight ideological reins. "They write things acceptable to the government," one newsman wrote, "or their work isn't published." Anatoly Kuznetsov was recently granted political asylum in England, saying he no longer could stand the restrictions imposed upon him in the U.S.S.R. His defection reportedly has caused tightening of restrictions on foreign travel for Soviet writers.

Russian writers Yuli Daniel and Andrei Sinyavsky were charged, in 1966, with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. They were sentenced to five and seven years, respectively, in prison at hard labor. We asked Deputy Premier Baybakov whether such trials did not constitute a bad situation.

"You should find out more about what they did," he replied. "They violated the U.S.S.R. laws and this cannot be passed by. It wasn't that they criticized leaders. There were actions as well as words. They did things that would be punished under your laws, too. This led to stories of repression. I categorically deny it."

Undenied, however, is the general knowledge that Soviet authors, composers and playwrights are expected to produce material not only acceptable to Communist ideology, but actively advancing it.

Nikolai Bezraydin, newspaper editor in Siberia's Novosibirsk, said there probably was one magazine or newspaper a day for every man, woman and child in his area "and that probably is typical of the whole country."

We saw lines of people at kiosks in Moscow, waiting to buy a newspaper or magazine. Home deliveries are made, even in the large cities, through the mail system. Newspapers are posted on public bulletin boards for people who do not buy them.

Soviet newspapers generally contain only four pages, infrequently going to six. The usual cost is two kopeks (roughly, cents) if the paper is four pages, three kopeks if it's six.

There are a number of national newspapers, distributed in all parts of the Soviet

Union. Both Pravda and Izvestia claim circulations of seven to nine-million a day.

Next come the Republic or regional papers, published in major cities and the capitals of the various republics that make up the Soviet Union. The regional paper at Novosibirsk, for example, circulates its 125,000 daily copies over much of eastern Siberia. The largest paper in Byelorussia, from Minsk, has 300,000 circulation, just about the same number of copies circulated in that republic by the two major national papers, Izvestia and Pravda.

Many other papers serve smaller districts, or even single cities or metropolitan areas. Magazines, too, are found with regional or district circulations, as well as the national publications.

Local and district papers—and even the regional papers to a large extent—print only news of their own areas, leaving the national and international news to the nationwide papers like Izvestia and Pravda.

A young editor in the Ukraine was asked if he ever wrote about international affairs. "What do I know about foreign affairs?" he said. "I have no contacts, no sources. I read Izvestia and Pravda. I know what our government has decided. I have no reason to distrust our government."

The Novosibirsk editor said he received, from the U.S.S.R. wire news service, Tass, and printed some news about the debate in the U.S. as to whether to go ahead with the proposed anti-ballistic missile system, Safeguard, and the results

When we asked if there was similar debate in the U.S.S.R. over such issues, Bezraydin said: "There is a difference between talk and action. We don't have such debates, but we are firmly convinced we must come to an agreement on disarmament."

"At this time," he said, "we are discussing going over to ten years of compulsory education. We are getting the parents involved in this debate."

Journalists in at least two cities scolded us for "printing the Chinese side of the border disputes," insisting, "Only our side of the argument is true."

Trying to use this as leverage to get approval of a trip to the border, we said, "We have no way to tell what is true or untrue unless you let us go to see for ourselves."

"We weren't on the moon when Apollo landed, but we believed it," one newsman snapped back."

"You presented the conflicts in two versions of some of the border incidents," charged Nikolai Novikov, head of the Southeast Asia department for Izvestia.

"Whose side are you believing? Ours, because the truth is on our side? Or are you presenting it so your readers could also believe the Chinese side? Many of your journalists are not certain of the position they're taking. Your readers could think it might be either side."

We took that as something of an unintended compliment, and tried to explain the American news system of reporting all sides of any situation—rather than expressing judgments or conclusions. The explanation left our hosts puzzled, unenlightened and unconvinced.

Soviet newsmen also were critical of American newspapers "because they carry so much paid advertising" (failing to note that even the U.S. papers with the highest percentages of advertising still carry three to five times as many columns of news space as any Soviet newspaper.)

They also criticized "printing of gossip and rumors that have not been officially announced by the government." They wondered how, under our system, the government ever managed to make its views known to the public. We assured them that our system gave government at any level ample coverage, but they still shook their heads.

Soviet reporters are subject to "ideological" training along with the coaching they receive in technical and professional aspects of journalism "and, of course, they have to be tested on their political knowledge along with everything else," a newsman confirmed.

Professors at the university in Novosibirsk's Science City said students have "much freedom in choice of thesis subjects," and "as a matter of fact a number have been written about the controversial charges of 're-Stalinization' and 'The Cult of Personality'."

With these little glimpses into Soviet thinking about freedom of expression—in newspapers, the arts, even in the scholarly work of a university—we were not reassured. It appeared, without reasonable doubt, that any conforming expression would be acceptable but that anyone attempting to swim against the stream of Soviet Communist thought certainly would be doing it at his own—and considerable—risk.

Letters to Editors Provide Outlet for Soviet Citizens

(By Charles L. Bennett)

Letters to their newspapers, it appears, may be one of the most effective ways Soviet citizens have of making their views known and having some—however slight—influence on shaping their laws and living conditions.

Represented in legislative bodies by deputies elected from no-choice ballots, the Soviet voter may feel remote from the law-making process. But when he takes pen in hand to complain about something, his letter may appear in a national newspaper of seven or eight million circulation. It may, even, require a formal answer from a top national official or be instrumental in changing a proposed law.

This letter-writing and answering function of Soviet newspapers was little known to our group of touring editors when we arrived in Moscow. Before we left the country after visiting eight other cities, we were convinced letters to the newspapers may be the Soviet citizen's only effective outlet for his own, personal opinions. Maybe that's why they write so many of them.

While providing an outlet for the citizens, the great mass of letters also provides editors and government officials with broad insight into the minds of their countrymen and a gauge on how the latest programs and proposals are being viewed by the proletariat.

Out in eastern Siberia, Editor Nikolai Bezraydin said his paper in Novosibirsk receives 17,000 letters a year. Izvestia's editors said they received 1,000 to 1,500 a day at that nationwide paper's offices. That can add up to 400,000 to 500,000 a year.

"We have a staff of about 50 people who do nothing but handle the letters," assistant Editor Yuri Filonovich said. "We try to answer practically every one, either personally or in the paper. Sometimes, when we get a great many letters on the same subject, a staff member does 'Review of Letters' as a special article. Or we may send a staff member to investigate a situation that has caused complaints.

"We publish as many as possible of the letters, but our space is limited so this goes only to about 10 a day, at the most.

"Writers complain about city services, international tension and acts of aggression, work progress, transportation, the airlines, local Soviets (city councils), bureaucratic faults, pensions, red tape in organizations or a certain official.

"The only thing they don't complain about is lack of work."

"Were any letters received about the Czechoslovakian actions?" we asked.

"Not too many," an Izvestia man replied. "Most of them were letters of solidarity" (agreement with the U.S.S.R. action). "We got more letters on the Safeguard system.

"Some writers criticize the paper for mistakes. Others want advice on purely personal matters.

"We frequently refer letters to those who can do something about whatever the complaint is. If some organization is criticized in a published letter, it usually replies—and we publish the reply. We could pressure them to reply, even though there is no law to require it. We would just write a story that the complaint had been made but the organization declined to answer it. Then they would. We follow up, too, to see what has been done about the problem.

"This is common practice on all of our papers. We deal with all problems except intra-party affairs."

"We get some crackpot letters, too."

We asked whether the letters were signed.

"Most of them are," was the reply.

We asked if organizations or governmental bodies ever were critical of the paper for printing letters of complaint about their operations.

"Yes, but it doesn't mean anything," Filonovich replied. "It is a peculiarly Russian characteristic to write letters of complaint and the tradition of requiring that they be answered goes back to Lenin."

We wondered if Soviet newspapers said anything critical of Nikita Khrushchev, before his 1964 downfall that caught most of the world by surprise.

"He's on pension. Why discuss him now?" a Minsk journalist wanted to know.

"Did any of your papers say anything against him when he was in power, if he was so unable to lead as we heard afterwards?" we persisted.

"There was criticism of some enterprises," answered Anatoly Lisovsky, a member of the board of the Union of Journalists for Byelorussia. "We published what was said at various meetings."

"Did the papers themselves say anything?"

Another Minsk journalist replied: "You'll just have to look back through your papers."

"Did your papers have anything to say about the Czechoslovakian action by the U.S.S.R.?" we asked the Novosibirsk editor.

"Of course not," Editor Bezraydin answered, "because we didn't feel critical about it. No objective observer would call the U.S.S.R. action in Czechoslovakia aggressive.

"We have a law," Bezraydin commented another time, "that prohibits anyone from propagandizing for war. Our strivings are peaceful strivings and the people want peace. So you can't say our people don't influence decisions."

"We'd be glad to explain the differences between what the American government is, and the American people are," Bezraydin replied. "Just read Marx's 'Das Kapital' if you don't know what an imperialist is."

"Do papers in Byelorussia sometimes find themselves in differing positions on actions of the Supreme Soviet?" we asked.

"We have not had such cases," a Minsk journalist answered, "because any decision would have had wide discussion before the law is passed. Before that, papers give lots of coverage and many letters would be received and printed.

"For instance, in the last two months we have been discussing the charter for collective farms, publishing articles by various experts who give the pros and cons on all the points. Such comments and discussions are taken into consideration before the final law is adopted and published."

Members of the Soviet Women's Committee, too, had told us of their coverage of provisions of a new family and marriage law. "We had much comment," one of the committee editors said, "and these were influential in shaping the final law."

"Would your paper, on its own, have something to say about the proposed law?" we asked the Minsk editor.

"Very often," he said, "the papers will make their own suggestions before the law is adopted. They would publish this as article bylined 'From the Editorial Board'. Such

an article might also criticize specific ministries or ministers."

"We are helped by the people," an Alma Ata news official said. "If there are drawbacks in a farm or factory, workers usually write to us to complain. We read these. Or a correspondent may discover a drawback and write about it."

In Minsk, we discovered an aspect of Soviet newspapers we had not heard about.

"In addition to our handling of their letters, the public has another way of expressing its views," said Leonid Proksha, the bushhaired and literate editor of "Voice of the Motherland," a satirical magazine nicknamed "The Hedgehog".

"We also have readers' conferences. We bring them together and they can criticize or praise the editorial board. How often this is done depends on how well the editorial office works. The paper that wants to interest its readers does it often. We have one 'Press Day' a year on which each paper reports to its readers on its activities.

"We don't invite specific readers, but publish the date of the conference and anyone can come. The central papers, such as Pravda and Izvestia, have readers' conferences out in the Republics. They do this at various enterprises and other places."

"The last such conference we had," said Deputy Editor Tolstik of the local Minsk paper, "was at a tractor plant and 300 attended. The workers there said 'This is a big plant and few stories are printed about it.' We later lined up volunteer correspondents at that plant to give better coverage.

"Two months ago," he continued, "when Pravda had a conference here, 600 people attended. Their two local correspondents, their science writer from Moscow and their Japanese correspondent reported on their work. About eight readers spoke, including some of the engineers and scientists who attended. They criticized Pravda for its failure to note some developments in the Academy of Science here."

Similar conferences of radio and television listeners and viewers also are held, we were told in Alma Ata.

When we asked about outside broadcasts being received, such as the Voice of America, BBC German and Chinese broadcasts, the answer was "Yes, they are heard" and "No, we do not jam them". We really didn't expect any different answer.

The role of our hosts, the Union of Journalists also was questioned. We were told the union has only 45,000 members, even though there actually are some 200,000 people in newspaper, radio and television news jobs.

"We accept professional newsmen," an official said, "and journalists who, by their work, have proved their professionalism. At our Congress every four years, the members elect an executive board of 125 members. This board elects the chairman, vice-chairman and 23 secretaries, from each of the Republics and other well-known groups and organizations." This group sets policy and, with a secretariat in Moscow, runs the affairs of the union.

At a meeting with officials of the Soviet's Novosti press agency, an American editor said, "We need more open daily coverage of each of our countries, by correspondents of the other, if we are to have better understanding."

Victor Mayevskiy, one of Novosti's founders and a noted writer, immediately replied, "But we can't have correspondents write dishonest things about us."

We chided Novosti for its notorious (in the western world) practice of charging foreign correspondents fees to arrange interviews with Soviet officials. But they defended this as "simply a convenience to reporters who are new to our country and cannot do it themselves."

Resident American correspondents in the U.S.S.R. are strictly limited to a 25-mile radius around Moscow; they can go elsewhere only with permission of the Soviet government. Some say approval is difficult or impossible to obtain, especially if the correspondent has incurred the displeasure of Soviet authorities. Others feel they are allowed to travel around the country reasonably well in the "open" areas. Many cities and parts of the U.S.S.R. are officially and absolutely closed to anyone but Soviet citizens. Officials told us they were constantly reducing the list of "closed" areas but we had no opportunity to check past and present lists.

One correspondent said the situation had eased considerably from the days of Stalin. "You think it's closed now," he said, "but in 1953, when he died, there had been no tourists from the U.S. for years and no tourists to the U.S. There were only three American correspondents in the U.S.S.R." (Seventeen attended a reception held for us by the American Embassy.)

Whatever the merits or demerits of the Soviet system of media control, we were forced to the conclusion that it works—from the viewpoint of creating a steady, all-embracing and thorough mental bath of government and party propaganda. Wherever we went, and no matter to whom we were talking, many answers to our questions came out almost exactly in the "official" language spread by the government-controlled press and broadcast media. These answers were quoted with conviction and assurance that could only mean unquestioning acceptance of the government version.

Never did we hear even so much as a mild comment of, "It might be better if we spent less on space and more on consumer goods." The official line is that both kinds of expenditures are necessary and good. And, certainly, we never heard anything resembling, "Of course, the situation in Czechoslovakia might have been handled better."

Such thoughts may well exist in the Soviet Union. They may be quietly exchanged between close and trusting friends. But they are not expressed in any public way that could attract support to a dissident or nonconformist idea. Information and thought-stimuli from outside the U.S.S.R. are severely limited. The mass Soviet brain is continually washed with controlled propaganda and little light from the outside world penetrates that communication curtain.

Soviet Industrial Output Improving

(By Charles L. Bennett)

When Soviet industry managers talk about how their factories are doing, the yardstick they use to measure by is what's done by industry in the United States. Frank to admit their manufacturing capacity still lags far behind America, they make no secret of their intention, eventually, to match and surpass U.S. output.

With complete government control over all industry, U.S.S.R. planners set ever-increasing goals for all kinds of production and every sign of closing the "industry gap" is hailed as a major achievement.

Our touring group of editors visited a sprawling new textile mill outside Alma Ata, a plant manufacturing huge earth-moving trucks near Minsk and a factory making prefabricated apartment buildings in Leningrad.

Despite low productivity per worker, which Soviet managers acknowledge as one of their chief problems, and technology not yet approaching modern American standards, it was obvious from our inspection tours that Soviet production is improving and expanding rapidly.

Nikolai Baybakov, a deputy premier of the U.S.S.R. and chief of the national planning board, said the Soviet's economic growth rate hit 10 per cent in 1967. "That was a very high rate," he commented, "but we were unable to hold it. We think rates of 6, 7 and 8 per cent are good rates. But we are never satisfied. There is a proverb that says: 'When you get something, you want more'."

Along with the Soviets' own determination to do better, U.S. sources estimate that, with only about one-fifteenth of the world's population, Soviet industry already accounts for nearly one-fifth of the total world output.

Vast natural resources and hydro-electric power potential back up the Soviets' drive to industrialize. Fifty per cent of the world's coal reserves are available in the fields of eastern Siberia alone, with other major deposits scattered from the Komi fields near the Arctic Circle to the famed Karaganda basin in Kazakhstan. Some of the world's largest rivers flow through all parts in the U.S.S.R. and the hydro-electric installation at Bratsk, in Siberia and one of the world's largest is only one of scores already producing or planned.

Baybakov himself was instrumental in developing the U.S.S.R. oil industry. Major pipelines carry oil and natural gas thousands of miles to urban and industrial centers.

Diamonds, gold, rare earths, potassium for fertilizer, copper, lead and minerals of practically every known kind have been discovered in many parts of the country. While some of the deposits are already being worked, many remain untapped reserves of far greater size than even the Soviets can see any use for until far in the future.

Areas such as Kazakhstan, where only a generation or two ago most people were nomadic herdsmen, are being industrialized rapidly. Under the massive Soviet planning system, whole new industrial cities have been created in the Urals and on the Siberian plains. Central planning may decide a plant in Moscow should be, instead, 4,000 miles away in a new Siberian city. The order is given and the plant is moved.

"We are not in the city, but out here in the country," said Ivan Sidorovich, manager of the Belaz truck factory outside Minsk, "because the government wants to solve problems of full employment in this area. Mechanization had released part of the labor force from agriculture so, to put them to work, our plant was set up here and helps to solve the problem."

Decisions on what a plant is to produce and in what quantity and quality come out of the central planning machinery too, with national, Republic and even city governments cooperating in the final plans.

Central controls over the factories extend all the way from the appointment of managers to such matters as air and water pollution. When problems appear, government officials order the factory to take the necessary steps to correct them "or shut down"—knowing such an enforced shutdown would be a black mark on the record of any plant manager from which his career would never recover.

"At Lake Baikal," Baybakov said, "where we built a paper mill on the shores of this Siberian lake which holds 25 per cent of the fresh water in the world, we spent 25 per cent of the total cost of the plant just for high quality filters and other devices to prevent pollution."

The whole personnel situation in Soviet industry is fascinating, because it differs in so many respects from the U.S. approach. First, of course, the government is the only real employer. By law, no individual in the U.S.S.R. can hire anyone to do any work for him. Pay levels are low—averaging only 120 rubles a month for all workers although industry pay is slightly higher than the average for farm workers. Soviet factory managers make an interesting distinction between "workers" and "employees". It's something like our "white collar, blue col-

lar" difference. Workers, by and large, are those who do physical work—carpentry, running machines, driving trucks, digging ditches. The employees, generally, are secretaries, accountants, designers, managers—who do "think" work, rather than physical labor. But in another sense, everyone employed wants to be considered a "worker" because this is the magic word in the Communist lexicon—the "industrial proletariat" upon whom Marx and Lenin based the Communist-socialist theory.

Low pay levels are compensated to a degree by the "free" health, recreation and social benefits which, under strict government control, are provided for the workers. In many instances, hospitals, schools and even apartment housing for the workers are provided directly through the management of the factory where they work.

In the Belaz truck plant, 1,300 of the 7,000 workers are women, doing such jobs as electrical and mechanical assembly, running cranes and doing test and quality control jobs, among many others.

In the Belaz plant, the average age of all the workers is only 26 or 27, illustrating the importance of technical education available to the younger generation.

Technical training, on through engineering, is available to those who qualify and many with the necessary training become managers of major factories while still relatively young. Nikolai Yakoblev, manager of the housing plant, is 29 and, like many others, gained most of his education while working and studying nights.

At the Alma Ata textile mill, 200 of 5,000 workers were also studying college courses and 186 were in technical courses, while continuing full-time work.

Special training courses in the factories are run jointly by the plant management and the trade union, as are tests for job advancement. In all our meetings with factory officials, there seemed to be sort of a "triumvirate" management . . . the official manager, the top trade union official and the Communist Party secretary for the plant—or "commissar". It appears that the manager is responsible for physical operations of the plant, the trade union for guarding the interests and welfare of the workers, and the party official for their political education and morale.

Raisa Panova, the red-haired, green-eyed party secretary at the textile mill, whom one of our editors characterized as an "18-cylinder gal," said shop foremen generally are members of the Communist Party. This is because "They lead the political education classes for workers who are not going to any school." (Those in school or college get their political education there, along with other subjects.)

"The workers attend moral and political lectures," she said, "and we explain international affairs to them."

Typically in a factory, Manager Sidorovich told us at Belaz, about 10 per cent of the work force might be members of the Communist Party. "They are the 'front line' workers," he said. "I am a member of the party committee, too. The plant manager participates in the party, and the party participates in management of the plant. There are closely-knit ties. The best proof of the closeness of these ties is the good quality and quantity of production. It shows we work well together."

Despite their showing of statistics indicating steady improvement in production per worker, all three plant managers agreed that low productivity is a continuing problem in Soviet factories.

"It is one of our problems," Manager Yakoblev said at the housing factory. But it was much worse before 1917. As a young man, I can assure you we won't have this problem for very long."

The trade union official beside Yakoblev chimed in with: "Productivity is now increasing faster than pay."

Official recognition like being named to one of the honorary orders of workers, such as "Hero of Soviet Labor", is one of the incentives used to spur workers. Massive campaigns are launched to inspire them to greater productivity such as the drive this year and next to mark the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth.

Leading workers pictures are posted on huge billboards at plant entrances as another form of recognition.

"We do have some of the usual problems with some workers," Yakoblev said at the housing factory, "such as absenteeism, drinking and woman chasing." Discipline for such offenses can range from official reprimands, through being assigned an unfavorable vacation time or not being given a pass to a rest home for his vacation, and on to having his picture posted as a bad example.

Discharges are unusual, Yakoblev said. "Our main goal is not to fire a person, but to keep him at work. If he's substandard and we fire him, he'll just go elsewhere and be a problem—so we might as well work with him here."

The housing factory and truck plant seemed to us to be safety engineers' nightmares. Floors in the truck factory were greasy and slippery and the safety guards and warning signs common to U.S. plants were totally absent. The housing factory was rather dark and full of hazards for unwary workers. We saw one woman hurt while we were touring the plant. It happened when another worker tossed a heavy iron rod out of a doorway and it struck her in the foot.

Yet the plant managers, unanimously, said their safety records were good. We couldn't get any statistics that were clear or could be compared to U.S. figures, but Madame Panova said, at the textile mill, "We have had only seven minor accidents in the past seven months."

Madame Panova mentioned one "trial" that Soviet managers apparently share with those in America—difficulty in getting some workers to use safety devices. "We try to get the workers in the loom area, where the noise level is high, to use earmuffs and provide them," she said, "but the workers just won't wear them."

Soviet technical and scientific institutes spend much of their time and resources creating the technology used in manufacturing plants and solving specific technical problems.

"Thirty-nine per cent of our budget is spent directly on projects to improve the economy," the deputy director of Kazakhstan's Academy of Science told us. "That's about eight to nine million rubles annually. In the past years, the Academy's science findings have created 80 million rubles of savings or profit for the Republic."

The textile plant manager said, "Only 3 per cent of our profit goes into research, but that is because we are a new plant."

Manager Sidorovich said of his Belaz truck plant, "This is the only plant of this kind in the U.S.S.R. So far as we know, there is no plant to equal this one in the world. The U.S. makes such trucks, but in small numbers at many different plants." His output, he said, is about 2,500 trucks a year, of all types.

When we asked about prices, he said "It all depends on where you sell and to whom." The "standard international price" though, he said, is about $2,000 per ton of capacity. That would make the standard price of one of the Balaz 27-tonners about $54,000.

"Eighty per cent of whatever profit we make goes to the government," Manager Dekin said at the Alma Ata textile mill. "The other 20 per cent we can use to improve the plant, build rest homes or culture palaces (recreation centers) or other benefits for our workers."

Despite vast differences in the Soviet and U.S. industrial systems, we learned, the "success story" of a hard worker who has moved to the top in Soviet management can have a familiar Horatio Alger ring.

The 42-year-old manager of the Belaz truck factory, when we asked how plant managers are chosen, said: "I use myself as an example.

"I was called for army service in 1942 when I was 17 and served seven years, longer than normal because of the war. This hindered my training, of course, but everyone has lots of opportunity for training.

"I began work in the Minsk automobile plant, as a fitter on the assembly line. There were many like me, who studied while working. I started in the sixth grade of evening school, and sat at a sixth grade desk at the age of 25. Despite this, I studied a lot and worked during vacations and all of my free time. This allowed me to go through two grades each year.

"In 1954 I got my matriculation papers for high school. I came to this (Belaz) plant in 1958, when it was just being built. I entered the Byelorussian Polytechnical School to study truck and tractor design. I continued working and went to evening school. I went for six years and graduated in 1960. I was a shop foreman by then. Then I advanced in my work and became head of the quality control department. At the end of 1961 I was named director (manager) of this plant.

"This appointment was on the basis of my qualification for the job. Much attention is paid to the authority of the person among his subordinates. Attention also is paid to whether he is a (Communist) party member. If I am entrusted to run a plant like this, I must be equally trusted by the party.

"I was talked to first (before his appointment) by various people, including the party committee. Then the minister of the auto industry of the U.S.S.R. issued an order appointing me.

"I am happy with the job that has been given to me and the trust placed in me. I have been twice elected to the Supreme Soviet (congress) of the Republic of Byelorussia, which is an honor. I also have been named Winner of the Red Badge of Labor and Laureate of the State Prize. Many of my colleagues have received similiar honors. Of course, it is very satisfying that your country recognized your work.

"I think every person thinks about what he will leave after him and it is very satisfying to see this huge plant where once was just a potato field."

THE AMERICAN ONCOLOGIC HOSPITAL—A 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, November 7, 1969, marks the 65th anniversary of the American Oncologic Hospital in Philadelphia, Pa.

The American Oncologic Hospital is one of only nine hospitals in the United States devoted exclusively to the treatment of cancer and related diseases.

Pennsylvanians—indeed all Americans—can be justly proud of the physicians, employees, volunteers, and sup-

porting community members whose dedication and hard work has made this 65th anniversary possible.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS: AN EXAMPLE TO BE AVOIDED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Warren Court handed down its infamous Black Monday decision some 15 years ago, both the certified liberals and the confused "me-too-ers" promised that here in Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital, school integration would be conducted promptly. The idea was that the District of Columbia schools would become the model for the Nation.

They have.

It is no wonder that decent Americans from one end of the country to the other, desiring to protect their children—desiring that the schools educate them—have resisted the ruin of the school systems maintained by their taxes.

The recent episode at one of the Washington schools last week, after which the faculty demanded a full-time police guard for the teachers, is a small indication of what other Americans will not tolerate in their cities.

I submit pertinent newspaper clippings for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), Oct. 27, 1969]

MACFARLAND FACULTY DEMANDS A FULL-TIME POLICE GUARD

(By Walter Taylor)

Teachers at a Northwest Washington junior high school troubled recently by disorders met this morning with top school administrators and demanded, among other things, a full-time policeman.

Almost all of the 49 teachers at Macfarland Junior High at Iowa Avenue and Varnum Street NW attended the meeting with Acting School Supt. Benjamin J. Henley and George R. Rhodes, assistant superintendent for secondary schools.

Even as the meeting was going on in the teachers' lounge, scores of students roamed the hallways playing radios, singing and threatening to go home.

At least half the teachers at Macfarland staged their own walkout Friday after a small group of students pelted a faculty member with eggs. The school then closed early.

William H. Simons, president of the Washington Teachers Union which backed the teachers' demands, said the faculty also demanded, besides the full-time policeman, an improved administrative structure, additional teaching personnel, the immediate repair of the school's bell system and the installation of an intercom system and "panic equipment" on all doors.

Simons said the union was in "full support of the faculty" and "their actions of Friday."

He said the walkout on Friday is "something that sometimes must occur to demonstrate the problems teachers sometimes face."

Rhodes, commenting after the meeting, said the teachers "pointed out some things we didn't know."

He added that he was "taking everything discussed at the meeting under consideration" and promised that some of the teachers' demands would be met "almost immediately."

Rhodes said an emergency repair crew would be at the school tomorrow to install the "panic" equipment—which allows doors to be opened from the inside but not from the outside. He also said the bell system would be repaired.

Rhodes said he would attempt to get a policeman assigned to the school "to keep outsiders away" but said only 50 officers are available to patrol more than 180 schools. "We may have to have a re-evaluation of our priorities on this regard," he said.

While the teachers met for nearly two hours with the administration, MacFarland's nearly 500 students were in the school's auditorium watching a movie. However, as the lunch hour neared, the pupils, supervised by a handful of substitute teachers and student monitors, began to parade through the hallways.

There were no serious incidents, however.

The egg-throwing incident at the school Friday is only one example of a "general breakdown of discipline" at MacFarland, teachers have charged. The school principal, Bertha Baylor, confirmed that the school has experienced several similar disorders.

In September five outsiders surrounded a male teacher who was struck above the eye, Mrs. Baylor said. On Thursday, a male teacher intervened when a student "pulled at" a female teacher, resulting in a scuffle and a heated verbal exchange, she added.

However, the walkout Friday, which caused school to be dismissed a half hour early, was the first this fall at any District public school.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 25, 1969]

EGG-THROWING TRIGGERS WALKOUT BY TEACHERS

(By John Mathews)

About half the teaching staff walked out of the District's Macfarland Junior High School yesterday, forcing an early closing. It was the city's first teacher work interruption over discipline this fall, after several incidents in spring.

Teachers say they will be back Monday.

Students pelting a teacher with eggs in a second floor hallway were the immediate cause of yesterday's walkout.

That incident was followed by a general breakdown of discipline with bands of outsiders roving in the hall. But teachers said yesterday's events were a "last straw kind of thing," the culmination of a series of incidents, including physical assaults on teachers, since schools opened in September.

Last night, after a 6-hour meeting of about 30 of the school's 49-teacher staff, Mrs. Marcia Derricotte, an English teacher who is building representative for the Washington Teachers Union, said the teachers planned to return Monday.

If the school administration does not act on a series of teacher demands, Mrs. Derricotte said, "I'm not saying we will walk out again, but we are not going to go on as we have. We do have a plan, but I can't disclose it now."

Charles Cheng, assistant to the president of the teachers union, said that Acting Supt. Benjamin J. Henley and George R. Rhodes, assistant superintendent for secondary schools, will meet with teachers at the school Monday morning.

The teachers at Macfarland, a generally middle-class school adjacent to Roosevelt High School in upper Northwest, are demanding added personnel to deal with discipline, security measures to control the entry of outsiders and some plan for dealing with problem and disturbed students.

"We also want a general meeting of teachers from all over the city to put our heads together and come up with solutions to problems we all have," Mrs. Derricotte said. She added, "There has been a trend to keep quiet about it (the discipline problem), but we think the citizens should know the full extent of the problem."

Since opening in September, District schools have been plagued with incidents, many caused by what has become the common enemy of most teachers and administrators—the "outsider." The term is used to describe teen-age dropouts and young adults who hang around and often enter the schools to mingle with students and disrupt activities.

On opening day, a teacher was beaten at one junior high, requiring hospital care. Since then, a teacher has been robbed in an elementary classroom, another has been stabbed by a student and gang threats and fights have caused several early closings.

WALKOUTS OVER SUSPENSION

Last spring, teachers walked out of two junior high schools. The issue then revolved about school board decisions requiring hearings before suspensions of students and the virtual elimination of dress codes. Teachers reacted, feeling their authority to control students had been undercut.

The Macfarland principal, Mrs. Bertha Baylor, said the school has experienced several incidents. Five outsiders surrounded a male teacher who was struck above the eye in September, she said. On Thursday, a male teacher intervened when a student "pulled at" a female teacher, resulting in a scuffle and a heated verbal exchange.

Teachers yesterday mentioned another incident that happened Thursday, but which Mrs. Baylor said was not reported to her. They had a group of boys, presumably outsiders, enter a classroom taught by a substitute teacher, and held their hands in their pockets, claiming they had guns. The teacher was pushed into a chair, her keys taken and she, with 30 students, was locked in the room.

Following the egg-throwing incident, Mrs. Baylor said she called a policeman to eject groups of outsiders roaming the halls. She thought the situation was under control when shortly after 1 p.m. teachers told her they were leaving.

Mrs. Baylor gathered the students in the auditorium from about 2 p.m. until 2:30 when she dismissed the school a half hour early.

"I don't approve or disapprove of the teachers' action, but I only wish they had informed me," she said. Teachers said 32 of the staff of 49 walked out, but Mrs. Baylor said no more than 21 left. Five teachers were absent yesterday.

MORE PERSONNEL SOUGHT

Mrs. Derricotte said the teachers had no basic complaint against the principal, but wanted either replacement of the two assistant principals or more personnel to control discipline. "In instance after instance we have asked for help on discipline matters and we haven't gotten it," she said.

Teachers also want locks on doors that would allow students to exit, but prevent persons from coming in during class hours. The union also feels that students should have a more meaningful voice in school affairs and better planned lunchtime recreation activities.

An added element contributing to the situation yesterday was the annual homecoming football game at adjacent Roosevelt High School. Mrs. Baylor in the morning asked the downtown school office to approve a 2 p.m. closing of the school, but was refused.

SYSTEMS BUILDING AND THE FUTURE OF CONCRETE

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John C. Mundt, a senior vice president of the Lone Star Cement Corp., made a most interesting speech recently on the uses of the systems approach in homebuilding, and the use of concrete in it.

Industrialized housing production in the United States is lagging behind many other nations. If we are to meet our housing goal, set last year, we must build twice as many units per year as we are building this year. Mr. Mundt points to one approach we might take.

His speech follows:

SYSTEMS BUILDING AND THE FUTURE OF CONCRETE [1]

EXPERIENCE IN EUROPE

In Great Britain the Bison and Wates systems building factories are operating busily, turning out prefabricated modular concrete components for public housing. Of total housing starts between 20–30 percent will be built with systems in Britain this year.

Thirty kilometers outside of Paris, Camus concrete system personnel recently sold 250 houses on three weekends.

In Milan, the latest model Balency plant, neat as a pin, produces attractive concrete wall panels for both the private and public market. The walls and stairs are precast—the floors are cast in place. Systems can use either precast or readymix.

In Vienna, the city owns two Camus plants and competes with private precasters—but the competition is more theoretical than real, for the city plants are booked up several years in advance with city housing projects.

In Russia, 20 years ago after the war thousands of people in Leningrad and Moscow were homeless. Today hundreds of new systems—built apartments rise where the postwar "Shanghai" slum area of Moscow stood. In Leningrad, 67 percent of current residential construction is industrialized, according to city officials. Most of the new apartments in both cities are of concrete—and the newest apartments are far more attractive than the first generation monotonous rectangles. In Moscow each floor of one 1969 experimental apartment unit has a color TV room and small restaurant.

In Denmark, the government estimates a 15-20 percent saving in construction costs using systems.

We must conclude that prefabrication is making significant inroads in Europe through industrialized building methods. These methods are responsible for about 25 percent of all construction currently put in place, with a higher percentage for housing in Russia, and there are today literally hundreds of building systems available throughout Europe. Most of them use precast concrete panels and are designed primarily for the construction of high-rise, high-density housing. The components can be produced in either a large central manufacturing facility or in an on-site plant. The central manufacturing facility is by far the most popular.

If this is true in Europe, will systems building shortly sweep the United States?

In attempting to predict the future in our own markets, it is very important to understand the conditions in Europe that assisted the introduction of industrialized building. There are five factors that have been clearly influential:

1. First, in Europe, there was an acute housing shortage after World War II particularly in damaged areas, requiring speedy erection of shelter. The need to house large numbers of people rapidly created large concentrated markets congenial to industrialized, mass production, which appeared to be the only way of meeting the problem.

In Russia, massive precast concrete factories were established without regard to how the first generation apartments would look but with close attention to perfecting methods of mass production of components.

Similarly, in other parts of Europe after World War II, public sector construction of low income housing created a dependable volume of work and encouraged the formation of systems companies. Continuity of production and concentration of volume in and around urban areas was so attractive, in fact, that excess capacity developed. Over the years, strong systems construction organizations were established to supply this market, with the result that many names of European systems builders are becoming well-known in this country—Balency, Camus, Bison, Wates, Jespersen, Larsen & Neilsen, and others.

2. Second, official government sanction has paved the way for the widespread use of prefabricated components in Europe.

In Great Britain, systems building has benefited from the official British encouragement of industrialization. The government rebates the Selective Employment Tax (SET), which is 1 pound, 5 shillings per man per week, if the employee works in a factory, such as a Bison or Wates precast plant. In addition, in 1965 the Ministry of Housing announced that special consideration would be given local housing authorities using systems building.

In Russia, it is official policy to use concrete, mostly on a systems basis. In Leningrad, structures in addition to residential construction are also systems built. The Sovietsky Hotel and a new 4000 seat auditorium were built with concrete modules.

In Denmark, the government requires concrete components for all projects in which it guarantees the mortgage.

3. The third factor assisting systems building in Europe was the need to save on labor.

In Denmark an acute skilled labor shortage developed after World War II. Skilled labor went into factory work (where wages were higher than in construction) as Denmark became an industrialized country (exports of industrialized products jumped from 15 percent before World War II to 65 percent of total exports today). Systems building was a logical answer since unskilled labor could quickly be taught to produce and erect concrete components. In the Jespersen system it is estimated that unskilled manpower on the site can be reduced to ⅓ and skilled labor to 1/6 of traditional construction.

In Leningrad, the Deputy Chief of Design estimates that conventional construction requires 2.5 man/days per square meter of construction whereas only 1.5 total man/days per square meter are required for modular construction. Here again it was necessary that unskilled labor do the work—the 900 day seige in Leningrad killed 80 percent of the city's construction workmen.

In Denmark and Leningrad, therefore, systems building succeeded, at least in part, because of a skilled labor shortage. This was also true in Vienna and Paris.

4. There has been little labor opposition to systems building in Europe.

Throughout Europe a unique method has developed in calculating the pay of construction workers. Basically, workers are all paid on an incentive plan, consisting of a fixed rate plus bonus. The plan militates in favor of cost savings resulting from systems building.

In Russia, incentives are common in the housing factories, with a 25 percent premium over monthly base pay for those who exceed quota. In addition, the winning employees have their pictures mounted on bulletin boards at the plant entrance, near the bust of Lenin!

In the Balency plant in Milan, 20–30 percent of company workmen study at night with tuition paid by the company. They are aware that time and motion studies are carried out regularly in the plant and as a consequence they have often requested new machines to assure more productivity.

We should also note that at the same time these events were occurring, the European work force, in general, was fully employed. This too, meant that little opposition—based on fear for job security—to systems developed.

5. Fifth, in most countries there is a single national building code. Systems builders, therefore, encounter few code problems.

In Great Britain, Model By-Laws (MBL) for building throughout Britain were adopted in 1962–1963 and superseded local building codes.

In other countries, the fact of official sanction for the use of concrete components and a single national building code have eliminated this possible obstacle as an issue.

To recapitulate, the marketer of systems building has had everything going for him in Europe: a severe housing shortage, official government approval, a skilled labor shortage, little or no opposition from unions, no code complications.

How, we must now ask, does this foreign experience apply to the United States?

Let us determine whether the same factors assisting industrialized building in Europe are present in America. It is clear that they are not.

1. First, whereas there *is* a housing shortage (vacancy rates are at record lows), there is no sizable, continuing low income housing program comparable to Europe's. We have been long on talk and short on action; we have Phases I and II of Operation Breakthrough, but we do not yet have Phase III—actual creation of an aggregated mass market upon which possible investors in systems building can rely.

The Kaiser Commission concluded that 7.8 million households in the United States are unable to afford decent housing, yet during the entire history of Federal activity in this field only 800,000 low income units have been built. Thus, in a third of a century, Federal efforts have met only one-tenth of the nation's subsidized housing needs.

Comparing European and American low income housing, we lack two things: aggregation of market and continuity of program.

2. Second, there is no official government sanction in the United States establishing a preference for systems or for concrete. Nor should we expect such a policy preference in the near future. Most of our houses are still built of wood, and in a traditional manner.

3. Third, we are experiencing a developing shortage of skilled labor in the United States that could ultimately ease the way for industrialized building. However, it was the conclusion of the Battelle study on "The State of the Art of Prefabrication in the Construction Industry," that the overall supply of labor would be sufficient to meet the demands of the construction industry through 1975.

4. Fourth, there has been union opposition to technological change in building con-

[1] Statement by John C. Mundt, Senior Vice President—Marketing and Public Affairs Lone Star Cement Corporation. Fall Meeting, Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, Jackson, Mississippi, October 23, 1969.

struction, such as the now famous Philadelphia Door case, a legal hurdle not present in Europe. The Tower amendment seeks to reduce constraints on technological innovation.

We must conclude, however, that the subject of construction manpower is more complicated in the United States than in Europe, where the future of industrialized housing is concerned.

5. Finally, our building code situation is much more troublesome than Europe's.

Because of substantial variation in code standards for specific components between marketing areas, the potential of the sectionalized home in the USA is more seriously hampered than in Europe. Many products and materials are accepted in some large cities and rejected in others. Precast and prestressed concrete components have been fighting a long uphill battle to gain universal acceptance—only recently was the way cleared for the use of prestressed units in New York City.

This is a countrywide problem. I am told by architects in Massachusetts that California systems are not applicable under the Boston Code. In Florida, 67 counties each have separate county codes—a contractor who qualifies in Dade County cannot build in Broward County without requalifying with a tough exam, mostly directed to exceptions to the Uniform Building Code.

In the Cleveland area, over 50 separate building codes are in effect. Take one small example of the result. The State of Ohio has a live load requirement for roofs of 25 pounds, Cleveland requires 30 pounds, and Akron 40 pounds. A systems builder could not, without waste, produce the same standardized component on a repetitive basis in this market.

The basic point of difference here between Europe and the United States is that central planning and control is characteristic of Europe with its national building codes. In our country land development has been regulated primarily by local government. As a result, builders, lenders and real estate brokers must cope with a new set of rules each time they enter a new market.

To recapitulate then, the marketer of systems building in the United States does not have the same factors helping him as his counterpart in Europe: there is neither aggregation of low income markets nor continuity of demand; manpower considerations complicate the picture; there are serious code problems.

It would be unrealistic to contend therefore that because systems building has succeeded in Europe it will *ipso facto* succeed in the United States. If it does succeed in the United States, it will have to be our own system, adapted to our own requirements, taking into account our own problems. We have not yet done this. The best evidence of this is that the largest current residential project in the United States, the $300 million Co-Op City project, is being erected with reinforced, poured-in-place concrete though there was certainly sufficient volume and continuity to support use of industrialized components.

FUTURE OF SYSTEMS IN THE USA

Does all this mean, in considering the future of concrete, that to be realistic we should discard any notion of a systems building future?

Before going further into this in detail, three quick comments are in order: (1) lest you consider me gloomy about American housing progressiveness, let me state that our 66 million housing units are still a marvel of production, leading the world in comfort and amenities—we provide 1.48 rooms per inhabitant (highest space per capita in the world); (2) none of the obstacles to industrialization we have mentioned (labor, codes, tradition, inadequate concentrated volume) are technical in nature; and (3) industrialization would increase concrete consumption. There is twice as much concrete in a European industrialized apartment of 1,000 sq. ft. using concrete panels as interior and exterior walls. If 20 cubic yards of concrete are used per living unit in conventional construction, 40 yards are used in European industrialized public housing. Applying the same increment to the 600,000 low income housing units needed each year in the United States would mean another 12,000,000 cubic yards of concrete annually in this one market alone. So we have a volume stake in systems building.

Now what of the future?

You are all probably aware that the Battelle and Kaiser reports were both essentially cautious about the future of prefabrication. The Kaiser report concluded that many technological breakthroughs failed to succeed, not because of artificial constraints on their use, but rather because they simply turned out to be more expensive than existing techniques. The Battelle study concluded that initial building cost reduction, derived from prefabrication, has not generally met expectations. If apartments can be built for $13 per square foot by conventional construction, industrialized components will not be used unless they are cheaper and equally attractive, marketing-wise. The Kaiser report found that manufacturers of prefabricated houses have been successful "primarily where they have not had to compete with modern line assembly operations on the sites themselves."

The latter point is important—for we have more systems building in America than we think. Technology in construction has not exactly been stagnant. Industries ancillary to construction have spent sizable sums on R&D. As a result, electrical services installed in a home are much more sophisticated today, as are heating, air-conditioning and appliances. In our industry, the advent of ready mix trucks, tower cranes and concrete pumps has revolutionized the placing of concrete. All sorts of pneumatic equipment permit greater productivity by construction crews. Contractors use PERT and CPM scheduling. Architects specify more and more prefabricated assemblies, knowing of the shortage of skilled labor. These changes have come in small increments, without the fanfare of dramatic discoveries—yet it is against this ever more effective construction process that full-fledged systems building must compete.

After all of the obstacles to systems building are listed in detail, it is still not possible to discard industrialized building on the basis of its present record in the United States for the simple reason that it has never been tried on a really large scale. A. Allan Bates, Director, Office of Standards Policy, Department of Commerce, flatly asserts, after studying Soviet methods, that, if an aggregated market develops (on the order of 5000 family units per year per factory), American industry could produce low cost housing of the required quality for $5 to $6 per square foot ("Low-Cost Housing," *Civil Engineering*, September 1969, pp. 44–48). Mr. Bates calculated this saving on the structure alone. Nor is Mr. Bates alone in these assertions. Throughout much of Europe, construction savings of 10–20 percent are not uncommon for industrialized building, plus all of the ancillary savings that flow from speedier construction.

The ancillary savings are very important. It should be made clear that "systems building" includes far more than the structure itself. In its broadest sense, it embraces every step from start (land acquisition, land development, and basic design) to the finished structure (its management, maintenance and rehabilitation). Systems building is essentially rationalized building and is as much a function of software as hardware.

The rising cost of construction will greatly assist the advent of systems. In 1967, according to Department of Commerce figures, the average annual earnings for craftsmen and operatives in the construction industry were $7,161 compared with $6,374 for craftsmen and operatives in manufacturing. The old pattern of high hourly rates and low annual incomes in the construction industry has been broken. We now have a pattern of high hourly rates and high annual incomes. If the Kaiser Commission was correct that in construction and homebuilding together, 1.8 men are required to fill every average yearly job, a higher ratio than in any other industry, costs are further inflated and we have a most expensive situation. If this sort of trend continues in the construction industry, labor will simply price itself out and industrialization in.

The possibility of substantial savings on a mass market basis and the opportunity of applying systems know-how to building is enticing new companies into the construction industry. These large firms will be able to bring immense pressure on code or labor restrictions—whenever these restrictions complicate the introduction of aerospace and other assembly-line techniques. Given a big enough market and given continuity, there is no question that American ingenuity will rise to the occasion and effect real cost reduction, without sacrificing aesthetic value. Systems building, at less cost per square foot, cannot be stopped—owners will demand structures at the lowest prices—within quality regulations—and will insist that savings be passed on to them.

Accepting the fact that systems building is inevitable, when and how rapidly will this come about?

Gentlemen, I have a definite personal opinion about that. I believe systems building is already with us to a substantial extent, that we will see more and more of what is better described as rationalized construction, and that further change will come with real acceleration. But the point I want to make today is really another point. Our whole social and economic structure calls for highly individualistic, democratic-if-you-please, procedures. As these procedures have been applied in the construction industry, we have accumulated a mass of hobbling restraints on innovation. My plea to you today is this: as we preserve our free institutions and commercial structures, let us make certain that they are flexible enough and open enough to embrace change. If systems building, on the merits, is a superior approach to the construction process, artificial constraints in the way should be removed. We have already noted that the obstacles to systems building are non-technical in nature. They are concerned with such matters as the fragmented structure of the industry, tradition, and labor and code complications.

There is one other related obstacle. The floundering of our low income housing program, the ups and downs in the highway and public works program, and the fluctuations in construction employment, result from an unclear definition of national priorities. As things stand now, housing is considered postponable, our program for eliminating urban blight is inconstant, and the effort to solve traffic jams in our cities is one of starts and stops, in more ways than one!

The reason for inconstancy of policy has been the failure to reach national conclusions about this matter of national priorities. It is high time that we as a nation came to real grips with this—fortunately there are signs that a comprehensive national debate to determine national priorities has begun. As citizens, and as representatives of our companies, we have a clear obligation to participate in this debate and make our voices heard.

In order to guarantee needed flexibility in the construction industry so that it will be sufficiently open to innovation and change,

there are a number of things that you and I can do. To demonstrate the practical application of these suggestions, let us relate them to housing, though they apply to other segments of construction as well:

1. As regards codes, our architectural-engineering-contracting fraternities and local officials should pay immediate, concerted attention to the elimination of building code anachronisms and inconsistencies. This is tiresome and unremunerated work, but it is best carried out in each community and state. Otherwise, there will be increasing pressure for federal takeover of the field. Local officials and businessmen should not abdicate their responsibility so that Federal pre-emption becomes necessary. It is obvious to all that the existing crazy-quilt of state and local building codes and mechanical codes burden and restrain interstate commerce in construction, frustrate housing programs for low and moderate income families, and discourage innovative building systems. As a minimum, we should seriously consider a uniform building code for each state.

2. We must convince labor that, if the volume of housing is sufficient and there is continuity, their problems will be less severe.

The answer to labor opposition to systems and innovation is the development of a satisfactory, national homebuilding program of sufficient size and continuity, for with such a program would come a dependable, yearly rate of earnings for construction labor. For example, if the United States jumped from an annual rate of 1.5 million new housing starts to 2.6 million, it would be clear that proposed technological advances would not be designed to supplant workmen but to supplement their job opportunities, through greater volume and continuity of compensation.

3. We must undertake a revision of our financial, tax and mortgage regulations. This is a vast and complicated area—a challenge to our tax experts, the American bar, the financial world, the tax committees of the Congress and the Treasury. Notice again that technology is not the problem.

Time does not permit a complete statement here of all that is involved, but permit me to make these assertions:

(a) Our current real estate tax policies penalize rather than encourage an owner to improve his property. Fear of increased tax assessment deters rehabilitation. Tax structures should be devised that penalize the unproductive use of land and offer incentives to new housing and rehabilitation.

(b) Longer term mortgages would reduce the ever greater burden of interest and amortization payments that now deter so many families from building their own homes. Imagine what 50 year rather than 25 year mortgages would do to the ability to undertake mortgage payments for young families and others who shy away from ownership.

(c) The total amount of taxation on real property is too high. Property taxes may represent 25–30 percent of monthly shelter costs in moderately-priced single-family housing, and some 15 percent in elevator apartment units. The increasing presence of abandoned or vacant housing in slum areas is evidence that something is wrong. If Federal income sharing with the states becomes a fact, we should consider making Federal grants conditioned on partial abatement of the property tax.

(d) One more little item to start you thinking: in Moscow and Leningrad, under subsidized housing, a person spends only 3–4 percent of his monthly income for rent. In London the renter in public housing pays about ⅙ of his earnings, plus gas and electric. In the United States we talk about 20–25 percent—this is far too much for a low income family.

4. We must assure HUD sufficient R&D funds, in proportion to the importance of housing to the economy, and see to it that these funds are expended by private companies, individuals or universities as the most efficient way of conducting research. In 1966, HUD's R&D expenditures were only 1 percent of those of the Department of Agriculture. Such a disproportionate allocation of funds is indefensible in view of the nation's housing needs. We must also make clear that private R&D expenditures in the construction industry are not practicable under conditions of inconstant, widely fluctuating demand. There are any number of promising areas for R&D work related to construction: the elimination of seasonal construction patterns, the development of new low cost means for transporting complete housing units or components, increasing densities without losing amenities, the trade off relationship between initial costs and subsequent operating and maintenance costs, the costing of design alternatives, the cost effectiveness of alternative assembly techniques. Americans spent over $25 billion a year on residential construction and upwards of $100 billion to buy, rent, operate and maintain their places of residence. An R&D effort commensurate with this volume should be able to save millions in national resources each year.

5. We must see to it that any efforts to "fine-tune" the economy with fiscal and monetary policies fall equally on all segments of the economy and not disproportionately on housing, highways and construction, as has been the case in the past. This can be accomplished by industry advocacy at the right policy-making levels. If the nation is to solve its social and economic problems, it can no longer turn its construction programs on and off every few months.

6. We should affirm that private enterprise should be the principal vehicle for meeting housing needs. We have seen a slow evolution of thinking in America toward this position. Public housing was born with the passage of the United States Housing Act of 1937. The theory of this early legislation was that the development, ownership, and management of housing projects are the responsibility of local government bodies. Down through the years the responsibility has evolved with loans to nonprofit sponsors of rental projects for the elderly and handicapped (1959), loans to limited dividend entities and cooperatives (1961) and finally to private developers. The basic policy trends since 1937 have been in the direction of increased reliance on private development, private financing, private ownership, and private management of subsidized housing. We should continue to encourage this concept and secure the passage of legislation to make it feasible.

7. Finally, we should not be hesitant to push concrete forward as the most logical building material of the 70's. The most strategic use of our national resources gives concrete a decided edge.

America imports 40 percent of the iron ore it processes, with a consequent drain on our balance of payments. We also import large amounts of petroleum. Use of steel shapes in construction and asphalt in roads therefore suffers a fundamental disability on this score.

The use of timber for housing may become increasingly a luxury. There is rising public pressure for preservation of large timber tracts. Moreover, consumption of timber will exceed production within a few years and timber—as well as iron ore and petroleum—will of necessity have to be considered for more strategic uses.

Concrete, on the other hand, can be manufactured from relatively unlimited national resources—sand, aggregates and calcareous materials from which portland cement is made.

We can make a strong case that in our housing and highway programs during the next few decades our most unlimited building resource should be used first—concrete. The Russians appear to have made precisely this determination, as have other European countries.

I think the conclusion we must reach in these seven matters is that taxes, subsidies, financing, enforcement of building codes, income maintenance and manpower training are all related. A decent house in itself is not enough. All of these subjects must comprise a consistent package and should be carefully re-evaluated so that they produce positive results. They must all be considered simultaneously.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, gentlemen, our industry should plunge actively at every level into the developing debate over national priorities. We must make certain that our economic system is capable of solving our problems—that our system is relevant to its age.

I am confident our system is sufficiently resilient, productive and strong to meet the challenge. Let me remind you that our principal competitor, the Soviet Union, is successfully housing its citizens, and today may actually be presenting more convincing housing solutions to the developing world than we are. Putting men on the moon could turn out to be a pyrrhic victory if we cannot put adequate roofs over the heads of our citizens.

A final comment about the decade ahead. It is my impression that we are living in an almost revolutionary moment in which the conscience of the country is increasingly aroused. We were proud to put the first man on the moon, proud of our progress in technology; but we are disturbed about lack of progress in solving our human problems, in improving our environment, or in even providing adequate housing. At times a democracy is most cumbersome! If we were in the Soviet Union, we could concoct a Soviet plan and simply decree—

That government apartments will be built for all, of modular concrete components.

That large central heating plants will be used for surrounding blocks of apartments as this is the most efficient manner of heat generation.

That highways will not go through cities but around them in order to reduce noise and pollution (Moscow has a 127 mile circumferential highway), and

That there shall be greenery and sanitary protection zones between industrial and residential areas.

Sounds easy. And it saves time. But we do not operate in this manner in a democratic society for we value our individual freedom too highly.

We must therefore remind ourselves that the freedoms of democracy carry an extra burden for citizens: the burden of spending time to make our system work. The freedom and burden of democracy for the citizen are worth preserving but the test of our system is that it be sufficiently flexible and practicable to solve problems—to solve them more quickly, and completely, and to solve them better—than would be the case under rival systems of government.

As de Tocqueville long ago stated: "The success of a democracy may be measured by the quality of functions performed by private citizens."

I hope these last remarks will not sound too general—they need not be, for no industry or product are more relevant to solving such problems as the housing or traffic problems than the concrete industry. We must accept the responsibility as citizens and as representatives of our companies, to participate in the making of the necessary public and private decisions. This is a time-consuming challenge. But if we accept the challenge and succeed, our lives will be more productive and rewarding than would be the case under a more dictatorial governmental

system, where citizen opinion and integrity are unimportant.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, these days when we are hit from all sides with a great deal of verbage on everything that is supposedly wrong with our Nation, it is refreshing to find people who still believe we have a great and wonderful country and are willing to put their feelings into words for others to read. I commend the following editorial on "What's Right With America" to my colleagues. It appeared in the Winston County Journal in Louisville, Miss., which is edited by Joe T. Cook:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By Joe T. Cook)

Some of us are getting a little tired of all the emphasis on what's wrong with America.

Certainly, this country is not without fault; and it is right and proper that a great and free people should know its faults and seek to mend them.

But, if the left-wing broadcasters and the liberal press had their way, Americans would conclude that all public officials are corrupt; that war is being prolonged by greedy, profiteering industrialists; that rioting and anarchy are in control; that we are waging an aggressive war against a poor, defenseless people; that dope addiction and alcoholism are universal; that racial discrimination and poverty have made of us a third-rate nation, utterly incapable of world leadership; in short, that the skids are under America the Beautiful, the home of the brave and the free—and that it won't be long now.

Well, we have news for the liberals, the socialists, the communists, the draft-card burners, the drop-outs, the hippies, and the traitorous "peace" propagandists.

Instead of everything's being wrong with America there are countless thousands of things that are right with America. Here are just a few of them:

This country still offers the greatest opportunity to be found in the world for those who want to work, discipline themselves, and sacrifice in order to enjoy the fruits of a free enterprise system.

America offers the greatest freedom in the world. No other major country provides complete freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, and of religion.

This country has unquestionably the highest standard of living in the world. We have twice the standard enjoyed in Western Europe, and four to five times the standard found in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. No other country remotely compares with the United States in this respect.

While we have a vocal minority who irresponsibly demonstrate on every supposed wrong in this country, we still have the great silent majority, who still work, educate their children, pay taxes, worship God and patriotically support their country.

We can be thankful for the courage, dignity, and dedicated leadership of President Nixon and his family. We can be thankful that he cannot be stampeded by any street demonstration that happens along.

The Nixon Supreme Court appointments are most encouraging and a part of what's right with our country.

We should bow our heads in thanksgiving for the country's faithful spiritual and moral leadership—men like Evangelist Billy Graham and countless other pastors and religious leaders of lesser prominence but equal dedication—who have the courage to point the way of righteousness.

We can be genuinely grateful for commentators and newsmen—men like Paul Harvey—who are unafraid to call it like it is.

We can point with genuine pride and hope to the countless young people of our nation whose ideals are high, whose morals are sound, whose faith is strong, and who love their country.

While we have, and will continue to have in the future, some bleeding-heart, liberal, demagogic Senators and Congressmen, we still have a hard core of realistic, patriotic, courageous statesmen that try to keep the ship of state on an even keel even though the waters around them are turbulent and threatening.

We can be thankful that our government is conscientiously trying to strangle the inflow of dope from Mexico and other countries.

It's right and good for the General Federation of Women's Clubs to conduct at nationwide campaign against pornography, vile movies, and smut literature, a great part of which is known to be inspired by communist organizations determined to undermine the moral fibre of our nation. (As a matter of fact, world communism has boasted that it will so undermine the morals of this country that our youth will not have the desire or be strong enough physically to defend our country.)

It's right with America when people, like those recently in Memphis, will dare to become involved to protect the lives of innocent people from deranged criminals and murderers.

Yes, there is a lot that is right with America.

As we approach our Bi-Centennial in 1976, let's set as our goal an emphasis on patriotism and loyalty to country, rededication to God and the great principles of the Bible, reaffirmation of our faith in the free enterprise system that has made our country the greatest in the world, to helping the minority groups of our country to help themselves with dignity and self-respect, to repudiation of the subversive forces that would infiltrate and weaken our nation, and to re-assuming for America the role of the great symbol of freedom and opportunity and leadership and helpfulness for all the peoples of the world.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, "Caveat emptor"—"Let the buyer beware"—is a slogan coined by the ancient Romans. A few unscrupulous merchants and producers still follow that motto. Fortunately the President's message to Congress on consumer affairs offers a new approach. "Let there be justice for the buyer."

The President presents in that message what he calls "a buyer's bill of rights," and I believe that his comments in this regard are well worth noting.

He speaks first of the consumer's right to choose—but, the President notes, the consumer also has a right to accurate information about the products from which he is making his selection. He has a right to be sure that his health and safety has been fully taken into account. And he has a right to have his complaints heard and fairly considered. All of these rights, as the President understands, are less easily achieved today than they were for past generations, for both our marketplace and our products are far more complex than they were, far less easily understood by the average purchaser. When someone takes advantage of him, there is often little that he can do about it.

The President's message tells us what Government and the people, working together, can do about it. He presents us with a program which is fair to both the consumers and the suppliers of goods and services; one which will move against deceptive or unfair businessmen without harassing or restricting the honest legitimate majority. This is an important fact, I believe, for, in the end, the best interests of buyers and sellers must inevitably coincide. I hope the President's proposals will receive prompt and favorable attention from this body.

WEIZMANN INSTITUTE CELEBRATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY—A TRADITION OF EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, the famed Weizmann Institute of Science, in Rehovoth, Israel, began a weeklong celebration of its 25th anniversary.

From humble beginnings, this research complex has grown into a world renowned center for advanced study in the fields of molecular biology, theoretical geophysics, nuclear physics, and the study of arid zones.

The 1,600 employees, including 250 full-time scientists, have earned an international reputation.

I take great pride in the fact that my fellow Cincinnatian and personal friend, Dr. Albert Sabin has been named the new president of the institute. We wish him well in his new responsibilities and are confident that he will carry the institute on to even greater achievements.

On October 20, President Nixon conveyed his congratulations to the institute on its 25th anniversary. I am happy to include the President's remarks, and join him in extending hearty best wishes from the American people:

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON TO INTERNATIONAL TRIBUTE DINNER, OCTOBER 21, 1969, HONORING THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND ITS PRESIDENT, MEYER W. WEISGAL

OCTOBER 20, 1969.

Mr. DEWEY D. STONE,
Chairman, American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science, New York, N.Y.

As the Weizmann Institute of Science reaches the quarter century mark in its inspiring history of service to humanity, I am happy to extend the warm congratulations of the American people to its members.

From a meager beginning just twenty-five years ago, the Institute has become a widely recognized center of excellence in the fields of research and graduate training in the nat-

ural sciences. It has indeed been a worthy memorial to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, scientist, statesman and proud patriot of the State of Israel.

Reflecting his magnanimous human spirit, through its remarkable contributions to man's capacity to improve his well being, it has inspired, as he did, hope in a better future and courage to persevere through present adversity. Lifting men's hearts and minds to an unrelenting pursuit of knowledge and of wisdom, you have speeded the pace of progress and constructive achievement.

Its members have surely earned the admiration and gratitude of all peoples.

RICHARD M. NIXON.

AMERICAN ONCOLOGIC HOSPITAL MARKS 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of Philadelphia's significant institutions, the American Oncologic Hospital, will observe its 65th anniversary on November 7, 1969, and I should like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues something about the history and services of this highly specialized treatment and research center.

Founded in 1904, the American Oncologic Hospital is one of nine in the country, and the only one in Pennsylvania, devoted exclusively to the treatment of cancer patients. Its impressive record includes the pioneer use of radium in cancer treatment and the installation of a supervolt X-ray therapy unit, the first in the Philadelphia area.

Located since 1911 at 33d Street and Powelton Avenue, American Oncologic affiliated with Jeanes Hospital and the Institute for Cancer Research in May 1966, to form the Fox Chase Center for Cancer and Medical Sciences. The hospital moved to Central and Shelmire Avenues in December 1967.

Situated on land made available by the trustees of Jeanes Hospital, with an enclosed bridge connecting American Oncologic and Jeanes, the center is aimed at waging a coordinated attack on the dread disease of cancer, by placing, at one location, the very best in resources, talent, and patient care.

The Fox Chase complex, a multimillion-dollar project, stands out in the medical field as a major center—combining laboratories for both basic and clinical research and hospital facilities for the diagnosis, study, and treatment of cancer patients.

During the fiscal year ended in June 1969, the American Oncologic Hospital admitted for treatment 1,239 patients, representing a 42 percent increase over the previous year. Patients received 17,546 days of nursing care, with the average length of patient stay 14.2 days.

Outpatient services during the year saw a similar substantial increase. To be exact, a 14-percent increase was registered by 9,045 outpatient visits, and cobalt treatments, which came to 7,558, increased by 11 percent over the previous year.

Recognizing the psychological as well as physical needs of cancer patients, American Oncologic, designed by the Philadelphia architectural firm of Vincent G. Kling and Associates, boasts a noninstitutional environment that unites the patient with nature, to offer a feeling of harmony, hope, and reassurance.

The building lends itself to an excellent arrangement of interior spaces, with bedrooms divided into small groups of no more than six two-patient rooms on each segment of the three nursing floors. Every unit is served by lounges, solariums and terraces, and bedrooms look out upon landscaped grounds and wooded areas.

Outpatient facilities, prepared to accommodate 30,000 annual outpatient visits yearly, include three waiting rooms surrounding the 2½-story lobby. Focal points of the lobby are clusters of sculptured metal leaves—a gift from the Women's Board—suspended from the ceiling, and tubs of live plants suggesting an arboretum.

A nonprofit, nonsectarian institution, American Oncologic does not receive support from any governmental or private agency. The treatment and research institution thus needs the support of many individuals and corporations to maintain its modern conveniences and standard of excellence.

It is indeed a model of what can be done in the never-ending fight against disease.

SPACE EXPLORATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas at Austin produces a weekly radio program entitled "Insight: Campus '69" in which discussions are held as to the ways the modern university can assist in meeting the needs of our society. Recently, with Mr. Joe Gwathmey as moderator; Dr. Norman Hackerman, president; Dr. Harlan Smith, chairman of the astronomy department; and Dr. Irwin C. Lieb, chairman of the philosophy department, all of the University of Texas at Austin, discussed space exploration and man's future in this new environment. The panel discussion went far beyond the useful analysis of the immediate future and examined the more profound aspects of space and its utilization for science and man's intellectual and material growth. Because of the significance of this discussion I commend it to my collegues and to the general public. The panel discussion follows:

INSIGHT: CAMPUS '69

"Insight: Campus '69"—A series of discussions about the ways in which the university of today is helping meet the needs of our society. Your host is Joe Gwathmey.

JOE GWATHMEY. As most of the world watched and cheered the successful moon landing of Apollo 11, this most ambitious of ventures inspired sharp and lively debate among scientists, philosophers, even poets and others who ponder men's actions and motives. Many think it hopeful that the moon trip may release another burst of human energy, that the world can be transformed as it was during the Renaissance. The moon landing itself, described by one noted astronomer as being the most dramatic single achievement of this time, only opens the door to countless other technological discoveries and advances. We will be talking about space exploration on this program in the series "Insight". Among our guests, as usual, is Dr. Norman Hackerman, President of The University of Texas at Austin. Dr. Hackerman, is The University of Texas at Austin directly involved in the study of the universe and space exploration?

Dr. HACKERMAN. Yes, the University is deeply involved. As many of the people who are listening know, we have completed the installation of one of the world's major telescopes at the McDonald Observatory on Mount Locke in West Texas, at which place the University also has several other major facilities. This potentially has greatly expanded our contribution to the study of space and the universe. The research programs now being conducted at the Department of Astronomy at the University involve the training of a significant share of the nation's Ph.D. graduates in astronomy. The use of the facilities at McDonald for experiments connected with the recent moon landing are also of importance. This is the retro reflector that some of the listeners may have heard about—which experiment will go on for a very long time indeed. So we are very definitely involved in astronomical research and space exploration. In fact, I believe one of the members of the next crew—the Apollo 12 crew—is a U.T.-ex, Commander Bean. U.T. Austin is also a member, among a number of consortia, of the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc. This group operates the Kitt Peak National Observatory just west of Tucson, and also has established an observatory at Cerro Tololo in Chile, where our scientists, as well as others in this country and other countries, will be able to study the skies of the Southern Hemisphere, perhaps as well as we now can study the Northern Hemisphere's skies.

JOE GWATHMEY. Thank you, Dr. Hackerman. Also among our guests on this program is Dr. Harlan Smith, who is chairman of the Astronomy Department at The University of Texas at Austin. Dr. Smith is also director of the University's McDonald Observatory in West Texas. He came to the University from Yale University in 1963. Dr. Smith is author of an award-winning series of film strips on astronomy entitled "The Story of the Universe", and he has served as co-editor for the Astronomical Journal. He holds degrees from Harvard University. Dr. Smith, Dr. Hackerman referred to the involvement of McDonald Observatory in the recent Apollo 11 landing. Could you tell our audience something about the University's experiments?

Dr. SMITH. Yes, they all go farther back I think than even Dr. Hackerman knows. We were involved in the moon program before it was born. The 82-inch telescope at the observatory, which has been there about thirty years, was used for some years to take high resolution photographs of the moon back in the day when that was the only way to do it—before any orbiters had reached the moon. The major maps of the moon were made, to a considerable extent, from these photographs, and these were used for the original Apollo site reconnaissance studies. So, in this sense, our involvement began twenty or thirty years ago. But, of course, the current involvement is the exciting one. The retro-reflector that was put on the moon by the first astronauts is an incredibly small thing—just a little over a foot square. And it's a quarter of a million miles away. Somehow we have to throw a beam of light at it from the earth—throw a kiss to the moon, as one

reporter put it—and pick up a reflection from that little object a quarter of a million miles away. This needs a giant telescope, a very powerful reflector, and not just a large telescope, but one that can be aimed with precision that is at or almost beyond the state of the art. Our new 107-inch apparently is capable of this. We've had some successes and expect to continue with this program now for as much as ten or twenty years.

JOE GWATHMEY. Also among our panel is Dr. Irwin C. Lieb, Chairman of the Philosophy Department of The University of Texas at Austin. Dr. Lieb is interested in both the humanities and the sciences, and especially space exploration and travel. He was formerly a member of the Yale University faculty and also taught at Connecticut College. Dr. Lieb holds degrees from Princeton, Cornell, and Yale. Dr. Lieb, what is the role of the philosopher in aiding man to understand the significance of space exploration and its impact on the individual and on society?

Dr. LIEB. Well, I'm not sure, Mr. Gwathmey, that philosophers have an especial competence or an especial role in enabling man to understand the significance of space exploration. This has been done, so far as it has been done, very successfully by imaginative writers. And they show us how to extend and elaborate and qualify our present understanding. We move toward understanding space from understanding other things. And these men have been very successful in showing us how we might do this. It is my impression, however, that philosophers might be of help in having us *establish* the significance of space travel It isn't as though that significance is *there,* to be discovered. That significance has to be established. And I think philosophers might be of help in enabling us to see how fully significant space travel might be. For it to be significant, or fully significant, it has to be connected with a variety of other activities. Philosophers, as "gadflies" might be attentive to these other activities and ask, what bearing does this have on art? What bearing does it have on religion? What bearing does it have on practical affairs? It might even be interesting to ask, what bearing does it have on theological matters? So philosophers might help us here in that they have, or try to have, a wide view of things. As they try to locate, and encourage others to locate, space travel in this wide view, they will perhaps help us to see what significance it can have.

Dr. HACKERMAN. How about making a guess at some of the significance? Philosophers usually take a little longer, I guess, but we have just a short time here. (Laughter)

Dr. SMITH. Let me interject here: Astronomers have a term, the "cosmic year," when we feel things aren't going fast enough. The cosmic year is how long it takes the earth and the sun to make one revolution about the galaxy. It's about two hundred million ordinary years. The saying is that in a cosmic year, perhaps we'll solve these problems. (laughter). I'm sorry, Chet, go ahead.

Dr. LIEB. Well, what problems are we talking about?

Dr. HACKERMAN. Let me interject one. It's practical, it's also philosophical, and certainly critical: Most of the people on the earth who read and speak are now vastly concerned about the pollution about them. Let's take the point of view that this is the first step to getting off the planet. In the past, ancestors have used up the woods, the brooks—whatever they needed—wherever they happened to be, and then moved to some other portion of the continent and then off the continent to another one. That's what exploration has done. And I suggest to you that is what this is—that this is our first step toward getting off the planet.

Dr. LIEB. We may very well have to go off the planet, and sooner perhaps than some of us would like to go at the rate the atmosphere is being polluted. But this, I think then, is one of the *practical* measures of space travel. It is now possible, for the first time—not merely imaginatively, but in fact—for men to leave the earth. Now, if this is possible, we can raise questions about where it would be desirable to go, and who will go, and under what conditions they will go. And it might well be the case that we will have as a body of humans and animals to move, and maybe make another Noah's Ark and go to another world.

Dr. SMITH. But it should be clearly understood that this is a safety valve for a vanishingly small minority of the human race. It may be immensely important in the sense that it takes, in principle, only a couple of people to perpetuate the race. But the wishful thinking one sometimes reads about the entire human race either escaping its overpopulation problems by moving out into the solar system, or escaping the muddying of our own nest that we're doing on earth by moving to other planets—this is purely wishful thinking. The energies to escape from the earth are now fantastic even than one can appreciate, unless, like Dr. Hackerman, you watched one little rocket take off. Now, the places to go in the solar system are so limited that the most we can hope to do, over several thousand years of very advanced technology, is to generate viable colonies of some size. But not even one-millionth of the human race can hope to go and live at such places.

Dr. HACKERMAN. But Professor Smith, we're talking about a cosmic year. (Laughter.)

Dr. SMITH. Yes, now in a cosmic year, this is a very interesting question. I'd like to digress for a moment and tell about three hierarchies of things that astronomers are very seriously discussing. These are what they call "levels of civilization". The "Class I" civilization is one like the Earth, like mankind on the Earth, which has succeeded in making a very habitable place in principle (if we'd only use our brains with the world we have around us). The "Class II" civilization is one that realizes that its central sun is putting out on the order of trillions of times as much energy as is being utilized by that civilization, and if all of this energy could be trapped, that civilization would be able to rise to at least technological, and perhaps other, levels proportionately higher. So Class II civilizations are those that have built "trapping shells" around their suns to utilize all of the unbelievable amount of energy which has come from these objects. Now these are sometimes called Dyson civilizations because one of the world's leading physicists first seriously proposed this, and even indicated ways in which we might look for such civilizations in the universe.

Now a young Russian has gone beyond him and suggested "Class III" civilizations that utilize all the energies of entire galaxies. He even speculated that the quasars might be related to these. Now, this is getting a little bit wild, but in the long, long run, and I wanted to say this because I think it is very important, in the long, long run I think the human race has a marvelous future. Human beings, with all their cussedness, are still some of the nicest things we know, at least when they're children (and some retain it a little bit longer). (Laughter). I think the human race is worth preserving. That's an article of faith. Maybe a philosopher could prove it, I don't know how. But assuming the human race is worth preserving, then we need to preserve not only our nest here but also to plant a few colonies of ourselves around in the solar system so that even if some character a few years from now does press the lethal trigger for the earth, the race has a chance to go on.

Dr. HACKERMAN. Well, we are talking primarily about the scientific and the practical rather than about the theological, but I'm afraid they're verging. (I don't mean I'm afraid, but I *think* they're verging). One thinks of this particular feat that we've been discussing as *the* most dramatic of the century, or certainly of the half-century, but I'm not so certain that the beginning of the unraveling of the genetic code isn't much more important. And they tie together in the sense that by control of the genetic code the population can indeed be moved, in principle, but in part, to some other location. We are oxygen-breathing animals that require certain kinds of ingestations that keep our systems functioning. There is nothing critical about that. One can conceive of other types of metabolism, if you could tinker with the code problem in a sufficient detail.

Dr. SMITH. Indeed some other planets probably have done this. The glimmers of life signs that are appearing on Mars, if they do turn out indeed to be life forms, almost certainly will turn out to be primitive ones that were presumably on the earth three or four billion years ago that were essentially ammonia-methane utilizers and/or producers rather than oxygen-carbon dioxide type life forms. And Jupiter likewise would be a planet of this character of life. So we may find that the solar system is already ahead of us along the lines that have just been suggested, but, whether or not it is, there is no question that in principle genetic engineering can show the way to these things someday. Are we wise enough yet to handle that?

Dr. HACKERMAN. Now we are verging on theology. That's what nature may be doing to us—may be playing games with us.

Dr. LIEB. When you say are we wise enough to handle that, how could anybody answer this question when we don't know? There may be vast adaptations we can make. Certainly here and now on the earth there have to be adaptations to the achievements that have already been made. We can hardly accommodate these achievements. Anyone who watched the televised reports of the landing on the moon will, I think, be appalled by the fact that we did not know how to speak of this. You may have remembered that everybody talked about things being fantastic, unbelievable. We were using the language of superlatives, and the man who uses the language of superlatives is at the end of his resources in language. He doesn't know what to say. So he makes exclamations. Until we can begin to speak comparatively, and say, well this is *like* something else, or this is more or less than something else, we haven't brought in this achievement. We haven't brought it into connection with the things that we do *know* how to talk about and do *know* how to understand. So if we think about our understanding, that has to be spread. It has to be spread *through* our language, and I think it's very plain that even the most professional of commentators were overwhelmed by this occurrence and did not know what to say about it.

Dr. HACKERMAN. I agree, there were a plethora of superlatives all right. But let me tell you some of those superlatives had a purpose: that is, funding for the space program for the seventies. (laughter).

Dr. LIEB. Well, it's all right to have mixed motives, I guess. A number of people have been very struck by the mixture of motives that has gone into the space program—whether it's competitiveness with the Russians, whether it's human exploration, and excellent and admissible because of this fine aspiration, whether it's to support American industry, and what not. I think it may very well come out of a variety of motives. And so far as I can see, there's not a thing wrong with its having a variety of motives impelling it forward. Do you think it will be continued now?

Dr. HACKERMAN. I think so. It will have some difficulties, because it takes a large amount of our treasure and it competes with other vital, important things for that treasure, but I suspect it is now so deeply ingrained that it will. Let's go back to Columbus's time. I suspect the same motives existed in a smaller culture as exist here. The forces, I don't doubt, were just as strong and the tensions were just as great. The time scale was different, of course. But the fact is that, once the discovery was made, even though it became no less dangerous and no less likely of loss (not of people but of treasure—because I suspect that people were less important), the fact is that there was a steady stream which widened and widened until it engulfed this continent. So I really don't see why we would turn our backs on this now that the accomplishment has been made. I'm somewhat biased—I think Harlan is somewhat biased in this regard, both of us being in the natural sciences—but I really, as objectively as possible, can't see any reason for the space exploration stopping.

Dr. LIEB. Well, I'm not opposed to its continuing at all. As a matter of fact, for personal reasons as well as more general ones, I am in favor of its being continued. One of the striking things about it is that it is now a *fact* that men have gone to the moon, and we don't have to sustain this thought any more merely by imagination. Imagination, precious as it is, is fragile. It doesn't fill in the details. But living men have in fact put their feet upon the moon. And now, out of this, a vast number of consequences which we could never have imagined, and possibilities which we could not have defined, are before us. In one or another way, for dozens and dozens of motives, men will have to go further here.

Dr. SMITH. It is sometimes asked if we can afford the space program. I think one might very reasonably ask can we afford *not* to have it in terms of quite a variety of arguments. The very existence of the very large aerospace technology, if that were to be cancelled, would create a depression of major magnitude in large areas of the country. We talk about bringing up the economic levels, and these are certainly extremely necessary in areas that now lack that, but I am not sure that the cure for that is to destroy the thriving technology in areas where it exists. Or alternatively, if that technology were to remain employed, it probably would remain employed in still overproducing yet more missiles to add to the overproduction we now have and would render the world perhaps a trifle more unstable rather than helping, as the space program does, to offer a reasonably peaceful outlet to some of these extremely advanced, and in some ways potentially dangerous, technologies. These are just two of the many arguments that I think can be raised along these lines. The space program looks expensive, and is, to be sure, expensive, because it's a focused effort of the American people into one budget—one rather clearly defined goal. If one tried to count up the amount of money that the American people put into miscellaneous types of disorganized activity, which is also a part of living and fun, but which does not conduce to any great social or scientific or human race type of progress, I think the total bill for that would be of the order of several hundred billion dollars a year. The miscellaneous trips, the extra bottle of beer from the ice box, all the things that one could very readily do without—having them adds a little color and flavor to life—having them to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars is an invisible use of our time and energy. Focusing approximately two- or three-tenths of one per cent of the total national effort of the country into reaching the solar system, to me, is an eminently worthwhile thing, and—can we afford *not* to do it?

Dr. HACKERMAN. How about the question that has been raised time and time again in the scientific community that there is insufficient science in the space exploration program, that science takes a far back seat, that the scientists of the country have little or nothing to say about the functions of the program, and that if there is any outcome of value to the world it will be scientific and thereby lead to the improvement of the world's population by translation from science to application. Do you have any opinion on whether science indeed is deeply enough involved to make this program worthwhile in their eyes?

Dr. SMITH. That's a good question, and there is a lot of discussion about it. A few scientists say that science is pushed too much into the back seat in the space program. It should be remembered that NASA has worked very hard to interest scientists from all possible relevant areas. In the first few years I must admit that many scientists did not come forward as rapidly as they should, so that in part the lack of top scientific direction, if it exists, is the fault of the scientists themselves. However, almost everyone who is active in science today, and wants to be involved in the space program, has found a welcome in it in some place or other. Our advice is sought—it isn't always listened to. I think, though, that if I were responsible for the safety of the first few sets of astronauts to the moon, I, too, would give primary consideration to the engineering factors and would necessarily put science in the back seat in the beginning. I think that there is no question that in the long run the advances in science will be one of, if not the technical result, from the space program. But in addition to that, there will be economic factors, especially communications, earth resources type studies, which themselves will pay the bill of the space program. But science certainly has a place, a large place, a growing place, and in my estimation it is not too far from where it belongs at this stage of the program.

Dr. HACKERMAN. Dr. Lieb, how do you feel about the question of the use of our treasure in this area when there are, of course, the problems of the cities and the problems of the poor and the problems of the disabled and the unabled? Do you have any particular point of view that might either justify the program or justify its cessation?

Dr. LIEB. Well, I have a point of view, but I don't have the facts which would justify recommendation. Harlan has said extremely well something about the use of our resources in the space program and otherwise. A nation does have limited resources, but a nation also tries to do many sorts of things. We talk as if our resources were strained, and perhaps they are. But on the other hand, this is a luxurious nation that can afford to do things that others cannot do. And furthermore, it can afford to do them—or some of them—on behalf of the others. It seems to me a facetious argument to say offhand we can afford to do this and we can't afford to do that. I think Harlan's point about what is it that we can afford not to do, or that we *can't* afford not to do is an important one, so that there have to be tables of priorities, and the developments of technology, the exploration of space, has *some* place on that table. If we were confronted with national catastrophes which we could not bear, or which we could not bear at the pace at which they are being borne now, then we might have to forego some portion or part of the space program. But then we would have to insert it at some muture time. We might say, well, for five years or ten years, this will proceed at a more modest pace, and then we'll go ahead. But I don't think there is any question that we *have* to be moving here, and, of course, we have to be moving in our cities, too.

Dr. HACKERMAN. It seems to me that there are two points of great consequence in this program. One of them is apparently the deep-felt need by people to look outside their own boundaries. I don't know how you evaluate that quantitatively. But it's always been true. It's true of children. They wander off, you know. They just go out and see what they can find. And it's true of us. The second is, and a very important one, that within this program, as Harlan's already said, it's entirely possible that we will be able to exploit our resources much more effectively than we can do now. Resource exploration via satellite is indeed a finite possibility and a very important one. Along with that is the fact that the investigations which inevitably must go on in the attempt to improve the vehicles, and their propulsion units and communications units—inevitably in there is a place where we will learn more about power and its production. Now aside from all the necessities of life, to improve its quality and so on, there are two things that are vital—one is energy and one is food. And the population on this earth will last only so long as it knows how to produce the energy and produce the food. It will inevitably decline when its needs exceed that which is available. And this program has inherently in it, it seems to me, the seed of that very important far-ranging, far-looking aspect of finding both resource and of producing forms of energy which are of paramount importance to us. I don't see how anybody can look at a program like this and look only at its facade, only at its press relations, only at the flag-waving aspects which are important, perhaps, to the nation, without recognizing that herein lies a real hope for the future.

Dr. SMITH. I'd like to add one more to that list of priorities. Food and energy are the basic constraints, but what we do with them depends on our attitudes, and I think the overall, integrated attitude of the human race, or of the segments that are active, like our country, in setting the pace now, are the third equally important variable. I think until the space program reached its present height, very few people had even reached what astronomers sometimes call the Copernican Revolution—the realization that the earth is a planet with limited, finite resources, and we're stuck with it. We've got to do the best we can here with these resources—that we're passengers on a spaceship in a very real sense. If the space program had done nothing else but to bring this home to most of the people of the country, so that we begin to think constructively about these problems and know them as real problems, then that alone I think has also been worth the bill.

JOE GWATHMEY. And gentlemen, on that point, I'm sorry, but we must conclude. Our guests have been Dr. Harlan Smith, Chairman of the Astronomy Department of The University of Texas at Austin, Dr. Irwin Lieb, Chairman of the Philosophy Department at U.T. Austin, and the President of The University of Texas at Austin, Dr. Norman Hackerman.

KENSINGTON CIVIC ORGANIZATION SUPPORTS MORATORIUM

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the broadly based public support for the Vietnam peace moratorum held throughout the country last month was a remarkable

demonstration of citizen sentiment on this crucial issue. It is clear that the American people want an end to the war in Vietnam without further loss of life.

I was impressed by the active support given the moratorium by a myraid of citizens groups in my congressional district. One such resolution of support came from the civic organization of the village of Kensington, where I reside. Because this resolution is typical of those adopted throughout the country and because such expressions of public sentiment require a positive response from the Congress, I include my remarks and that resolution in the RECORD at this point:

THE KENSINGTON CIVIC ORGANIZATION,
Great Neck, L.I., N.Y., October 16, 1969.

Hon. LESTER L. WOLFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: The following resolution was adopted by the Kensington Civic Organization of the Village of Kensington in the County of Nassau in the State of New York:

"RESOLUTION

"This general membership meeting of the Kensington Civic Organization, held on October 16, 1969, hereby voices its positive appreciation for, and its endorsement of the Vietnam war moratorium held on October 15, 1969."

Very truly yours,
MARTIN L. ELLIS, *President.*

THE SMOG DANGER GROWS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, smog is no joke.

It was not so long ago that Los Angeles' air pollution problems made that city the laughingstock for a myriad of punsters and comedians.

Now, there is not a major city in America not plagued with dirty, unhealthy air.

The magnitude of the smog problem was recently put together in a series of articles by Scripps-Howard Staff Writer William Steif. Steif's stories are not very funny; indeed, they portend tragedy if we just maintain the type controls we have in operation today. I believe these four articles are must reading, and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 23, 1969]

SMOG THREATENS "IRREVERSIBLE" CATASTROPHE

(By William Steif)

Earlier this summer long fingers of yellow-gray smog reached 110 miles from Los Angeles to Palm Springs. The desert resort, which formerly baked under a brilliant blue sky, no longer could boast it was "a refuge from smog" for tearful Angelenos.

The episode was not unusual. Pollutants are despoiling more and more of America's air. Smog is only one manifestation of a situation alarming many scientists and even politicians. The Administration's recent public prod to manufacturers to produce a low-pollution auto engine is one result of that alarm.

The air is ambient—that is, all-encompassing. It envelops the earth to an altitude of 19 or 20 miles. Four-fifths of it is in the first seven miles above earth.

Until recently man considered the air infinite. But it actually is finite, amounting to between five and six quadrillion tons. That is a lot of air—a quadrillion is one followed by 15 zeroes—and would seem sufficient for all time.

But many scientists worry that we are expelling so many poisons into the air so quickly that we are in danger of changing the air's nature.

A recent government report says:

"New danger signals indicate that the planetary atmospheric system is undergoing changes that may have irreversible catastrophic effects . . .

"The world's population is expected to double by the year 2000, with an associated increase in industrial growth and commercial activities, and a commensurate increase in the potential for pollutants to be emitted into the atmosphere.

"Meteorologists and other scientists in the U.S. and elsewhere have alarming evidence that pollution particles which are conspicuous over urban communities and industrial complexes, are spreading across nations and continents and slowly encircling the world . . .

"It has been suggested by eminent scientists that the net increase of pollutants such as particulate matter and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution has affected the weather. Since 1860, fossil fuel burning has increased the atmospheric content of carbon dioxide about 14 per cent.

DESPOILED ZINC

"Some scientists fear that increases in carbon dioxide will prevent the earth's heat from escaping into space, melt the polar ice caps, raise oceans as much as 400 feet, and drown many cities. Other scientists predict a cooler earth as the sunlight is blocked by increases in particulates. The results could be more rain and hail and even a possible decrease in the food supply . . ."

Almost four-fifths of the air is nitrogen, almost one-fifth oxygen, the rest other gases and water vapor.

About 30 per cent of the oxygen inhaled by a person goes to the brain. Without oxygen, the brain is damaged fatally within six minutes.

Human lungs are highly specialized tissue which evolved over millions of years. They are, in effect, a one-way screen, holding back the blood on one side but permitting the oxygen in the air to make its way to the blood, where millions of red cells transport the oxygen to other body tissues and there exchange the fresh oxygen for carbon dioxide. This waste is conveyed back to the lungs and exhaled.

Scientists warn that it is impossible for the lungs to adjust fast enough to cope with the present rate of increased air pollution.

EARLY POLLUTION

One of the first laws against air pollution was recorded in England about 1300, when King Edward I issued an edict against burning coal. The penalty was death, and at least one man was executed for breaking the law.

But economics soon triumphed over the desire for pure air.

In the 17th Century John Evelyn, an English writer, was so concerned about smoke pollution he compared "dark London" to "Troy sacked by the Greeks." One remedy he proposed was planting sweet-smelling trees. It took the Industrial Revolution and Henry Ford's mass production of the internal combustion auto engine, to take air pollution out of the crank-case category.

Most major air pollution episodes have occurred in this century. Here are some of the best-known:

In December, 1930, in Belgium's heavily industrial Meuse Valley, 62 persons died during a three-day fog, 10 times the normal number.

A month later 592 persons—again, a large jump in the death rate—died in the Manchester area of England.

In 1948, at Donora, Pa., almost half the town's 14,000 inhabitants became ill during a four-day fog, and 22 died.

A great fog which blanketed London in 1952 left 4,000 more dead than would have been expected normally, and in 1956 some 1,000 "extra" deaths were blamed on an extended fog.

In New York City, in November, 1953, there were 220 excess deaths during an air pollution episode; early in 1963 such an episode brought 300 to 350 excess deaths; in Thanksgiving week of 1966 extra deaths were figured at 168.

DEATH RATE ZOOMS

Today the death rate from bronchitis and emphysema in the U.S. is nine times as high as it was 20 years ago. At the present rate of increase, 180,000 Americans will die of these lung ailments in 1983.

Emphysema—a progressive breakdown of the lungs' air sacs brought on by chronic infection or irritation which diminishes the lungs' ability to transfer oxygen to the blood and carbon dioxide from it—is not the only disease brought on by dirty air. It has been indicted in lung cancer, bronchial asthma, and other respiratory diseases, and even the common cold. Air pollution also is listed as a probable cause of lead poisoning, with its concomitant effect of mental retardation in children, and more exotic diseases like beryllosis (beryllium poisoning) and fluorosis (fluoride poisoning).

A study on northern Staten Island, N.Y., showed the male death rate from respiratory cancer was 55 per 1,000, compared to 45 only a few miles to the south; the death rate among women from the same disease was twice that of the women a few miles to the south. The reason? The evidence pointed to the smoke blown by the prevailing westerly wind from the Bayonne-Elizabeth industrial complex in New Jersey.

CLEO'S NEEDLE

Air pollutants affect more than our health.

Since coming to America in 1881, Cleopatra's Needle—an ancient Egyptian obelisk—has been more deeply eroded in New York City's air than it was during the 3,000 years it spent in Egypt.

A Public Health Service study showed that air pollution reduces the amount of sunlight reaching earth; Chicago, for example, loses 40 percent of its light overall, New York City 25 per cent.

Steel corrodes 200 to 400 per cent faster in urban, industrial areas than in rural areas. Pollutants abrade, tarnish, soil, erode, crack, weaken and discolor all kinds of materials.

Cattle in West Central Florida have been stunted by the polluted fallout from 15 phosphate plants operating in two counties where 600,000 people live.

The best estimates are that agricultural losses caused by air pollution now exceed $500 million a year.

In California alone, air pollution losses exceed $100 million yearly. The once-thriving spinach industry in the Los Angeles basin has been driven out; citrus has been hit, as has grape production in the state's Central Valley. In New Jersey damage has been reported in every county and has affected 36 commercial crops.

Probably the most dramatic destruction of vegetation by air pollution occurred in 1910–11 at an Anaconda, Mont., copper smelter. Every major tree species in an eight-mile radius was found dead or dying.

Extensive crop damage also has been reported in Colorado, Oregon, Florida, Mon-

tana, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Tennessee, Idaho, Utah and Washington.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 24, 1969]

AMERICA DESPOILED: AIR POLLUTION ILLS OBVIOUS

(By William Steif)

Dr. John T. Middleton, commissioner of the National Air Pollution Control Administration (NAPCA), compares air pollution episodes to the exposed tips of icebergs.

The toll in terms of increased death rates and widespread illness often is obvious.

"But the rest of the damage air pollution causes to health is more difficult to see altho it is greater in extent," Dr. Middleton says. "It is daily, insidious, usually unnoticed in its early stages, and it affects millions."

What are the leading pollutants and their sources?

NAPCA experts have just compiled their estimates of nationwide emissions of the main pollutants during 1966. There has been no substantive change since then, except probably for the worse.

The experts found the U.S. expelled 188.8 million tons of pollutants into the air in 1966. Of this total, half came from mobile sources, mainly autos. The other half came from stationary sources, such as power plants, steel mills, burning coal, refuse banks, cement plants, oil refineries, etc.

FIVE WORST POLLUTANTS

The five major pollutants are almost wholly the products of combustion. They are:

Carbon monoxide, a tasteless, odorless, colorless, lethal gas which has an affinity for hemoglobin 200 times greater than oxygen does. Some 94 million tons are expelled each year into the air in the U.S., three quarters by motor vehicles.

Particulates, tiny bits of matter which can become deadly irritants in combination with other pollutants. Some 21.5 million tons are thrown into America's air yearly, mostly by smoke stacks.

Sulfur oxides, which in combination with the moist membranes of the lungs (for example) form sulfuric acid, a poison. Some 30.4 million tons are thrown into the air yearly, two thirds from burning coal.

Hydrocarbons, organic compounds which are a vital ingredient in the photochemical process producing smog and its deadly by-products such as ozone. Some 25.9 million tons are expelled into the air annually, more than half from vehicles.

Nitrogen oxides, another vital smog ingredient. Seventeen million tons go into the air each year, just under half from transportation sources.

SIX YEARS—BILLION TONS

In the six years the U.S. alone can throw more than a billion tons of pollutants into the ambient air, but other advanced cultures are keeping up with us. Thousands of Japanese walk around Tokyo today wearing gauze face masks in the hope of protecting themselves from pollutants (little chance, the experts say). Vehicular and industrial emissions are as bad in European centers as in the U.S.

Los Angeles—"Where the birds cough"—is noted for auto-produced smog.

Not so well known is the effect of air pollution from stationary sources, as described in a new report prepared by the NAPCA. For instance:

In Jackson County, Ala., a coal-fired TVA power plant deposited 43 tons of particulates per square mile monthly at a spot 3.6 miles from the plant last year. The normal fallout figure is five tons per square mile monthly. Measurements at a spot almost 10 miles from the plant showed fallout was 18 tons a month—still 3.5 times the norm.

An aluminum smelter 15 miles from Portland, Ore., emitted 3.5 tons of fluorides daily up to 1946. In the next six years controls cut the emissions to 1.5 tons, and after 1952 to 700 pounds daily. Nearby dairy farmers sued and won on grounds milk production was cut; medical testimony also attributed liver and kidney damage of a farmer and his wife to fluorides.

A beryllium extraction and manufacturing plant six miles from Reading, Pa., has had pollution-control equipment since the 1930's (beryllium is a toxic metal used in oxide form as a copper alloy). But the company has faced 35 lawsuits since 1948, charging it with causing berylliosis (beryllium poisoning). The state health department began a study of the problem at Reading in 1957 and found 48 cases of the disease by 1959, 68 by 1960, 75 by 1963.

LITTLE BOY VICTIM

Among the cases were a three-year-old boy and his 15-year-old sister exposed to their father's contaminated clothes for the two years the father worked in the plant. Twenty-one people who suffered berylliosis had no direct contact with the plant or its employes, but lived 0.6 to 5.3 miles from the plant. By 1960, 31 of the Reading berylliosis victims had died.

Sulfur oxides and particulates are the prime pollutants emitted by stationary sources.

A typical plant, such as one operated by Armco Steel Corp., 25 miles north of Cincinnati, expels 30,000 tons of sulfur dioxide and 25,000 tons of particulates each year. The U.S. Steel Corp. plant at Lorain, Ohio, 20 miles west of Cleveland, throws off 77,000 tons of sulfur dioxide and 44,000 tons of particulates, for example.

But it is unfair to single out the steel industry.

Five miles from Tacoma, Wash., a copper smelter emits 196,000 tons of sulfur dioxide into the air yearly, more than two-thirds of all the sulfur dioxide spewed into the 15,000-square-mile Puget Sound area. A mile from the smelter concentrations of the gas often are greater than one part per million; by contrast, the peak of the Thanksgiving, 1966, disaster in New York City found a sulfur dioxide of only 0.97 parts per million.

The coal-fired power plants of Louisville Gas & Electric Co. emit two-thirds of the sulfur dioxide and two-thirds of the particulates in that area.

Union Carbide's ferroalloy plant five miles from Marietta, Ohio, emits two-thirds of the area's sulfur dioxide, nearly a quarter of its particulates.

LONG GRIM LIST

The list compiled by the federal government is long.

Sulfur dioxide and particulates of solids—silica, lead sulfate, ammonium sulfate, aluminum, iron, copper—have been indicted as health hazards.

Congress more than two years ago asked HEW to report "on the need for the effect of national emission standards for stationary sources."

The report has been completed. It recommends a federal crackdown on the public and private electric utilities which produce nearly half the sulfur dioxide emitted into the air and a sixth of the particulates.

Initial investment for air pollution controls, the report estimates, would be $340 million to $510 million, with annual cost thereafter $120 million to $180 million.

Without controls, the report says, power plants in rural areas "will bring the problems of the urban area with them." Selective controls, and constant review, are asked for other industries, too.

But the federal government fights the battle against air pollution from stationary sources like a fighter with an arm tied behind his back.

After pioneering efforts in Pittsburgh, St. Louis and California, Congress in 1962 held hearings on air pollution and in 1963 passed a weak bill. It strengthened the law in 1965 to provide future national standards for autos, but didn't get around to dealing with stationary sources until 1967. Then it left control of stationary air pollution to the states.

So far, the NAPCA has designated 16 areas of the nation in which air quality controls must be applied. Eventually, an additional 41 regions will be designated. In these regions, states are supposed to set air quality standards to conform with federal criteria. But this is still in the future; no one knows how tough the states will be, or how effective the industry lobbies may be.

Meantime, our air gets dirtier.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 8, 1969]

U.S. CARS SPEW OUT 94M TONS OF POISON A YEAR

(By William Steif)

The evening of Aug. 28 was hot and muggy in Boston this year, but 30,000 people, mostly young, thronged through the Commons, the big center city park, to hear a rock group named the Chambers Brothers.

Many parked their cars underneath the Commons in a three-tier, 1,500-car municipal garage. In all, 1,300 cars were in the garage when the show was over. A large part of the audience descended into the garage and, almost simultaneously, drivers started their motors and headed for the garage's three toll-booth exits.

Within minutes, youngsters started staggering out of the garage on foot, choking and gasping. Others passed out in their cars.

Police carried at least 20 unconscious persons out of the garage, ambulances took 25 persons to hospitals, while oxygen was administered to still others in the Commons. A city official ordered the garage cleared. Everyone soon recovered and went home. And 24 hours later the incident was nearly forgotten.

Yet the near-disaster beneath the Boston Commons is a sign of how badly we have despoiled America. Those who passed out were suffering from carbon monoxide poisoning. They had inhaled part of the 94 million tons of a tasteless, odorless, colorless, lethal gas which U.S. exhaust pipes pour into the atmosphere yearly.

MOTORS EMIT HALF

Half the nation's air pollution comes from stationary sources, such as power plants, steel mills, cement factories, coal cleaning plants and forest fires.

The other half of the 188.8 million tons of pollutants the United States pours into the air yearly comes from transportation sources, mostly 100 million cars and 15 million trucks and buses.

Vehicles produce three quarters of the carbon monoxide the United States emits so casually into the air; they produce more than half the 25.9 million tons of hydrocarbons emitted yearly; they produce just under half the 17 million tons of nitrogen oxides produced each year.

The vehicular emissions, all the result of incomplete combustion, poison the air envelope in which we live. They are concentrated in the great metropolitan areas, where most of the autos are.

Some 25 million tons of carbon monoxide go into the air of the 10 most populous areas annually from vehicles. In Los Angeles, vehicular carbon monoxide represents 98 per cent of all that gas emitted; in Philadelphia vehicles produce 69 per cent of the carbon monoxide. In New York City vehicles emit 5.3 million tons of carbon monoxide annually, in Kansas City, they emit 600,000 tons yearly, and similar amounts in Milwaukee and Denver.

Almost everyone knows enough not to shut the garage doors while his car's motor is running.

The reason is that carbon monoxide, a deadly poison has a vastly greater affinity for the blood's hemoglobin than oxygen. Inhaled, it is a quick killer.

Air containing 80 parts per million of carbon monoxide, breathed over an eight-hour period, renders about a sixth of the body's hemoglobin—which transports oxygen to the tissues and takes away wastes—temporarily useless. This is equivalent to the loss of a pint of blood.

Peak-hour traffic jams in Los Angeles and Detroit have built carbon monoxide concentrations to as high as 150 and 120 parts per million. Some measurements have been even higher, up to 400 parts per million.

An official of the National Air Pollution Control Administration says:

"A friend of mine, 62 years old, was caught in the Holland Tunnel, under the Hudson River, for three hours one day. When he got to his home in New Jersey he told his wife he felt terrible. That night he died of a heart attack.

"You can't prove any connection, but . . ."

LOS ANGELES ACTS

Hydrocarbons are organic compounds that seem fairly harmless in themselves. So are nitrogen oxides (altho nitrogen dioxide concentrations have caused severe lung diseases).

But put hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides together, bake them in the sun, and a photochemical reaction takes place which produces smog and a whole new family of pollutants called oxidants.

Los Angeles County, plagued by smog since World War II, pioneered its control. In the early 1950s it got tough with its citizens, forcing the shutdown of 1.5 million backyard incinerators. When that didn't work the county got tough with industry, prosecuting oil refineries, steel mills and 40,000 other offenders.

But the smog just got worse.

Finally, the internal combustion engine was pinpointed as the culprit and in 1960 the California legislature passed a law requiring auto makers to reduce contaminants, starting with 1966 models. In 1965 the U.S. Congress followed suit, providing controls on 1968 models and more stringent ones on 1970 and 1971 models.

Yet today 80 per cent of all of metropolitan Los Angeles' air pollution is produced by autos. The same is true of the District, where the number of cars per square mile is one and a half times as great as in Los Angeles.

How much smog is there in the cities?

The chemical products of smog initially cause upper respiratory irritation when they concentrate at 0.05 parts per million. But state lawmakers are chary of setting "smog alert" levels too low. It doesn't look good to hometown boosters.

So California's "adverse level," by law, is 0.15 parts of oxidant per million. Colorado is stricter; its "adverse level" is 0.10 parts per million.

Under the California standard, Denver in 1965 had only 14 days of bad smog, Cincinnati only five days, Washington only four, and even Los Angeles only 83.

But under the Colorado standard, Denver had 51 days of bad smog in 1965, Cincinnati 36, Washington 40, and Los Angeles 149.

And under the initial-irritation standard, Denver had 226 days of bad smog, Cincinnati 137, Washington 163, Los Angeles 221.

That's one way of measuring smog's effect in the cities.

Another way is to measure total emissions of the smog-producing ingredients. Thus, in 1967, hydrocarbon emissions in Los Angeles amounted to 1.3 million tons and nitrogen oxide emissions 471,000 tons; in Pittsburgh, in the same year, 95,000 tons of hydrocarbons and 267,000 tons of nitrogen oxides were emitted; in Dallas-Fort Worth, 143,000 tons of hydrocarbons, 95,000 tons of nitrogen oxides; in Birmingham, 64,000 tons of hydrocarbons, 25,000 tons of nitrogen oxides.

GIRLS' STOCKINGS BURN

Several years ago a Detroit auto maker sent a car across the country with a new gas turbine engine. At Los Angeles the company's press agents turned out a group of long-stemmed girls wearing mesh stockings to pose with the car.

The girls stood to the rear of the car when the ignition was switched on—and the next thing they knew, their stockings were on fire. The car's exhaust was more than the press agents had bargained for.

None of the girls was burned badly, but the story illustrates the type of problems the nation faces in groping for replacements for the internal combustion engine.

This engine, invented by Nikolaus Otto, a German engineer, more than a century ago, is reliable, compact and cheap. Probably no other mechanism has contributed more to Western civilization. Indeed, its problem is its popularity.

The internal combustion engine burns its fuel within itself. Its carburetor mixes air with gas. The mixture is forced into combustion chambers (cylinders), where sparks explode the mixture, driving pistons. The power produced is transmitted to the wheels.

The trouble with the system, from the standpoint of smog-fighters, is that the fuel is never completely burned. When the engine is operated at maximum efficiency, cruising at high speed, it produces large amounts of nitrogen oxides. When it is decelerating it produces its maximum emissions of hydrocarbons.

Either way, it produces the raw materials of smog.

Since the early part of this century people have been experimenting with external combustion engines. This amounts to lighting a fire under a boiler which makes "steam" (power) that is transmitted to move a piston.

The external combustion engine has the singular advantage over the internal combustion engine of burning its fuel much more completely. It requires lower-grade fuel, doesn't need a transmission (since its power can be transmitted directly to the wheels), and doesn't need as much horsepower as the internal combustion engine (since it doesn't lose as much power).

But there are problems, reminiscent of the Los Angeles girls' mesh stockings.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 9, 1969]

INTERNAL COMBUSTION DIRTIES THE AIR: CARS POWERED BY STEAM AND ELECTRICITY TESTED IN POLLUTION FIGHT

(By William Steif)

William Lear, an energetic retired millionaire, has set up shop at a former Air Force base near Reno, Nev., to build an experimental car driven by a pollution-free steam engine.

Mr. Lear, 66, has a string of industrial successes, climaxed by development of the Lear Jet executive plane. When he sold out in 1968, he retired to Los Angeles, where the smog, which is despoiling so many American cities, bothered him. He also was having transmission problems with his Cadillac and when he found repairs would cost $280, he decided to build a car with an external combustion engine since it would require no transmission. Mr. Lear's engine—powered by a steam turbine—is one of several being developed as a possible pollution-free replacement for the internal combusion engine.

General Motors has worked on such a project with an Oakland, Calif., firm. The National Air Pollution Control Administration has a Waltham, Mass. firm doing similar work for it. The California Highway Patrol is starting to test an Oldsmobile with a steam engine, and Dallas and San Francisco are scheduled to test steam buses under a Department of Transportation (DOT) contract.

SOME DRAWBACKS

But the external combustion engine has drawbacks, too.

For instance, an auto's internal combustion engine runs continually when the driver is on the road, even if the car is stopped for a red light. The way to stop the external combustion engine is to turn off the power; that also turns off radio, air-conditioner and, if it's night, the lights. So an auxiliary power source has to be designed and put in the car.

More expensive metals and higher-precision tooling are needed. Some think the external combustion engine is overweight and accelerates too slowly.

Nevertheless, the National Air Pollution Control Administration is spending $1 million this year in research and development on steam engines, while DOT is spending $1.2 million on electric engine research.

The big problem with an electric engine, beyond development of a practical battery, is that if the nation's autos went electric, demand for power to charge the batteries would skyrocket. That, in turn, would mean building many more coal and oil-fired utility plants, which are among our worst industrial polluters.

Both General Motors and Ford have experimented with, and are continuing to work with electric engines, the only assured way of getting zero emissions of pollutants from an auto. General Dynamics, Gulton Industries, and Allis-Chalmers have worked on the problems involved, too, and Westinghouse Electric has even produced, commercially, a scaled-up golf cart using lead-acid batteries for suburban shopping retirement villages and other restricted uses.

But a federal report says, "there has not yet been developed a battery power source which could economically provide an auto with both the power needed to achieve reasonable speeds . . . and the energy needed to give the auto a reasonable range of operation between recharging."

Many believe the best bet still may be to reform the internal combustion engine. One way to do this is by direct injection of the fuel into each cylinder, metering the gas and cutting emissions. Four foreign car makers, Volkswagen, Mercedes-Benz, Porsche and Alfa-Romeo, already have begun to build their engines this way, and there are hints that American manufacturers are considering fuel injection.

TWO METHODS

So far, American auto makers have used two methods to reduce emissions:

By injecting air into the still-hot mixture going out the exhaust system, which creates more thorough combustion. This method requires an air pump, and is being used only in Cadillacs and manual-shift cars because it is more expensive.

By regulating the carburetor jet or nozzle that mixes gas with air more precisely, so that less fuel goes into the mixture. This is used in about 80 per cent of new American cars.

Although the auto makers talk about how expensive emission controls are, federal experts say the average cost per car is only $15 to $20.

The Justice Department and General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and American Motors agreed last month to settle an antitrust suit, filed 10 days before President Nixon took office, accusing the auto makers of conspiring to retard development and use of devices to control air pollution in cars.

Under the consent agreement, the auto makers—without admitting guilt—said they would not obstruct development of anti-smog devices and would make available,

without fees, licenses on anti-pollution inventions to any firms desiring them.

The Justice Department said the consent decree would stimulate immediate attacks, through competition, on air pollution.

But the Los Angeles County supervisors have asked Federal Judge Jesse W. Curtis to reject the consent decree. They want a full trial, arming potential litigants with data to sue the companies for damages. At least 24 congressmen feel the same way and have urged court delay on the consent decree. Rep. Bob Eckhardt (D-Texas), talks of a congressional inquiry into the settlement. And last month two Chicago aldermen filed a $3 billion suit against GM, Ford and Chrysler on the same conspiracy charge.

RACE WITH TIME

Federal standards for pollution emissions, to reach maximum stringency in 1971 models apply only to hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. No nitrogen oxide standards have ever been set, nor are there standards for emissions of lead.

Pre-1968 model cars now on the road emit 1,575 pounds of carbon monoxide from the exhaust. They also emit 215 pounds of hydrocarbons from the exhaust, 105 pounds from a tube running out of the crankcase, and 85 pounds by evaporation.

By 1980, federal experts say, the federal standards will reduce carbon monoxide levels in urban areas 45 per cent and cut hydrocarbon levels 33 per cent.

But, because more complete combustion produces more nitrogen oxide, the nitrogen oxide emission levels will be 70 per cent higher by 1980. Emissions of lead will be 100 per cent higher by then, because of an increased auto population—combustion doesn't destroy lead.

After 1980 emissions in all categories will rise because of the rising population and increasing number of autos.

"That gives us just about 10 years," one expert says.

SHARING THE BLAME

The outraged citizen tends to blame Detroit's auto makers for air pollution. But there are less obvious and equally large targets for indignation.

The oil industry (with a single exception) continues to put lead in gas to remove knocks and increase octane rating, altho this can also be done at the cost of a cent or two a gallon by more precise refining. As a result, autos dump 200,000 tons of fine lead particles into the air yearly, and the auto makers are prevented from using a muffler which would be very effective in producing almost-total combustion in lead-free fuel.

Nobel prize-winning geneticist Joshua Lederberg recently noted healthy people now have 100 to 300 parts per billion of lead in their blood, a "two- to five-fold increase" over the unpolluted environment. Clear-cut symptoms of lead poisoning appear at 800 to 1,000 parts of lead per billion, Mr. Lederberg said, adding that he felt the safety margin was getting slim.

Altho kerosene-burning jet planes account for only 2.1 per cent of the nation's carbon monoxide emissions and only 1.2 per cent of hydrocarbon emissions, they are big polluters in airfields' immediate areas. Federal experts say it would cost all U.S. airlines $12 million to put an improved kind of combuster on their planes the next time the engines must be overhauled. The airlines so far have rebuffed federal efforts to get them to cooperate.

Yet Dr. Lee A. Dubridge, the President's science adviser, concluded in a 55-page "backgrounder" prepared for the White House last month:

"Autos are the prime source of air pollution in the U.S. . . . and pose a hazard to health . . . (but) at present there is a lack of incentive, both in and out of the auto industry, for adequate further development of unconventional vehicles.

CRIME AND THE BLACK MAN

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Sterling Tucker, vice chairman of the District of Columbia City Council, recently addressed himself to the question of crime in this city, and the black leadership's response to it.

As a black leader, as a minister, and as a local government official, Mr. Tucker's words should carry special weight; they are worth serious consideration.

A summary of his speech, and a Washington Star editorial commenting on it, follow, so that my colleagues might share Mr. Tucker's perspective:

CRIME AND THE BLACK MAN

Crime in our country, crime in our city, increasing at a bewildering rate, casts a shadow over our lives. There is no one sitting here today who is untouched by it. You may not have been robbed yourself, held up in a dark alley, or your purse snatched as you walked down the street; you may not yourself have felt a gun in your back or found your home broken into, belongings stolen you'd saved to buy . . . but you are nonetheless a victim. A victim of the fear that is perhaps the highest cost of crime. The fear that catches you when you simply hear footsteps behind you on a dark street. Or when you see someone waiting up there ahead in an alley. Or when you keep wondering if you double-locked your door. Many are the irreparable injuries of crime, to the victim and to the offender himself. But one of the very worst is what it is doing to the way we live with each other.

And certainly we experience it to the full here in Washington, D.C. Our city ranks among the highest in crime in the nation. Not only is it higher than most cities but it is growing faster: our rate of crime increase is triple the national average. Statistics for D.C., for the first six months of this year showed robberies up 46%, rape up 50%, over last year.

We know the majority of the perpetrators come from the social levels of the poor and the disadvantaged. The rich white boys in the suburbs are stealing cars too, more and more in fact. But for an overall daily record of larceny, burglary and assault, they don't match our brothers in the ghetto.

Similarly, we know who the victims generally are. They are not the voices who cry the loudest in this country for law and order; they are not the ones buying the police dogs and the burglar alarms for their suburban fortresses. No, the victims are, far and away, the poor and the black. Statistics (from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement, 1967) reveal the shocking fact that if your income is under $3,000 your chances of being robbed are five times higher than if your income is over $10,000; your chances of being raped four times as high; of suffering burglary, almost double. So if you're poor *and* black in this beautiful land of ours, you begin to know what crime really means.

We also know what is at the root cause of the crime. The President's Commission's report included what was to me a very poignant statistic. A survey was conducted to determine how American citizens rated the seriousness of national problems. All income levels, both black and white, rated race relations at the top of the list, and all rated crime as the number two problem; except for one category, the category that was the poor black, they put as the number two problem, *above* crime, the problem of education. So those, by far the most victimized, knew what the seed cause is.

We know and we agree that in the last analysis at the root of the crime are the desperate conditions of the ghetto: the inadequate, overcrowded, ill-equipped schools; the unbearable, dilapidated overcrowded housing; the unemployment; the broken families; all the vicious forces that push the poor urban black outside of society. And it is no wonder then, say the sociologists and the reformers, no wonder then that he *acts* as if he were outside that society—acts out that alienation in crime.

But while I am disturbed about the rampant wave of crime, and while I am deeply disturbed about the conditions that perpetuated the ghetto and foster crime, there is something else here that also disturbs me.

What disturbs me is the failure of black leadership to speak out against crime itself. I do not hear their voices raised against the robbery and burglary and rape that is perpetrated on our people, against the gun-toting that turns our streets into alleys of fear. *The statistics rise, but they maintain an aloof silence. And it disturbs me because their silence most damages the black community itself.*

Now it is easy to understand *why* there has been this silence. We black leaders have been directing our attention to society's crimes against our people, and quite rightly so—to the tragic injustices of our system, to the attitudes and vicious practices of a racist white majority that have kept our people so long in poverty and despair. When it comes to crime, we have focused on police tactics: we have told the story of police brutality and bigotry and documented it, of how the ghetto-dweller feels the need not for protection *by* the police, but *from* the police. We have brought this out into the open and forced changes and the first steps toward community control.

This is good. What is *not* so good is that in fighting these practices our attention has been diverted from crime itself. Now my point is that the time has come when black leaders must speak out against crime as well as against the police. We must lay equal stress on the crimes of the people against society as on the crimes of society against the people. My point is that *not* to do so distorts the picture and lays an intolerable burden on the black man himself.

For this silence encourages certain assumptions that are degrading and dangerous. It tends to encourage the assumption, for example, that crime is only a function of poverty and injustice. It tends to justify the crime rate in terms of the cost of living. Bleeding hearts, both black and white, say in so many words, "You steal because you're poor. You're not responsible for your poverty, therefore you are not really responsible for your crime." Now this attitude is highly injurious, not only to society, but most particularly to the recipient of all this commiseration and sympathy, the black man himself. It is degrading, it is harmful, and it is false.

It is false because those who steal are not those who are trying to make ends meet. Those who steal are not those who are trying to meet the monthly rent bill and the gas bill and all the other bills, and trying to feed their children and clothe them. Those who are doing that, those who really *are* fighting the cost of living, are not the ones who steal. Take the working mother who is up before dawn to get out to the suburbs to do another woman's housework, and returns

after a hard day's work to cook for her own children and then stay up late into the night doing her own housework and washing and ironing their clothes. If you want to know about poverty, about the grueling daily effort to make ends meet, ask *her*—not the hold-up artist.

And it is degrading to her, to her efforts and to her courage and dignity, to condone the assumption that poverty justifies crime. As statistics show, she more likely than not is the victim.

Therefore, we must not let the injustices of society, as cruel as they are, muffle our alarm over crime. We must speak out. The burden of being black in this society is bad enough. The burden of being poor is bad enough. What we certainly do *not* need is the additional burden of being told, "You steal because you're poor." What we do *not* need is to condone and tacitly support the assumption that we are not morally responsible. We do not need this erosion of our dignity. We must not let society hang *this* on us as well.

Over a year ago, it appeared we were on our way to a new kind of people involvement in the war on crime in this city. This was to take place through the pilot project in the old 13th precinct, with the people taking the lead.

What, then, was a promising new prospect of a people-police partnership has turned into a nasty, highly explosive people-police confrontation.

One of the issues here is Dr. Robert Shellow, the Director of the project who has been highly controversial from the beginning and whose credits (with a large part of the black leadership of the area) were long ago exhausted.

A second tension point developed when this precinct was merged into the new Third Police District, thus nullifying much of the planning already underway and raising fresh suspicion as to the sincerity of the District Government in this experiment in crime fighting.

The "people" role here seems to have been diluted and the Government seems determined that its point of view shall prevail.

What was originally proposed for this project is too important for it to become lost and washed out in this controversy. We need the people's voice, their leadership and their support if crime is to be stamped out.

We particularly need the Black leadership, those who can move with ease and effectiveness in the ghettos, interpreting the program, pointing out the problems, developing activities of community education, and forging a new relationship between police and the people.

It seems to me, at this point, that this can only be achieved by replacing Dr. Shellow and by bringing *intact* into the Third District the pilot precinct leadership structure which had already been put together before the merger of the precincts.

I think the Government would serve itself and the people well by following this course of action.

This may be the door through which Black and white leadership might walk together in effecting a solid and well-coordinated partnership with the police in a winning battle against crime—a common enemy.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 28, 1969]

APPEAL TO BLACK LEADERS

Sterling Tucker, vice chairman of the City Council, was right the other day in criticizing "the failure of black leadership to speak out" against the criminal element in this city.

Tucker was right for one reason because of the fact, well known but not often mentioned, that the great majority of the victims of crime in this city are black. And as the volume of crime increases, which it will, more and more members of the black community will suffer the consequences.

It is hard to understand why black leaders have not been more active and vocal in the effort to cut down on crime, especially since the principal offenders are youthful blacks. Several starts have been made, but nothing much ever came of them. Perhaps this is due to a reluctance to be identified with the police, with the "power structure," or with the theme of "law and order"—associated in some minds with racism.

Whatever the reason or reasons, effective action by the black leadership is overdue. Crime in Washington is indeed reaching what the President has called "crisis proportions." It is estimated that by the end of this year there will have been 15,000 robberies and 20,000 burglaries in this city. The appalling rate of crime increase is shown by the fact that the number of robberies here in July, and again in August, was greater than the yearly totals for 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963.

It would be quite wrong to think that the black leadership alone holds the key to the solution of this problem. Nor can the police, even when at full strength, do the job alone. Both can help, especially if they will work together. But the best hope, perhaps the only real hope, lies with Congress. If the legislators will stop sucking their thumbs and pass the package of anti-crime bills which has been put before them, then this community may be on the way to seeing some daylight ahead.

APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS OFFER THEIR THANKS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our U.S. Apollo 11 astronauts, in their world travels from country to country on behalf of the U.S. space program, are living up to the high standards that we Americans and the world are proud they possess in full measure.

In a heartwarming gesture Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin Aldrin have sent cards of appreciation to those of us who have supported the Apollo moon landing program, and to the many people who have participated in these programs.

As I believe the U.S. Congress and the American people generally should know of this fine response by our U.S. Apollo 11 astronauts, as well as officials, scientists, workers, and taxpayers, I am including this pleasant greeting and appreciation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We are grateful and proud to have participated in the achievement of our national goal of a successful lunar landing . . . and return. We believe that as the exploration of our universe expands, so will the benefits of all mankind. We hope that the people of earth are now entering a new era of peace and common understanding.

To those of you who have offered encouragement and good wishes, whose dedicated support has made our programs possible, and whose prayers have sustained us, we extend our humble thanks.

NEIL A. ARMSTRONG,
Commander.
MICHAEL COLLINS,
Command Module Pilot.
EDWIN E. ALDRIN, JR.,
Lunar Module Pilot.

RACIAL QUOTA PLANNED FOR JOBS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Supreme Court last week, blandly ignoring the law enacted by the Congress and authorizing Federal judges to enforce as law the totally illegal decrees of HEW means more than the end of public education in the South.

For a number of weeks, the left wing has been carefully laying the groundwork for the Supreme Court to destroy craft labor unions. The sleeper is the so-called Philadelphia plan.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, rotten as it is, spells out plainly the prohibition against racial assignment of pupils to schools to overcome what is called racial imbalance. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ignored that provision of law, and the Supreme Court did likewise.

The same law also prohibits racial employment quotas of the type undertaken in Philadelphia. Agencies of the Federal Government, however, believing themselves to be above the law, have blandly ignored this law.

I include as part of my remarks section 703(j) of Public Law 88–352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, together with recent newspaper clippings indicating its patent and flagrant violation.

The material follows:

[P.L. 88–352, 78 Stat. 257]

SEC. 703. (j) Nothing contained in this title shall be interpreted to require any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee subject to this title to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the race, color, religion, sex, or national origin of such individual or group on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any race, color, religion, sex, or national origin employed by any employer, referred or classified for employment by any employment agency or labor organization, admitted to membership or classified by any labor organization, or admitted to, or employed in, any apprenticeship or other training program, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section, or other area.

[From the Sunday Star, Oct. 26, 1969]

HEARING SET TOMORROW ON PHILADELPHIA PLAN

Labor Secretary George P. Shultz and U.S. Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats are to testify this week at hearings before a Senate subcommittee on the Labor Department's plans to increase job opportunities for minority groups on federal construction projects.

The hearings start tomorrow before the Separation of Powers subcommittee. They will deal with the so-called "Philadelphia plan," under which federal contractors must agree to meet goals of minority group employment when they offer bids.

Staats ruled in August the plan was a racial quota system conflicting with the 1964 Civil Rights Act, but the Labor Department,

backed by a Justice Department opinion, maintains the plan is legal.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., D-N.C., the subcommittee chairman, said the hearings will look into whether the Labor Department, in pursuing its plan to increase minority job opportunities, has "usurped congressional authority and violated legislative intent."

"To me, the plan is a classic breach of separation of powers. It openly disregards the intent of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and twists the purpose of an executive order," Ervin said.

The Philadelphia plan, so-called because so far it applies only to that city, is an attempt to improve what Shultz has called a deplorably low rate of minority employment among higher-paid construction trades there.

Witnesses at the hearings are to include Jerris Leonard, assistant attorney general in charge of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division; Sens. Jacob K. Javits; R-N.Y., and Paul J. Fannin, R-Ariz., and spokesmen for labor and the construction industry.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 27, 1969]

JAVITS SEES NO VIOLATION IN "PHILADELPHIA PLAN"

(By Dana Bullen)

Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., today told a Senate subcommittee the controversial "Philadelphia plan" to promote minority hiring on federal construction projects does not violate a ban against racial quotas.

Speaking for himself and eight other senators Javits defended the Labor Department move as necessary to spur hiring of minorities.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., D-N.C., however, contended that plan requires racial quotas and charged it would be "a travesty" for the Labor Department to claim minority hiring percentages are not based on race.

ERVIN HITS PLAN

The plan—based on an executive order promulgated in 1965 by the Johnson administration and implemented several months ago by the Labor Department—requires federal contractors to agree to meet goals for minority group employment when they offer bids for projects.

Ervin, whose separation of powers subcommittee today opened hearings on the plan, said he felt it imposed an improper racial "quota" whether this is "disguised" as a "target," a "goal," a "range," or a "standard."

Although other Nixon administration officials disagree, Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats asserts the plan constitutes a racial quota system conflicting with provisions in the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

So far, the plan applies only to projects involving six Philadelphia construction trades, although the Labor Department expects to extend it to projects in other cities.

According to Ervin, the Labor Department's approach would require minority employment of between 19 and 26 percent by the affected trades by 1973. These figures start lower, however, with a range of 4 to 9 percent until Dec. 31, 1970.

GOOD FAITH

Javits contended the plan sets standards for judging minority hiring complaints but does not require a contractor to do more than take "good faith affirmative action" in this area.

He said this removes "a great deal of the uncertainty and confusion which have so far plagued minority-hiring efforts in federal programs. "In the past, many contractors have voiced legitimate complaints that they simply did not know what was expected of them," Javits said.

Other senators he listed as joining in his statement were Birch Bayh, D-Ind.; Edward W. Brooke, R-Mass.; Clifford P. Case, R-N.J.; Charles E. Goodell, R-N.Y.; Robert P. Griffin, R-Mich.; Fred R. Harris, D-Okla.; Philip A. Hart, D-Mich., and Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 28, 1969]

ERVIN ASSAILS PLAN ON MINORITY HIRING

(By William Chapman)

The Labor Department's controversial Philadelphia Plan to increase the hiring of minorities on federal contract jobs was denounced yesterday as a case of discrimination in reverse.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.) opened two days of subcommittee hearings on the plan by insisting it forces contractors to "discriminate against workers who are not members of any minority group."

Ervin's view was disputed by nine liberal senators, led by Sen. Jacob J. Javits (R-N.Y.), who contended the plan is both legal and fair.

The plan is a device by which the Labor Department hopes to increase the number of Negroes and other minority-group members working on jobs under federal contracts.

In applying it to Philadelphia, the Labor Department established "goals", or specific percentages, to be used in determining whether an employer was making an effort to increase the hiring of Negroes.

Ervin contended yesterday that that is the same as fixing a quota of blacks to be hired. That, he said, violated even the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which forbids discrimination in hiring under federal contract awards.

Javits, however, argued that the Labor Department's "goals" are merely criteria by which the employer's efforts can be graded.

The employer's contract is not cancelled nor is his company blacklisted if the goals are not met, Javits said.

Ervin was backed up by one Northern congressman, Rep. Roman Pucinski (D-Ill.), who complained, "The heavy hand of the federal government setting up quotas is not the answer."

Pucinski observed that 10 years ago the Labor Department was bent on removing racial designations and secret quota systems from its own hiring practices. "Now they are bringing them back in," he said.

Contractors cannot meet the percentage goals, he added, without specifically recruiting Negroes, a practice he said would violate the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

While Philadelphia contractors have bitterly resisted the plan, a spokesman for the Associated General Contractors of America took a wait-and-see attitude in testifying before Ervin's Judiciary subcommittee.

William E. Naumann, a Tucson builder and member of the general contractors' legislative committee, said his organization wants to see how the plan is applied in other instances before taking a position.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 29, 1969]

AFL–CIO JOINS FOES OF PLAN ON MINORITY HIRING

(By Spencer Rich)

The AFL–CIO lined up yesterday with Sens. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.) and Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.) and U.S. Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats in opposition to the Labor Department's minority hiring plan for Philadelphia construction workers.

But the plan was defended by Labor Secretary George P. Shultz and Assistant Attorney General Jerris Leonard as necessary to combat what Leonard called "blatant discrimination" against Negroes by construction unions in the Philadelphia area.

Leonard told a hearing of Ervin's Senate Judiciary subcommittee on separation of powers that of six unions in the Philadelphia area whose workers would be subject to the plan, four had 1 per cent or less minority members as of June, 1969, one had less than 1.5 per cent and one had just under 2 per cent.

The plan has already been put into effect in Philadelphia and is expected to be extended to at least nine other cities by the Labor Department. It requires firms bidding on federally financed construction contracts of $500,000 or more to agree in advance on an "affirmative" program for hiring minority members.

For ironworkers, for example, where Negro employees now number less than 2 per cent in the Philadelphia area, the contractor must agree to try to raise his portion of Negro ironworkers to between 5 and 9 per cent by the end of 1970, 11 and 15 per cent the next year, 16 and 20 per cent the next year, and 22 to 26 per cent by the end of 1973. Similar goals are set for five other trades.

McClelland and Ervin hammered away at Leonard and Shultz in an attempt to get them to concede that the plan imposes racial hiring quotas on construction firms working under government contracts and therefore violates Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which forbids such quotas.

Staats, in his role as congressional budget watchdog, has already issued a ruling to this effect and repeated yesterday that his office will refuse to certify for payment any contracts in which a low bidder fails to get the job because he refuses to agree to the hiring plan or in which government costs are raised as a result of inclusion of the plan.

But Leonard and Shultz refused to concede any violation of Title VII. They insisted that the minority hiring figures were merely "goals," not quotas forbidden by the 1964 law, and that a contractor who failed to meet them would suffer no penalty if he could show he had made good faith attempts to hire minority group members.

"That is a subterfuge," shouted McClellan. "It's a quota."

The AFL–CIO spokesman, Louis Sherman of the building and construction trades department, said the AFL–CIO adopted a resolution at its convention last month opposing the Philadelphia plan as a quota system. He said the unions were doing all they could to get more Negroes into the building trades, but the Philadelphia plan was not the right way to do it.

SALUTE TO INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest public works projects ever undertaken is our Interstate System. This system is now nearing completion and the full benefits of this great system are now being fully realized for the first time by the many motorists of our country. The system was expensive to be sure, but just in terms of the lives it is already saving, it is well worth the expense. The Muscatine Journal recently took note of the importance of the Interstate System:

INTERSTATE DIVIDENDS

A motorist from the Muscatine area can now go up to Interstate 80 and drive to Boston, Mass., or Chamerlain, S.D., or the western part of Nebraska, without seeing a red light.

Progress on the Interstate highway system (including the toll roads which are a part of the system in some areas) permits a vacationer to drive nonstop—except for toll booths and gasoline refills—between Boston and Chamerlain, S.D., in about 30 hours. That is 1,800 miles.

Almost 66 per cent of the planned 42,500-mile super-road network has now been completed.

Largest public works program in history, the interstate system will link virtually every locality of 50,000 or more people with high-speed, limited-access roads that will carry 20 per cent of the nation's traffic.

Besides speeding travelers on their way, the system saves lives. Highway officials estimate that interstate travel is 25 per cent faster and two and one-half times safer than the old primary roads.

More than 2,000 miles of the system have been opened to traffic in just the past year.

According to the Department of Transportation's Bureau of Public Roads, 27,975 miles of interstate highways have been completed since the program began: 5,050 miles (12 per cent) are now under construction and 9,474 miles (22 per cent are in preliminary stages.

The final cost is expected to exceed $60 billion—an average of more than $1,400,000 a mile. The federal government pays 90 per cent of the expenses through the Highway Trust Fund (gasoline taxes). The states pay the rest.

In terms of driving safety and convenience, the interstate highways are already paying tremendous dividends to the motoring public.

THE NEXT 10 YEARS IN SPACE

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful Americans have been asking each other and their Representatives in Congress what are we getting for all the dollars we have invested in space exploration. This is a question that has been asked ever since the National Aeronautics and Space Administration opened its doors for business in 1959.

The outstanding successes of the space program have culminated in the successful return of Apollo 11 astronauts to the surface of the earth from the epochal journey to the surface of the moon. Those successes include weather satellites, communications satellites, applications technology satellites, and navigation satellites, which are at this very moment producing a steady flow of benefits for the American people and the people of the world. The past 10 years have been a prolog to the enormous advancements we anticipate in the next 10 years.

In a speech before the Engineering Society of Detroit, Mr. Robert Anderson, executive vice president of North American Rockwell Corp., outlined in exciting fashion what the future holds for this Nation in the next 10 years in space. I urge every Member to read and reflect upon the ideas expressed by Mr. Anderson, a man who is a leader in an organization that has made realistic commitments of its resources to the achievement of success over those years. The speech follows:

THE NEXT 10 YEARS IN SPACE

(Remarks by Robert Anderson, executive vice president, North American Rockwell Corp., before the Engineering Society of Detroit, Sept. 26, 1969)

Ladies and Gentlemen: Just ten days ago the Space Task Group submitted to President Nixon its recommendations for future space activities.

PRESSURE OF PRIORITY

The document details for the President's consideration the different paths he may elect to follow in implementing a national space program.

"Our opportunities are great," the committee said, "and we have a broad spectrum of choices available to us."

The Task Force report comes at an opportune time, for many questions are being raised about our space activities.

Specifically what should be our next goal? What should be the sequence of events for the next ten years, or for the remainder of the century?

If we elect manned missions to Mars, when should we embark?

Or should we ground the space ships, put them in moth balls and let a future generation take up the challenge?

Behind a great deal of the uncertainty, of course, is the pressure on the budget and the scale of national priorities. The pride of accomplishment in what we have done with Apollo 11 is being weighed against the needs of man on earth.

I'm as aware as any man of the need for solutions to growing ecological and social problems here on earth.

We must tackle those problems and solve them. But we also need to exploit our achievements in space.

I am convinced we can do both. In fact, my main point here today is that the two are directly related.

This nation needs a balanced space program, a well planned series of steps that will carry us into the next century. I will outline some of the steps that should be taken during the coming decade.

I contend that those steps, in the long-term, will make this earth a better place in which to live. In that sense, space activities are not competing with programs of ecological improvement or social betterment. They are actually complementing them.

TERRIFYING ENVIRONMENT

Our earth environment is terrifying in many ways, with its air and water pollution, its congested cities, with its population explosion and the threat of world hunger. The ironical part is that many of today's problems are caused by yesterday's technical solutions. Triumphs in health and sanitation have brought overpopulation. Triumphs in communication have brought an almost unmanageable mass of information.

That does not lessen the urgency of the situation. Every projection we encounter is pessimistic about the future if we don't find a way to clean the water we drink and the air we breathe. Every new baby born into this world is a reminder that we must find a way to convert useless land into fields of growing crops, or recover more food from the sea.

As scientists and engineers, many of us confess our inadequacies. We see over and over again that knowledge of our planet as an environmental system has been woefully inadequate. We have sometimes upset the balance of nature by forgetting the side effects of our advances and problem-solving.

ABSOLUTE NECESSITY

As a result of that inadequacy, gentlemen, it is absolutely necessary for us to continue space exploration. Only there can we fully observe the interaction of man, nature and technology.

We are in considerable trouble today. That trouble could be compounded as our technological society advances toward the year 2000 if we do not make use of the extraordinary new tools that are now within our grasp.

Space gives us an effective platform overseeing the earth. We will be able to see problems clearly; we will be able to measure the severity of those problems; and we will be better able to control them. Pollution, food supply, and cloud cover data will come under global surveillance. We will be able to manage our environment in the supercrowded eras to come.

On the earth, with our space-sponsored advances, we will be making effective contributions in urban affairs; while education, law enforcement, and city planning will be direct beneficiaries of those advances.

The sweeping scope of space technology will be felt more and more in the vast programs being planned to change the course of rivers and the flow of electricity over thousands of miles. It will reach into the purification of our waters and the desalting of the sea. It will have a bearing on the revitalization of our earth transportation system, and it will have a great influence in the field of medicine.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

The amazing technological advances witnessed in this country since the end of World War II came about in large measure because of the tremendous impetus of both military and space research and development activities.

Where would television be today without the impetus of that research? What would be the state-of-the-art of today's commercial jet aircraft if that flood of research and development had been shut off? What would be the status of nuclear energy or microelectronics?

Dr. George Mueller of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration puts the case for space research and development in these unequivocal words: "Our space program is forcing technological innovation which leads to new processes, new products, new companies, and, in fact, whole new industries. This space program is the focal point of our industrial growth."

The advances are the seeds of increasing productivity and the foundation for new products and services. They have been the catalyst needed to keep our economy growing and to keep the products of our industries a step ahead of the rest of the world.

They have enabled our economy to grow to the point where we can seriously contemplate eliminating poverty, transforming our cities into habitable areas again, and planning massive changes to improve our education and transportation systems.

CONTINUED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Those vast infusions of research and development can continue with a well-planned space program.

We will, I am sure, continue to have a strong program. The alternative would be like building a huge factory, turning out one automobile, then shaking hands all around and going home while the factory gathers dust.

It will be a different kind of program, however, because there's going to be a big switch in space.

Up to this time it's been a research and development effort. We've stood, figuratively, with a wet forefinger in the air, testing the unknown wind of space.

There was a time only a few years ago when we thought that prolonged weightlessness might cause a man's bones to disintegrate. We weren't entirely sure how dif-

ferent metals would stand up under the alternate extremes of heat and cold in space or withstand constant exposure to radiation.

Now we know the answers.

We're out of the pure research, development and test stage—that is, the steps leading up to the first moon landing.

We're ready for operational activities.

We're going into long-term moderate cost operational space programs that will have as their central theme the maximum benefit for man on earth.

The key to economy will be re-usable space shuttles, spacecraft that journey out to orbit then return intact on their own power and land just like an airplane.

We're rapidly coming *to the end of the period* when we toss a hundred-million dollars worth of hardware into the sky, then let it drop back into the Atlantic Ocean after its one-time-only task as a booster is finished.

It's costing this country one thousand dollars a pound to put a payload into earth orbit and return it to earth. The industry's goal is to bring that price tag down to fifty dollars a pound—which is just about equivalent to the cost incurred with our most advanced research aircraft.

That's earth orbit. We've got similar savings planned for lunar activity. It's been costing this Nation $100,000 to move a pound of material from the earth's surface to the moon's surface and return. The goal of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is to drop the cost to $200 a pound. And that means a lunar transportation system.

MEANING FOR EARTH DWELLERS

Understandably, people are demanding, "What does it *mean to us here on earth?*"

Ladies and gentlemen, it is almost certain that the missions planned for this coming decade and beyond will improve the living habits of every man, woman, and child on earth.

Consider the returns from just two unmanned satellites alone. Various groups have estimated that in the United States about $2 billion could be *saved annually by farmers, fuel producers,* and public utilities if effective weather forecasts could be made just two weeks in advance. This capability will be provided by the advanced weather satellites that soon will be ready.

But that $2 billion figure pales before another projection.

Earth Resources Technology Satellites will become operational within a few years.

Congressman Joe Karth of Minnesota, second ranking majority member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, is an authority on that particular project.

He estimates that the economic benefits from this one satellite alone—in weather forecasting and increased food production, and in uncovering new resources of the ocean and new mineral and water resources—could add more than $6 billion a year to the economy of America alone.

Here's another unmanned satellite example:

The new communications satellites that will soon be on station in space will represent an incredible advance in the state of the art. With them, truly "Every call will be a local call."

Those satellites will enable even the most primitive of emerging nations to leapfrog a century of development efforts such as we have seen in this country—from the first Western Union telegraph pole to today's automatic nationwide dial system. The new nations will literally "space talk" themselves right into the 21st century.

We are convinced that we *can and must use men* and machines in space to cope with the problems and fulfill the expectations of the 1980s.

We know where we are going in space for the next three years, for the hardware has already been allotted.

NEXT IN LINE

We must now complete the next four landings to give us the basic scientific data on the characteristics of the moon. These data are the key to establishing the origin and evolution of that body.

The famed chemist, Professor Harold Urey of the University of California at San Diego, has pointed out that the surface of the moon is timeless and unchanging. In contrast, the air and water that sustain life on our planet have ground away most of our geological history.

These next four Apollo missions should answer question after question about the moon's evolution, and many of these answers may apply to the Earth. The latter Apollo missions should also uncover a great many more questions.

But we are ready for this with more advanced lunar exploration missions. They will be programmed to answer the unanswered questions.

They will lay the foundations of knowledge if we are to make commitments in the late 1970s for permanent lunar bases.

The use of our lunar landing space craft and launch vehicles as an earth orbiting space station is an indication of the versatility of the coming generations of space hardware. We will convert the *third stage of the launch* vehicle into an orbital workshop for launch in 1972.

This program looks toward a permanent space station for Earth resources observation and on-the-spot weather interpretation.

Looking further ahead, we at North American Rockwell are deeply involved in the studies and industrial competitions that will rival or excel in importance the Apollo effort.

In the 1960s our space program was determined by one single goal—land a man on the moon and return him safely to earth. Space technology today has matured to the point where no single spectacular goal will serve as did the Apollo program.

Space programs will have multiple goals, and they will be driven by requirements for low operational costs and direct tie-in to what we do on Earth.

ADVANCED SPACE STATION

The advanced space station is one of these systems. North American Rockwell and the General Electric Company, as a team, are designing such a system for National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We are in a competition to design a national laboratory in space, a laboratory to operate continuously for ten years. It will be manned by engineers, scientists, and astronomers, all spending several months in orbit just as they now spend time as visiting researchers, at laboratories or on research ships sailing the Earth's oceans.

The station will be an effective operational system because we can change missions and operations at minimum cost. It will be economical in operation which will mean that private industry, universities, and other nations of the world can "rent" time in space for their own needs and purposes.

There will be entirely new areas of research open to these scientists-in-space as they explore the results of weightlessness on materials and processes. We will enter a new era in manufacturing technology, for engineers in orbit will be able to perform industrial processes with materials and chemicals that today are impossible or not even dreamed of.

Within the past fifty years the advances that have been made in materials development have resulted in new industries, new products, and to a large extent the burgeoning economy we know today.

That same surge of materials development, with a resulting benefit to man on Earth, is waiting in the new era of orbiting space stations.

KEY TO ECONOMY

The key to economical, low cost operation of our space station and of all the space missions to come *will be the space shuttle* program, a technical advancement over Apollo far greater than that of Apollo over Sputnik.

This is the system to transport men, material and satellites into Earth orbit and bring them back at less than $50 a pound.

We are investigating a system where the launch vehicles and the spacecraft are as one; where we *can reuse our boosters* 100 times or more.

They must be operational spacecraft in the same sense as *the jet airliner.* Instead of the current two months of checkout and countdown, we must operate with the post flight inspection, refueling and takeoff procedures of jet airliners coupled with progressive maintenance and overhaul programs—a true "spacelines" operation.

The technical challenges run the whole spectrum *from basic materials* through space traffic control. But we can do it, and this system is the key to the "harvest of space."

What I've just related is a balanced, national space program, one that is a logical sequence to these years of preparation.

We don't have to talk in terms of the future alone when we consider the benefits to man from the space program. Earlier I mentioned the big switch in space from research and development activities to operational flights. There's a switch down here on Earth, too. I'm talking about the transfer of aerospace technology to everyday human needs.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration officials have identified over 3,000 technological innovations useful in civilian life that have been directly attributable to the space program. New biomedical equipment, new food treatments, new flame proof materials, new energy sources are just a few. Important developments from the space effort are being studied by commercial firms that will affect the lives of all of us.

Gentlemen, the world changed permanently the moment Neil Armstrong stepped on the surface of the moon.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has said, "We are experiencing the birth shock of being born into a new world. There is no turning back."

We have no thought of turning back. Our eyes are on the charting of the course that lies ahead. Determining that course in space for the United States will not be an easy decision. It will be a far more difficult and complex task than setting the Apollo goal in 1961.

Nevertheless, a great deal of the future growth and health of this nation depends on our choice. Space technology is opening a new world, not a hundred miles above us, but here on Earth. Operations in space have a vital role to play in making this a better, a more livable world.

For that reason, I am sure the national decision will be to accept the challenge.

We will take the next giant step for mankind.

Thank you.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS ENDORSED BY BURGER COURT, MITCHELL AND NIXON

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, HEW appropriations authorized by Congress to allow the spending of taxpayers' moneys by HEW expressly prohibits, in sections 409 and 410, the use of any part of the

funds for designated acts to overcome racial imbalance.

The recent Supreme Court decision orders enforced as if law specific guidelines prepared by salaried HEW employees, advisers and consultants, educators, and counselors. In the Mississippi case the guidelines number some 30 volumes. All of this preparation required vast expenditures of money. Whose money?

If one penny of taxpayers' funds was used in this social injustice bonanza against the express provision of the act of Congress appropriating money to HEW, the spending constituted the crime of misappropriation of taxpayers' funds. In such case, it would appear that every involved HEW employee, consultant, and other recipients of the misappropriated funds were guilty of a crime and certainly are open to civil suits by taxpayers who are interested in restoring the misused funds to the Treasury, as well as criminal action by various grand juries in the Southern States, where crimes took place.

Now we certainly understand why Mr. Finch is pleading so desperately with Members of the other body to try to remove the Whitten amendment from the 1969–70 HEW appropriations bill so that he is not again forced to steal the taxpayers' money to continue his guideline racket.

Can anyone imagine what would happen to an ordinary citizen if he or she stole taxpayers' money, or even if they were the recipient of misappropriated Federal funds.

Or can anyone imagine what would happen at the Pentagon if some general used military funds to pay for a project which was expressly forbidden by Congress?

When these civil suits or criminal indictments are filled, who will hear the cases?

All of the judges who are involved in the elevation to a phony "law of the land" of the illegal guidelines, manufactured with misappropriated funds, must certainly be held to be accessories after the fact. Their ignorance of the law is apparent, but no excuse. They are, therefore, subject to being excused or denied the honor of sitting in judgment in cases in which they have an interest entirely contrary to the American people.

Another interesting innovation in the Supreme Court's per curiam was that despite jurisdiction in civil rights cases being conferred by Congress on U.S. district courts, the Supreme Court apparently does not trust its control over all district judges and has decided to amend the judicial code as well as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, so in paragraph 4 of its decision, it decreed that the courts of appeal retain jurisdiction and enforce their own illegal orders.

Recent actions of the Supreme Court of the United States leave much to be desired.

The present Justices seem to be laying the groundwork for an ugly and destructive confrontation with the U.S. Congress and the American people.

So that our colleagues will know the absolute absurdity of the HEW guidelines which the Supreme Court would dignify by treating as the "law of the land," I submit guidelines typical of the 30—except for breakdown of school assignments—section 409 of the current HEW appropriations and the Supreme Court per curiam follow my remarks:

Sec. 409 of the Appropriations Act under which the H.E.W. employees are paid reads as follows:

"No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force busing of students, abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent in order to overcome racial imbalance."

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

NO. 632.—OCTOBER TERM, 1969

Beatrice Alexander et al., petitioners against Holmes County Board of Education et al. On Writ of of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

[October 29, 1969.]

PER CURIAM.

These cases come to the Court on a petition for certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The petition was granted on October 9, 1969, and the case set down for early argument. The question presented is one of paramount importance, involving as it does the denial of fundamental rights to many thousands of school children who are presently attending Mississippi schools under segregated conditions contrary to the applicable decisions of this Court. Against this background the Court of Appeals should have denied all motions for additional time because continued operation of segregated schools under a standard of allowing "all deliberate speed" for desegregation is no longer constitutionally permissible. Under explicit holdings of this Court the obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools. *Griffin* v. *School Board*, 377 U.S. 218, 234 (1964); *Green* v. *County School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 438, 439, 442 (1968). Accordingly, *It is hereby adjudged, ordered, and decreed:*

1. The Court of Appeals' order of August 28, 1969, is vacated, and the cases are remanded to that court to issue its decree and order, effective immediately, declaring that each of the school districts here involved may no longer operate a dual school system based on race or color, and directing that they begin immediately to operate as unitary school systems within which no person is to be effectively excluded from any school because of race or color.

2. The Court of Appeals may in its discretion direct the schools here involved to accept all or any part of the August 11, 1969, recommendations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with any modifications which that court deems proper insofar as those recommendations insure a totally unitary school system for all eligible pupils without regard to race or color.

The Court of Appeals may make its determination and enter its order without further arguments or submissions.

3. While each of these school systems is being operated as a unitary system under the order of the Court of Appeals, the District Court may hear and consider objections thereto or proposed amendments thereof provided, however, that the Court of Appeals' order shall be complied with in all respects while the District Court considers such objections or amendments, if any are made. No amendment shall become effective before being passed upon by the Court of Appeals.

4. The Court of Appeals shall retain jurisdiction to insure prompt and faithful compliance with its order, and may modify or amend the same as may be deemed necessary or desirable for the operation of a unitary school system.

5. The order of the Court of Appeals dated August 28, 1969, having been vacated and the case remanded for proceedings in conformity with this order, the judgment shall issue forthwith and the Court of Appeals is requested to give priority to the execution of this judgment as far as possible and necessary.

A DESEGREGATION PLAN FOR THE WILKINSON COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

(A report to the superintendent by the Division of Equal Education Opportunities, U.S. Office of Education, Atlanta, Ga.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Atlanta, Ga.

MR. BERNARD WAITES,
Superintendent,
Wilkinson County School District,
Woodville, Miss.

DEAR MR. WAITES: In accordance with the July 5, 1969 order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, the following desegregation plan for ending the dual school system in the Wilkinson County School District is submitted for your consideration.

We wish to express our appreciation for the cooperation received from you and your staff.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE J. JORDAN,
Senior Program Officer, Equal Educational Opportunities.

III. DESEGREGATION OF FACULTY AND OTHER STAFF

The School Board shall announce and implement the following policies:

1. The principals, teachers, teacher-aides and other staff who work directly with children at a school shall be so assigned for the school year 1969–70 and subsequent years that in no case will the racial composition of a staff indicate that a school is intended for Negro students or white students. For the 1969–70 school year the district shall assign the staff described above so that the ratio of Negro to white teachers in each school, and the ratio of other staff in each, are substantially the same as each such ratio is to the teachers and other staff, respectively, in the entire school system.

The school district shall, to the extent necessary to carry out this desegregation plan, direct members of its staff as a condition of continued employment to accept new assignments.

2. Staff members who work directly with children, and professional staff who work on the administrative level will be hired, assigned, promoted, paid, demoted, dismissed, and otherwise treated without regard to race, color, or national origin, except to the extent necessary to correct discrimination.

3. If there is to be a reduction in the number of principals, teachers, teacher-aides, or other professional staff employed by the school district which will result in a dismissal or demotion of any such staff members, the staff member to be dismissed or demoted must be selected on the basis of objective and reasonable non-discriminatory standards from among all the staff of the school district. In addition if there is any such dismissal or demotion, no staff vacancy may be filled through recruitment of a person of a race, color, or national origin different from that of the individual dismissed or demoted, until each displaced staff member who is qualified has had an opportunity to fill the vacancy and has failed to accept an offer to do so.

Prior to such a reduction, the school board will develop or require the development of non-racial objective criteria to be used in selecting the staff member who is to be dismissed or demoted. These criteria shall

be available for public inspection and shall be retained by the school district. The school district also shall record and preserve the evaluation of staff members under the criteria. Such evaluation shall be made available upon request to the dismissed or demoted employee.

"Demotion" as used above includes any reassignment (1) under which the staff member receives less pay or has less responsibility than under the assignment he held previously, (2) which requires a lesser degree of skill than did the assignment he held previously, (3) under which the staff member is asked to teach a subject or grade other than one for which he is certified or for which he has had substantial experience within a reasonably current period. In general and depending upon the subject matter involved, five years is such a reasonable period.

IV. TRANSPORTATION

The transportation system shall be completely re-examined regularly by the superintendent, his staff, and the school board. Bus routes and the assignment of students to buses will be designed to insure the transportation of all eligible pupils on a nonsegregated and otherwise non-discriminatory basis.

V. SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND SITE SELECTION

The size and location of new school buildings and additions to existing building can significantly affect desegregation now and in the future.

All school construction, school consolidation, and site selection (including the location of any temporary classrooms) in this system shall be done in a manner which will prevent the recurrence of the dual school structure once this desegregation plan is implemented.

VI. MAJORITY TO MINORITY TRANSFER POLICY

Whenever there shall exist schools containing a majority of Negro students, this school district shall permit a student (Negro or white) attending a school in which his race is in the majority to choose to attend another school where space is available, and where his race is in a minority.

VII. ATTENDANCE OUTSIDE SYSTEM OF RESIDENCE

If the School District grants transfers to students living in the district for their attendance at public schools outside the district, or if it permits transfers into the district of students who live outside the district, it shall do so on a non-discriminatory basis, except that it shall not consent to transfers where the cumulative effect will reduce desegregation in either district or reinforce the dual school system.

VIII. SUGGESTIONS FOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Successful implementation of desegregation plans largely depends upon local leadership and good faith in complying with mandates of the Courts and the laws upon which the Courts act. The following suggestions are offered to assist local officials in planning for implementation of desegregation orders.

Community

1. The Superintendent and Board of Education should frankly and fully inform all citizens of the community about the legal requirements for school desegregation and their plans for complying with these legal requirements.

2. The Board of Education should issue a public statement clearly setting forth its intention to abide by the law and comply with orders of the Court in an effective and educationally responsible manner.

3. School officials should seek and encourage support and understanding of the press and community organizations representing both races.

4. The Board of Education, or some other appropriate governmental unit, should establish a bi-racial advisory committee to advise the Board of Education and its staff throughout the implementation of the desegregation plan. Such committee should seek to open up community understanding and communication, to assist the Board in interpreting legal and educational requirements to the public.

5. The Superintendent should actively seek greater involvement of parents of both races through school meetings, newsletters, an active and biracial P.T.A., class meeting, parent conferences, and through home visits by school personnel.

6. The Superintendent and Board of Education should regularly report to the community on progress in implementing the desegregation plan.

School personnel

1. The Superintendent should provide all personnel copies of the desegregation plan and arrange for meetings where the personnel will have an opportunity to hear it explained.

2. The Board of Education should issue a policy statement setting forth in clear terms the procedures it will follow in reassignment of the personnel (see section on Desegregation of Staff).

3. Assignments of staff for the school year should be made as quickly as possible with appropriate followup by school principals to assure both welcome and support for personnel new to each school. Invitations to visit school before the new school year begins should be offered.

4. The Superintendent should see that a special orientation program is planned and carried out for both the professional and non-professional staffs (including bus drivers, cafeteria workers, secretaries and custodians) preparatory to the new school year. He should make every effort to familiarize new and reassigned staff with facilities, services, and building policies, and prepare them to carry out their important role in a constructive manner. The Superintendent should direct each principal to see that each teacher new to a school is assigned for help and guidance to a teacher previously assigned to that school. Each such pair of teachers should have an opportunity to meet before the school year actually begins.

5. The Superintendent should arrange an in-service training program during the school year to assist personnel in resolving difficulties and improving instruction throughout the implementation period. Help in doing this is available from the South Mississippi In-Service Consulting Center at Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

6. It is important that, through personal observations, students see that nonprofessional service positions in their schools are not for members of one race and that harmonious working relationships can exist between members of both races. The Superintendent and Board of Education should therefore take all necessary steps to assure that all staffs are bi-racial.

Instructional program

1. Each principal should be required to appoint biracial faculty committees to study and, as necessary, revise each area of the curriculum to assure better learning opportunities for all students. This should become a continuous activity in each school and throughout the district.

2. Student evaluation policies and procedures should be reviewed continuously for areas in need of improvement and adjustment to encourage the educational growth and motivation of students.

3. Remedial programs in reading and mathematics skills, as appropriate, should be introduced and/or expanded for *all* students in need of special help. Such a program should supplement regular course offerings and assignments of students.

4. Grouping procedures should be reviewed and revised as necessary to assure they support the spirit as well as letter of desegregation plan the district has accepted responsibility for implementing in good faith.

5. Participation in extracurricular activities by students of both races should be actively encouraged by administrators and teachers as a means for developing school spirit and a feeling of belonging.

6. School organizations—student government, cheerleaders, musical organizations, athletic teams must be operated on a nondiscriminatory basis and should include students of both races.

7. Guidance counselors should be oriented and urged to plan a leading role in successful implementation of the desegregation plan.

8. The curriculum should be reviewed and, as necessary, revised to provide recognition of Negro history, culture and contributions to our society. Library books which deal with such subjects should be added to school book collections.

9. Vocational education offerings should be reviewed and improved as a means of providing students of both races with education relevant to vocational interests and as a means of reducing dropouts.

10. Headstart or similar preschool programs for children of both races should be implemented.

11. Use of Federal and State education funds should be planned comprehensively for maximum educational benefit to all eligible children.

Students

1. The Superintendent should direct each principal to hold special orientation programs welcoming students who will be new to a school, before the regular school year begins.

2. The Superintendent should require each principal to see that students are frankly and fully informed about the desegregation plan and their responsibilities to help carry it out. Each principal should seek to establish rapport and communication links with new students to encourage mutual understanding and confidence.

3. The Superintendent should direct each principal to establish a student-faculty human relations committee representing both races to aid in the successful implementation of desegregation.

4. All school staff and members of the student body should exert extra effort to assure the full participation of all students of both races in extra-curricular programs, including when appropriate the provision of a "late bus" for those staying after school to participate in such programs.

5. Each principal should request teachers to make themselves available to students outside of regular class for counseling and extra instructional help.

IX. RESOURCES FOR ASSISTANCE

In addition to the regular resources for assistance available to school officials, districts developing or carrying out plans of desegregation in Mississippi may call upon the following agencies for help:

South Mississippi In-Service Consulting Center, University of Southern Mississippi, Southern Station, Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401, Phone: (601) 266-7150.

Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, U.S. Office of Education, 50 Seventh Street, N.E., Room 404, Atlanta, Georgia 30323, Phone: (404) 526-3076.

BATTLE OF PHILOSOPHY

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 3, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that well-organized

pressure groups have united to exert unseeming pressure to prevent the confirmation of President Nixon's nominee as Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Judge Clement Haynsworth.

Their real objection, the Judge's constitutionalist philosophy, has been masked behind the recitation of other thin objections. Mr. Haynsworth's philosophy is the real issue, and I hope the Members of the other body will come to see the matter in that light. Neither political opportunities nor faulty vision should stand in the way.

I wish to insert herewith, by unanimous consent, a timely and perceptive editorial which recently appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel:

BATTLE OF PHILOSOPHY

As the Clement F. Haynsworth, jr., debate grinds on, it is becoming increasingly obvious that organized labor is the main force behind the opposition to his confirmation as a supreme court associate justice.

There has been considerable said about pressure exerted by President Nixon in behalf of the Haynsworth nomination. But there has been too little said about the pressure that unions evidently are exerting on various senators to vote against Haynsworth. The political arm twisting by the unions might make the White House efforts seem relatively gentle.

Just why the unions are so dead set against Haynsworth is not clear. His judicial record is not that antilabor. He has sat on eight labor cases that were reversed by the supreme court but none of the reversals suggested that the decisions overturned were "antilabor." Haynsworth has written eight prolabor opinions and joined in 37 other prolabor rulings.

Having failed to find any damaging conflict of interest evidence and apparently unable to smear him as antilabor, the opposition to Haynsworth has swung back to an original complaint, that he is a southerner, ipso facto, a segregationist. But his record in civil rights cases shows him to be a moderate.

One is left with the feeling that the opposition to Haynsworth is motivated by a desire to try to preserve the philosophical status quo of the court. One senator, in fact, candidly says he will vote against him simply because he disagrees with his socio-economic philosophy.

President Nixon, in defending his nomination, effectively answered this attitude by saying that "if Judge Haynsworth's philosophy leans to the conservative side, in my view that recommends him to me.

"I think the court needs balance, and I think that the court needs a man who is conservative—and I use the term not in terms of economics, but conservative, as I said of Judge Burger, in respect to his attitude toward the Constitution.

"It is the judge's responsibility, and the supreme court's responsibility, to interpret the Constitution and interpret the law, and not to go beyond that in putting his own socio-economic philosophy into decisions in a way that goes beyond the law, beyond the Constitution."

This, we believe, is the fundamental issue involved in the Haynsworth nomination, and the basic reason for the opposition to him is that the liberals are fighting a desperate rear guard action to keep the supreme court's philosophical scales weighted on the side of social activism—in spite of the fact that the people in the last presidential election in effect voted to redress the supreme court's balance.

SENATE—*Tuesday, November 4, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, maker and preserver of all things visible and invisible, we worship Thee in Thine infinite majesty and thank Thee for Thy wondrous gifts to us and to all mankind. We thank Thee for life and reason, for the gifts of nature and of grace, for truth revealed in Thy word and made known through men, for the precious gift of freedom, and the hope of a more perfect world. Make us good men in a good government. Give us the peace of forgiveness and reconciliation that we may find our way to peace among the nations.

Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1969, Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on November 3, 1969, the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 91–502) thereon, which bill was placed on the calendar and the report was printed.

INDIAN EDUCATION: A NATIONAL TRAGEDY—A NATIONAL CHALLENGE

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 3, 1969, Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on November 3, 1969, submitted a report entitled "Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge" (S. Rept. No. 91–501), which report was printed together with supplemental views.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970—RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 262

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

"Page 48, at the end of line 17 and before the period, insert the following: ': *Provided*, That all funds herein appropriated to the business loan and investment fund and all moneys hereinbefore or hereinafter appropriated to such fund, together with all moneys otherwise available to such fund, shall be available to meet guarantees bearing the full faith and credit of the United States of America heretofore or hereafter made by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended.'"

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12964, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 3, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAM ADDRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President spoke sincerely for peace. He emphasized, once again, that he wants to get the United States out of Vietnam. What is still not clear is the how or when. There were no specifics. The President undoubtedly had his reasons for not making this clarification. Nevertheless, until it is made, I am afraid the issue of Vietnam will remain as divisive as ever in the life of the Nation.

The difficulty in waiting for the "other side" and for Saigon to make up their minds that there has been enough bloodshed and destruction is that we are also